Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2002-04 - 2002-05

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2002-04-01 through 2002-05-31

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 4,973

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 00:07:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a888cs$i27$0@208.207.71.155>
Source record: 39267

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You must have been drunk when you heard it also, or you heard wrong.
>
> Nope, I heard right. Most hams that I talked to agreed that the Advanced
> exam of the 1970's was more comprehensive than the Extra. I didn't have
> first hand knowledge cuz I never saw an Extra exam until restructuring.

Aw, well maybe I just didn't notice since I took the General,
Advanced and Extra writtens at the same setting.

2. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 00:26:19 UTC
From: N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a889ug$q4sop$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 39268

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a87uk1jdr2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> Bob, Just an FYI...
> The information is available for anyone to read from FCC
> archives. Jim, N2EY has specific cites he often posts.
> The above comment by Val is one of the few that
> has some actual supporting references.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Thanks Bill. The references Jim posted were just the sort of thing I was asking Val to post. With a reference back to the original, I (and all others in netland) can read it for ourselves, and decide the proper context. If Val had done that he would have been a lot more credible.

Thanks and 73's,

Robert / N4IXT

3. Re: My rebuttal to WA6ITF's SLAM of CB RADIO!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 00:35:16 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331193516.02307.00001562@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39269

Good for you...and thanks. Take care and 73.

Mark

4. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 00:41:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a88abf$nq7$0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 39270

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a87dcv$cq$1@208.206.142.88...
> >
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> >
> > > The ARRL didn't "cave in" on WT 98-143 ... they fought to
> > > the end for 4 classes of license with A and E having a 12 wpm
> > > Morse test. NCI simply won because our arguments were
> > > clear, logical, and in line with good public policy,
> >
> > BS. You browbeat poor old Bill Cross into capitulation. Hard to blame
> > him considering your spewing on this NG over the years.
>
> Dick,
>
> If you knew where you might beg, borrow, or rent a clue, and
> if you knew Bill Cross, you'd know that nobody "browbeats him
> into capitulation." Bill is a long-time extra, who spends most
> of his haming chasing DX and IOTAs on CW ... he's also a
> sensible, dedicated public servant who's committed to doing
> what's best for the long-term health and future of the ARS.

Why, *OF COURSE*!! He did exactly what you wanted, so he's perfect in
every way! Of course it didn't hurt at all that he knew where PC is, in
that he didn't dare offend such a horde of "victims".

{{remaining ton and a half of BS properly disposed of}}
```

5. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 01:00:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a88bf4ocs0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 39271

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> > States should become a radio amateur.
>
> I'm sure from reading the Amateur's Code that there was never any
> intent to establish a pecking order within the ARS.
>

So why do insist on trying to do so all your life??

> > Is she coherent?
>
> Nope, my point exactly. Everyone cannot become an amateur radio operator.

Gee, check with NCI, maybe they'll back a testing waiver for people who
are out of it but whose relatives feel should have a ham radio license.

>
> > > As long as incentive licensing continues to
> > > exist, the door will be open for higher class bullies to heap abuse on the
> > > lower classes. Why don't you talk to those bullies about "Live and let live"?
> >
> > Excuse me while I take time to laugh off your latest offering as being
> > beyond reality.
>
> Of course, as one of the bullies, you are forced to defend yourself
> thusly. One wonders why all the power mongering since it doesn't seem
> to accomplish anything productive.

You are one sick SOB.

6. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 02:02:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA7B159.B251C605@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39272

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> > States should become a radio amateur.
>
> I'm sure from reading the Amateur's Code that there was never any
> intent to establish a pecking order within the ARS.

So there was only one class of license at the time Mr. Segal penned it?

> > Is she coherent?
>
> Nope, my point exactly. Everyone cannot become an amateur radio operator.

I believe I stated that it was never intended for all to become radio
amateurs. I believe the incoherent have always been left out. Perhaps
you can start a movement to have them included.

> > > As long as incentive licensing continues to
> > > exist, the door will be open for higher class bullies to heap abuse on the
> > > lower classes. Why don't you talk to those bullies about "Live and let live"?
> >
> > Excuse me while I take time to laugh off your latest offering as being
> > beyond reality.
>
> Of course, as one of the bullies, you are forced to defend yourself
> thusly. One wonders why all the power mongering since it doesn't seem
> to accomplish anything productive.

...and this silliness tops your last offering.

Dave K8MN

7. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 02:28:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020331212833.01774.00000343@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39274

In article <uae48455h8k8d9@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>
>That is, there seem to be a lot of people unhappy with the
>ARRL, and nowhere is it written in stone that it be the ONLY
>significant organization representing amateur operators.
>Institutional survival IS job #1 with ANY organization and the
>jettisoning of code might have been a very small price to
>pay to put the NCI threat, the LONG RUN threat, to sleep,
>hopefully for GOOD!

Val:

You're in the right section, but sitting in the wrong seat. I have
very strong doubts that the ARRL sees the NCI as any kind of
threat as a "competing organization." You see, NCI is just a small
group of hams who write letters to the FCC; it is not a national
organization with hundreds of thousands of members, in spite of
the member "numbers" you're seeing. There are probably at most
a couple of dozen actual NCI members.

What the ARRL is concerned about is the dismal growth record
of the ARS of late, and the fact that if more people don't become
hams, there won't be a source of prospective ARRL members, and
thus, their membership will decline and the League, already in
financial difficulty, will face extinction. Follow the money, and
you will learn the truth.

The ARRL had to ditch any notion of supporting the status quo
in code testing because they knew they can attract more potential
members with a dumbed-down, free-for-all type of licensing
structure, than one with any practical, meaningful standards.

73 de Larry, K3LT

8. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 02:28:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020331212834.01774.00000344@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39275

In article <3CA70A97.24C6B4D4@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I have no problem with that, but how do you propose to keep those
>> frequencies from going to waste if they are to be used for expansion
>> of phone privileges? HF phone *is* a waste.
>
>Larry, exactly what do you say on HF CW that cannot be said on
>HF phone?

Cecil:

Not much, because from all the evidence I've heard, the language used
on HF phone would never be tolerated on HF CW.

>If the content of the QSOs are the same,

Trust me, it isn't!

>why does the
>mode matter as long as the message gets through?

Well, in a wider variety of cases, the message *will* get through on CW
when it won't on SSB, and thank goodness for that!

>The 40m Novice
>band is presently more like the 40m phone band, filled with
>foreign commercial AM stations. However, since I got my IC-756pro,
>I am finding lots of space between those interfering stations.

Well, I find the same space with my 1987-vintage IC-735.

Sooooo -- You're using an off-the-shelf "appliance" instead of home-
brewing your own multi-band, multi-mode, DSP software-defined
DC-to-Daylight transceiver, using chips produced with your own
two hands right in your basement "clean room" and software you
coded on your palm pilot during your last visit to the bathroom?
What are you -- some knuckle-dragging CW user, or what?
Better not let Lennie Anderson catch you! After all, all the new No-code
soon to be Zero WPM Generals and Extras will be able to do that
in their sleep!

73 de Larry, K3LT

9. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 02:28:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020331212835.01774.00000345@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39273

In article <1RFp8.543$Zh6.31469920@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> I was starting to think that you might be here to conduct some reasoned
>> debate and discussion. From the above trash it's clear I was mistaken.
>>
>> Twit filter = On
>>
>> Hans
>
>Hans, I've never seen you put a "twit" filter on Bruce or Larry. Why is
>that?

Brian:

He can't see what you just said -- you're in his twit filter!

BTW -- if as many people were in as many twit filters as are claimed
in this NG, the place would resemble the Sahara Desert at high noon.

73 de Larry, K3LT

10. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 03:02:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a88ijpetr0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 39276

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <1RFp8.543$Zh6.31469920@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> I was starting to think that you might be here to conduct some reasoned
> >> debate and discussion. From the above trash it's clear I was mistaken.
> >>
> >> Twit filter = On
> >>
> >> Hans
> >
> >Hans, I've never seen you put a "twit" filter on Bruce or Larry. Why is
> >that?
>
> Brian:
>
> He can't see what you just said -- you're in his twit filter!
>
> BTW -- if as many people were in as many twit filters as are claimed
> in this NG, the place would resemble the Sahara Desert at high noon.

I can tell you that at least half of all posts to this NG never are
opened here anymore.

11. Re: Its been Fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 03:42:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca7d98a$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39278

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331181134.11827.00001860@mb-mq.aol.com...
>
> 3. And TiT I will be in the Dallas Area part of the week, maybe we can
have a
> QSO on your favorite 2 Meter CB Repeater. The Question for the rest of you
is
> will TIT and I have the QSO?
>

No question about it. I would not speak with someone like you. So, no, we
will not be having a QSO.

Kim W5TIT

12. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 03:46:09 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca7da4e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39280

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a888cs$i27$0@208.207.71.155...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You must have been drunk when you heard it also, or you heard wrong.
> >
> > Nope, I heard right. Most hams that I talked to agreed that the Advanced
> > exam of the 1970's was more comprehensive than the Extra. I didn't have
> > first hand knowledge cuz I never saw an Extra exam until restructuring.
>
>
> Aw, well maybe I just didn't notice since I took the General,
> Advanced and Extra writtens at the same setting.

Ya see, for Dick it's all about validating himself. He's got no validation
without chest thumping... It's all it was ever about for him. There's no
viagra for folks like little Dick.

Kim W5TIT

13. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 03:48:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca7daca_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39281

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331170328.21846.00001948@mb-ch.aol.com...
> >WA8LUX shows his complete ignorance again.
>
> Yea your right, I forget to mention that you probably have the same Tatoo
on
> your ASS

Hasn't someone explained to you that schoolyard antics and childish one
liners aren't the insults you think they are...well, at least once grown up.
Maybe you're not very grown up...never mind.

Kim W5TIT

14. WA6ITF's Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 03:57:40 UTC
From: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3ca7d963.883644@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
Source record: 39279
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Return-path: <newsline@ix.netcom.com>
Received: from msgstr02 (msgstr02-data [172.20.3.51])
by msgstore03.icomcast.net (iPlanet Messaging Server 5.1 (built Sep
5 2001))
with ESMTP id <0GTV00END65SL5@msgstore03.icomcast.net> for
k8cpa@ims-ms-daemon
(ORCPT k8cpa@comcast.net); Sun, 31 Mar 2002 19:46:40 -0500 (EST)
Received: from bright06.icomcast.net (bright06-qfe0.icomcast.net
[172.20.4.63])
by msgstore02.icomcast.net (iPlanet Messaging Server 5.1 (built May
7 2001))
with ESMTP id <0GTV0024165S12@msgstore02.icomcast.net> for
k8cpa@comcast.net
(ORCPT k8cpa@comcast.net); Sun, 31 Mar 2002 19:46:40 -0500 (EST)
Received: from mtain05 (lb-ldap-155.icomcast.net [172.20.3.155])
by bright06.icomcast.net (8.11.6/8.11.6) with ESMTP id
g310kcW23060 for
<k8cpa@comcast.net>; Sun, 31 Mar 2002 19:46:38 -0500 (EST)
Received: from xlate1.mailsvcs.arrl.net
(DCCInc-Colo-46-9.OneCall.Net [216.37.46.9])
by mtain05.icomcast.net (iPlanet Messaging Server 5.1 (built Feb 6
2002))
with ESMTP id <0GTV00D1865PGD@mtain05.icomcast.net> for
k8cpa@comcast.net
(ORCPT k8cpa@comcast.net); Sun, 31 Mar 2002 19:46:37 -0500 (EST)
Received: from hall.mail.mindspring.net
(hall.mail.mindspring.net [207.69.200.60]) by
xlate1.mailsvcs.arrl.net
(8.11.6/8.11.0) with ESMTP id g310kb505563 for <k8cpa@arrl.net>;
Sun,
31 Mar 2002 19:46:37 -0500
Received: from pool0210.cvx18-bradley.dialup.earthlink.net
([209.179.238.210] helo=default) by hall.mail.mindspring.net
with smtp
(Exim 3.33 #1) id 16rpxy-0006Vk-00 for k8cpa@arrl.net; Sun,
31 Mar 2002 19:46:34 -0500
Date: Sun, 31 Mar 2002 16:47:06 -0800
From: Bill Pasternak <newsline@ix.netcom.com>
Subject: Re: Your Article on AR Newsline #1285
In-reply-to: <3.0.6.32.20020331172357.0079ba90@pop3.norton.antivirus>
X-Sender: newsline@popd.ix.netcom.com
To: chuck K8CPA <k8cpa@arrl.net>
Message-id: <3.0.6.32.20020331164706.007ee730@popd.ix.netcom.com>
```

MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

The difference between "opinion" on your part and "fact" on our part
is
that we have the documentation -- including several hours of
audioitape
with one Raymond Beardsford alias Richard B. Cooper and the California
State Attorney General for Consumer Fraud in 1977 - one Herschell
Elkins.

de
Bill P.

At 05:23 PM 3/31/02 -0500, you wrote:
>coming from a Former CB Radio Operator, I have never, EVER heard such
>BIASED, OPINIONATED, BULLCRAP in my life... You made most CB'ers sound like
>IDIOTS! SHAME ON THE AR NEWSLINE SERVICE!
>
>73 LID
>
>de K8CPA
>
>-Chuck
>
>A copy of this is being POSTED in The Newsgroup REC.RADIO.CB!
>
>
>
>
>-Chuck K8CPA
>k8cpa@arrl.net
>web: http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA
>
>"I went down to the crossroads, Fell down on my knees..." - Eric Clapton
>1969
>
Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
Writer - Producer
The Amateur Radio Newsline, Inc.
wa6itf@arnewsline.org
http://www.arnewsline.org
"Since 1976 - Hobby Radio News
for Todays Radio Amateur"

==========

Of which I replied.

Date: Sun, 31 Mar 2002 22:54:02 -0500
From: chuck K8CPA <k8cpa@arrl.net>

Subject: Re: Your Article on AR Newsline #1285
X-Sender: K8CPA/mail.comcast.net@pop3.norton.antivirus
To: Bill Pasternak <newsline@ix.netcom.com>
Cc: k8cpa@comcast.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)

At 04:47 PM 3/31/2002 -0800, you wrote:
>The difference between "opinion" on your part and "fact" on our part is
>that we have the documentation -- including several hours of audioitape
>with one Raymond Beardsford alias Richard B. Cooper and the California
>State Attorney General for Consumer Fraud in 1977 - one Herschell Elkins.
>

Provide me with what audio tape you have and documents you have, and
allow
me to review them, and I'll post a retraction... otherwise, it's all
opinion.

-Chuck K8CPA
k8cpa@arrl.net
web: http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA

So, it's in your corner Bill!

I'd like to see these so-called documents.....

73!

15. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:03:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1_Qp8.1068$Xf7.55356920@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39282

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331175027.11835.00001979@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >My mother is right, I'm nothing like you
>
> Yea your right, I tryed to explain that to her.

Seems that no one listens to you.

16. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:04:37 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <p%Qp8.6882$ml2.527834@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39283
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Randy" <Anonymous@anon.com> wrote

> The sale of Ham radios to non-licensed persons is not illegal.
> Perhaps this line of thinking should be addressed but until it is you can
> look forward to unending "pirate" operations on the Ham bands.

Every so often a guy like Randy comes up with the mistaken idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of amateur radio equipment and supplies. These are the folks who suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out under the nose of the impressionable public. I suspect they don't like the idea that soldering guns and schematics are openly sold to those without the proper credentials also.

While it is easy, on the surface, to agree with their goal (keeping amateur equipment out of the hands of bootleggers), I feel the attitude that amateur equipment should be treated as some sort of controlled substance is short-sighted and in fact damaging to our service.

I live in a large metropolitan area. We have one full line amateur store in town. There are no other similar stores in the whole state. In the four states which border us, there are 2 more amateur radio stores. THAT'S IT! In 5 states, there are only 3 stores! In the whole country, my guess is that there are less than four dozen stores selling amateur radio equipment, antennas, and supplies! It is as though we were some secret society, bent on concealing our presence from the world.

Not all that many years ago, there were at least 6 electronic stores here in town which sold amateur equipment (not exclusively, but they all had a good selection). Add to that two Heathkit stores, and even the Sears stores sold amateur transceivers for awhile. (Yes, Virginia, right there along with the Craftsman sockets and Silvertone TV sets.) In the same era, Radio Row in NYC was blocks of wall-to-wall storefronts catering to electronics experimenters. Popular Science magazine had a regular column about amateur radio, and occasional construction articles. Every second little town had an amateur radio club. Amateur Radio was a populist, Joe SixPack kind of hobby.

During those years it was easy for a person to get interested in being an amateur, to shop around for the best

deal on equipment, and to meet an Elmer. We were visible to the public, and well regarded.

Then somewhere along the line came the magic of 1-800 shopping, amateur radio marketing became streamlined, and radio stores disappeared from Hometown America. With the demise of the local radio store, all the Elmers disappeared into their shacks and newcomers flounder around in fancy four-color ads in back of CQ and QST magazine, trying to decide how to be a ham. Clubs floundered, in part due to the loss of hams around the coffee pot in the back of the local electronics part store.

Rather than continuing to restrict the availability of amateur equipment, as though we were selling assault weapons or recreational pharmaceuticals, I vote for opening up the market. Let's have radios for sale in the strip malls alongside the video games, Lionel trains, and mountain bikes. And it won't hurt if a few of us put on our Elmer-suits and lurk around to spot the likely recruits.

When they outlaw ham gear, only outlaws will be hams.

73, de Hans, K0HB

17. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:08:30 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uafm869g3ttda@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39277

Carl R. Stevenson wrote, after I asked,

>> So, when is NCI officially disbanding?

the following . . .

>When there is no longer a mandatory Morse test for
>any class of Amateur license anywhere in the world.

One always has to admire ambition! But anyway,
when code testing goes away here that will be the
end of your agitating in the U.S., right? I mean,
when the F.C.C. ends code testing in the Land of the
Free then we can assume you'll be trying to call in
airstrikes only in FOREIGN countries, and we won't be
hearing from you anymore on U.S. ham-related issues.
Would that be a fair statement?

Val

P.S. Does Iraq have the code test? We could kill
two birds with one stone there, pretty shortly, by
sicking you and your friends on old Saddam, couldn't
we? Yeah, the NCI Air Force would no doubt reduce
him in seconds, and CNN would be there to record
you writing "NCI" on some of your ordinance! My, my,
how the WORLD would TREMBLE!

**

18. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:12:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <V6Rp8.1075$9r7.55920065@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39284

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA7907A.B4FB1218@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > BTW, what is a "neener?"
>
> It's the verbal equivalent of stroking one index finger
> upon the other.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Phew! For a minute I thought it might be the 0-land equivalent of "asswipe"
or something. I'd hate to put myself in the same class as Val.

19. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:13:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <T7Rp8.1076$ds7.55964913@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39285

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020331212835.01774.00000345@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <1RFp8.543$Zh6.31469920@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> I was starting to think that you might be here to conduct some reasoned
> >> debate and discussion. From the above trash it's clear I was mistaken.
> >>
> >> Twit filter = On
> >>
> >> Hans
> >
> >Hans, I've never seen you put a "twit" filter on Bruce or Larry. Why is
> >that?
>
> Brian:
>
> He can't see what you just said -- you're in his twit filter!
>
> BTW -- if as many people were in as many twit filters as are claimed
> in this NG, the place would resemble the Sahara Desert at high noon.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Yeah, I read most of them if I have time. No filters here.

20. Re: Its been Fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:19:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <0dRp8.1079$Ez7.56366143@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39286

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331181134.11827.00001860@mb-mq.aol.com...
> Thanks guys for the Fun Weekend you to TIT. I have to get ready to take of
> this week on Bussiness, and wont have time to play on the Newsgroups.

Sounds like Schneider hitched up the trailer. Don't forget your donut
cushion.

21. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:22:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <DgRp8.1081$nB7.56440097@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39287

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uafm869g3ttda@corp.supernews.com...

> P.S. Does Iraq have the code test? We could kill
> two birds with one stone there, pretty shortly, by
> sicking you and your friends on old Saddam, couldn't
> we? Yeah, the NCI Air Force would no doubt reduce
> him in seconds, and CNN would be there to record
> you writing "NCI" on some of your ordinance! My, my,
> how the WORLD would TREMBLE!

Hey Hans, this guy is advocating murder.

22. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:23:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <vhRp8.1082$Ts7.55997926@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39288

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA7943A.F22A768@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > >Val, your entire line of thinking here, with all of these
> > >backroom conspiracy theories, is false and so absurd
> > >that it makes you look foolish to even suggest it. If you
> > >had been involved long enough in ham radio policy and
> > >politics, you'd know that, but as a "newbie" your mistake
> > >is understandable/excusable.
> >
> > So, when is NCI officially disbanding?
>
> Asked and answered already - when the code requirement is removed
> for all amateur exams in all countries.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

He knows the answer. He just needs a forum to spout off.

23. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:24:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a88nic$e47$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39292

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uafm869g3ttda@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote, after I asked,
>
> >> So, when is NCI officially disbanding?
>
> the following . . .
>
> >When there is no longer a mandatory Morse test for
> >any class of Amateur license anywhere in the world.
>
> One always has to admire ambition! But anyway,
> when code testing goes away here that will be the
> end of your agitating in the U.S., right? I mean,
> when the F.C.C. ends code testing in the Land of the
> Free then we can assume you'll be trying to call in
> airstrikes only in FOREIGN countries, and we won't be
> hearing from you anymore on U.S. ham-related issues.
> Would that be a fair statement?

That's a fair statement as regards NCI. That's
not at all something you can expect from me as
an individual.

If you think otherwise, please explain why you'd
expect me, an indivdiual, to not voice my opinion
on other ham issues.

> P.S. Does Iraq have the code test? We could kill
> two birds with one stone there, pretty shortly, by
> sicking you and your friends on old Saddam, couldn't
> we? Yeah, the NCI Air Force would no doubt reduce
> him in seconds, and CNN would be there to record
> you writing "NCI" on some of your ordinance! My, my,
> how the WORLD would TREMBLE!

And Val claims his roots are in acadamia?

Still ROTFLMAO.
Bill K2UNK

24. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:24:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <biRp8.1083$B96.51963023@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39289

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA79629.79B1A920@IEEE.org...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > The fat lady has sung ... get on with your life, quit your incessant
> > bitching, and don't presume to insult people like Bill Cross who
> > are so far above you in intelligence and integrity that "head and
> > shoulders" doesn't even come close to describing it adequately.
>
> I've always pictured Dick's head and shoulders as being just
> about the level of his buttocks. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

No neck?
```

25. Re: WA6ITF's Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:24:58 UTC
From: Big CBer <bigcber@nowhere.iam>
Message-ID: <3CA7E11B.86F9E9DF@nowhere.iam>
Source record: 39290
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Chuck K8CPA wrote:
>
> web: http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA

Nice hum in you're audio.

26. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:26:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331232645.15133.00000207@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 39291

In article <3a415f47cd4c25d2a9eddf6a98635bf0.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>When I was first licensed (WN2CJV
>in 1962), novices had voice privileges in the 2 meter band. I suspect
>the ARRL was trying to get more activity up there.

Novices had 2 meter privileges from the very beginning of that license (1951) but lost voice (actually, AM only) privs in 1967.

The original reason/idea for the Novice was to provide a sort of "learner's permit" that would lead to a higher class license. The Tech was originally intended to be an experimenter's license, so it made sense for the Novice to have some VHF privs as a lead-in to the Tech, and some HF privs as a lead-in to the General and higher classes.

> A gentleman had
>built (around 1964) a 1 tube transceiver for 440 MHz - problem was, he
>had no one to talk to - even if it had a lot more than its' 1/2 to 1
>mile alleged range!

There was a single tube 440 transceiver in the late-60s ARRL Handbooks - used a single 6CW4 and a couple of transistors in the audio section. A far cry from a
modern HT!

> Now, novices and coded techs can use 10 meters. I
>wonder why?

The original idea was to counter incursion by freebanders in the late '70s and early '80s.

>International agreements prohibit amateur operation below
>30 MHz without some CW. Exactly what that means, I'll leave to the
>more knowlegeable folks around here.

There's an ITU treaty section that says, in effect, that all hams whose licenses
allow operation below 30 MHz must pass code tests. The USA abides by this treaty, and the FCC sez that because of that treaty section (S25.5), code tests are still needed. FCC also sez that treaty requirement is the one and only reason we still have the 5 wpm code test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

27. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 04:27:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <LkRp8.1085$FJ7.56876471@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39293

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA79970.21233D0B@IEEE.org...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Yea, the great ARRL/NCI conspiracy. Gee, it
> > doesn't get any funnier than this.
>
> Remember how screwed up Dr. McCoy got after a mind meld with Spock?
> Maybe Val's mind meld with Dick is having the same effect?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Was that before or after Spock went into heat?

28. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:16:04 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uafq6tajq8r474@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39294

N2EY wrote:

[In reply to my comment that the FCC decided in 1975 that the
code test had "no regulatory purpose."]

>1975 is significant because in that year the FCC proposed
>a VHF/UHF-only ham license with no code test, as part of a
>complex restructuring proposal. It would be more accurate to
>say that the FCC decided in 1975 that code testing was not
>an absolute necessity for all ham licenses. The "no regulatory
>purpose" phrase is from the Report and Order (R&O) for 98-143,
>the restructuring proposal that took effect in April of 2000.
>In that quarter century, it is clear from FCC actions that their
>view of the necessity of code testing changed from 'not an
>absolute necessity for all ham licenses' to 'serves no regulatory
>purpose for any ham license other than meeeting treatyrequire-
>ments'. Lot of difference there.

I've read your histories, the most recent one and one you put
on some time ago, and should have qualified my message
this morning in this area. That's what happens when you get
in a hurry on a Sunday morning before church. I should have
prayed a little more over it! The FCC's code position certainly
was a slide, not totally precipitous.

[About "no regulatory purpose being WRONG!]

>I agree. But the FCC doesn't, and they make the rules.
>The mere fact that FCC does something doesn't make
>it "right", of course, but it does make it legal.

This is all quite fascinating, about the FCC. It seems to
be like some kind of Black Box, a mystery wrapped in an
enigma, it's actions unfathomable. However, I cannot help
but assume that it's just like other government agencies,
and under constant bombardment by those with axes to
grind, including particpants in amateur radio. That is,
when I read "The FCC did this out of the blue," well,
I refuse to give it much credence. That is, it may have
been out of the blue for SOME folks, but, er, ah, for
others it sure as heck likely was not! Who do you see
as the primary influencers of the agency over time,
vis-a-vis the ARS? There's a major article here, for
a magazine that does not currently exist in amateur
radio. That is, I don't think QST would run any historical
piece that really delved into ALL the possibilities.

[About code and "international understanding"]

>Sounds good to me - but the FCC doesn't buy it. Nor
>any other procodetest reason other than "gotta satisfy
>the treaty".

Do you have any thoughts on WHY this came about? That
is, why the desire to get rid of ALL of it, in spite of it's long
history in the ARS and its demonstrated usefullness? It
seems like cutting off your nose to spite your face.

[To my comments on Ham Radio's "Top Ten]

>Ed's list, as I read it, says that code TESTING is not in
>the Top Ten. Just his opinion, anyway. But note that FCC
>received comments on code testing from less than one
>half of one percent of US hams, even though the comment
>period was longer than usual and comments could be filed
>online. Such a small turnout indicates that, indeed, most
>interested individuals don't really care very much about
>code testing, one way or another.

Could be. Or, it could be that they thought the ARRL
was actually interested in preserving the test, right up
until the wheelchair went into the water! That is, if you
think your interests are being protected by the people
who seem to be saying that they're protecting them, well,
that helps keep you in your chair. Somehow, this whole
affair has the air of the "sandbag"! See below my
thoughts about why no "Pro-Code" grass-roots group
ever appeared.

[NCI as a threat to ARRL]

>I don't think so. ARRL's position did not change
>significantly from the initial proposal. FCC simply
>decided not to go along.

I'm really sorry, but this last just won't do. It's a bit like
the old New Yorker cartoon about the scientist with the
blackboard full of equations, and the "solution" down
in the lower right-hand corner. But over in the lower
left-hand corner, in tiny print, was the legend, "then a
miracle happens," in between two crucial expressions.
Why, why, why did the FCC "not go along?"

[More on NCI.]

>No-Code-International has a total historic membership
>of perhaps 3400 individuals, worldwide. Membership
>numbers are sequential and started with #1001, and
>there are no dues and noexpiration date on membership.

Well, yes. BUT, they got a seat at the table, didn't they,
and from even smaller acorns mighty oaks have grown.

The bureaucrat's REAL job is to stomp the potential opposition, or find a way to neutralize it, BEFORE it gets to truly amount to something. Code testing may have had to go because it had become the "bete noire" of a group with the potential to unite a large group of currently un-politicized amateurs. You may think this idea nonsense but I do not, based on many conversations with local hams, over several years.

[About the "stab in the back" over code testing.]

>I'm not sure what you mean. Neither organization changed
>their position when it mattered.

Well, gee, they wouldn't, would they? However, it appears to me that at the very least the ARRL top leadership simply didn't care enough about the code issue to put up any real fight. Oh, sure, they had an official "position," but, hey, Mr. Hare's messages say volumes about what that piece of paper actually meant. And, the ARRL's tepid "defense" of code, behind a seeming "strong statement," could well have shut off any really effective grass-root organizing FOR the code test. If it's true that a handful of people raised enough stink to kill code testing, well, it's sure enough likely that as many people organized to DEFEND it, could have stalemated NCI! But, heck, the code was seen to have the ARRL behind it! Surely, that would be enough to stop the avalanche! Oopsies!

[About an ARRL/NCI "deal" over code.]

>Sounds like wild speculation to me, Val.

Yes, it is speculation, and maybe it's "wild." But have you read today's newspaper? Or yesterday's? Today's "wild speculation" is too often the day after tomorrow's old news! When something about a situation smells bad, it's usually time to start "speculating."

>What I think has happened is this: FCC has made it
>abundantly clear that they want the code test to just go
>away, for all sorts of reasons. They did not reach this
>position quickly or because of any single group. Rather,
>it has developed slowly but steadily for 27+ years. And
>the USA is not the only country going this way.

Gee, I'm sorry, but this smacks of a "then a miracle happened" kind of statement. WHY did the FCC move this way? And WHY was there no effective resistance to their attitude, when, with the VE's doing the testing, what did the FCC care about what test was actuallly given? What was the skin off their nose? Who was pushing from behind he scences? Or, maybe, the FCC was consulting Quiga boards for it's positions?

>The ARRL leadership is thus faced with the choice of sup-
>porting a code test position that has no real chance of suc-
>cess, OR, taking a neutral stance and focusing its resources
>on other issues. The ARRL BoD chose the latter route a
>ittle over a year ago. Has there been massive outcry from
>the membership? Not that I know of.

Well, by a year ago, er, ah, the die was cast, I think. The time
for a defense had just about passed by then! No, there's
something missing from this picture; something does not add
up. And, in the end, if the whole avocation is in danger of
going down by the stern, well, mistakes are being made by
the bucketfull.

[About people unhappy with the ARRL.]

>Those "unhappy with the ARRL" have a whole laundry list
>of reasons. Some are still mad about "incentive licensing",
>even though it was the FCC's idea, not ARRL's. Many
>don't understand what the ARRL actually does, or why a
>national organization is needed in the first place. Some
>are mad about the code test issue - on both sides of the
>fence. Lots of other stuff. A real challenge to balance all
>the diverse interests.

No doubt that's true. However, a little honesty might have
gone a long way where this issue is concerned. Leaders
have to lead and if they refuse to do that, for whatever reason,
and then blame the rank and file later for their inactivity, well,
it looks pretty cheap.

>Will NCI up and disappear if/when code testing goes away?
>We'll just have to wait and see.

If they are as trivial as you say, it doesn't matter what they do
from here on out. They are just about as much "past history"
as the code test. This last, I think, will be EASY for me to live
with! Fair thee well in the Underworld, NCI!

Val

29. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:21:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7EE4F.966DCAB2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39296

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I'm sure from reading the Amateur's Code that there was never any
> > intent to establish a pecking order within the ARS.
>
> So why do insist on trying to do so all your life??

If you haven't noticed, I simply peck back and up, never down.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

30. Reply from WA6ITF

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:23:24 UTC
From: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3ca7ed06.5911687@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
Source record: 39297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

it seems Bill thinks this ain't no big deal... Think again.......

see below.

==========

Date: Sun, 31 Mar 2002 20:31:46 -0800
From: Bill Pasternak <newsline@ix.netcom.com>
Subject: Re: Your Article on AR Newsline #1285
X-Sender: newsline@popd.ix.netcom.com
To: chuck K8CPA <k8cpa@arrl.net>
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)

1: I re-read your note. What rec.radio.cb? ARNewsline is only posted
on
the Internet to http://www.arnewsline.org. (We do not involve
ourselves
with these useless internet discussions because they are based on
nothing
more than inuendo, lies and personal assaults. I don't think they
serve any
real purpose other than permitting people to vent hatred and there is
just
far to much of it in the world. Read the front page of your local
newspaper if you do not believe me.)

2: S1nce we never asked you to post a "rebuttal" and we have no
reason to
ask you to retract it. As long as you did not change the content of
our
material and did not slander either myself or ARNewsline Inc., you are
free
to make any comment you like. (If its on one of thise newsgroups you
reffered to -- well -- have fun.)

3: We will be happy to share with you material -- but only as time
permits.
Besides, every bit of it -- and I do mean e-v-e-r-y bit of it is and
long
has been in the public domain. Our sources go back to the late 1950's
and
through the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's. Which leads to:

4: In reality, it is nothing that has not been published and
republished in

such venerable vehicles as the old Westlink Report, CQ Magazine, 73
Magazine (neither of which were/are anti CB) and a great, great deal
in CB
Radio News (1957 - 1979)and CB Magazine. The latter two had nothing at
all
to do with Amateur Radio and were very, very viruently anti-ham radio.
Probably the reason that neither is being published any longer. Do
you
remember either of these two -- or Wayne Green at 73 taking on the
Communications Attorney Service Inc. and its 300,000 subscribers who
each
paid $50 a piece to a con artist? Or CB Radio Times taking on the CB
Leagal Service which boasted 50,000 subscribers in 1976? Probably
not.

Last comment. Maybe you should not bother listening into Part 2 next
week
and Part 3 the following week.

de
Bill P.

==========

of which I replied.

==========

Date: Mon, 01 Apr 2002 00:18:25 -0500
From: chuck K8CPA <k8cpa@arrl.net>
Subject: Re: Your Article on AR Newsline #1285
X-Sender: K8CPA/mail.comcast.net@pop3.norton.antivirus
To: Bill Pasternak <newsline@ix.netcom.com>
Cc: k8cpa@comcast.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)

At 08:31 PM 3/31/2002 -0800, you wrote:
>1: I re-read your note. What rec.radio.cb? ARNewsline is only posted on
>the Internet to http://www.arnewsline.org. (We do not involve ourselves
>with these useless internet discussions because they are based on nothing
>more than inuendo, lies and personal assaults. I don't think they serve any
>real purpose other than permitting people to vent hatred and there is just
>far to much of it in the world. Read the front page of your local
>newspaper if you do not believe me.)
>

rec.radio.cb is a internet usenet newsgroup. for someone who CLAIMS to
be
quite aquainted with the internet, you sure are in the dark alot. and
another thing, where'd you learn how to type?

As you see, Bill, I just insulted you twice in the last sentance, this
is

what this article was to most CB'ers, an insult, You're basically slapping
all CB'ers in the face and saying the Amateur Radio Service is better than
CB Radio. and futher more, you're trying to whitewash the service and make
like the Amateur service is better. Which it isn't, The Amateur Radio
Service has it's problems too, K1MAN for instance, 14.313, 75 meters,
14.275, the list goes on and on.....

>2: S1nce we never asked you to post a "rebuttal" and we have no reason to
>ask you to retract it. As long as you did not change the content of our
>material and did not slander either myself or ARNewsline Inc., you are free
>to make any comment you like. (If its on one of thise newsgroups you
>reffered to -- well -- have fun.)
>

Your right, you didn't ask me for anything, I personally took ISSUE with
YOUR SLANDERIOUS COMMENTS towards a radio service that I use on occasion, I
took issue with YOU slapping the faces of every CB'er in the world, by
indirectly calling them Law-Breakers, Stupid, and basically trying to run
the CB Radio Service into th ground, to make the Amateur Radio Service look
good. Which is in face a LIE. the Amateur Radio Service has it's self, in
face does have problems.

>3: We will be happy to share with you material -- but only as time permits.
> Besides, every bit of it -- and I do mean e-v-e-r-y bit of it is and long
>has been in the public domain. Our sources go back to the late 1950's and
>through the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's. Which leads to:
>

So in other words, We'll get it too you, when WE feel like WE have the
time, sounds to me like I'll never see anything from you. I think your
trying to weasel out of providing me SOLID facts as to your story.

>4: In reality, it is nothing that has not been published and republished in
>such venerable vehicles as the old Westlink Report, CQ Magazine, 73
>Magazine (neither of which were/are anti CB) and a great, great deal in CB
>Radio News (1957 - 1979)and CB Magazine. The latter two had nothing at all
>to do with Amateur Radio and were very, very viruently anti-ham radio.
>Probably the reason that neither is being published any longer. Do you
>remember either of these two -- or Wayne Green at 73 taking on the
>Communications Attorney Service Inc. and its 300,000 subscribers who each
>paid $50 a piece to a con artist? Or CB Radio Times taking on the CB
>Leagal Service which boasted 50,000 subscribers in 1976? Probably not.
>

And I answer that with.... You ever read the announcements in QTH
Classifieds??? You ever hear of the scams pulled on E-Bay? BY HAMS TO
Other
HAMS??? My point???? Amateur Radio operators ARE NOT these perfect
little
people, who never do ANYTHING wrong... and yes, I remember all that
stuff,
my father was a active CB'er in the 1970's, I have copies of the CB
magazine and CB Radio News.

>Last comment. Maybe you should not bother listening into Part 2 next week
>and Part 3 the following week.
>

Oh! Not only am I going to listen to it... But I will comment on it,
and
If I hear anything that I do not like, I will be posting a rebuttal
to it
on my website and in the newsgroups as I see fit.

>de
>Bill P.

73 de k8cpa

-Chuck

-Chuck K8CPA
k8cpa@arrl.net
web: http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA

==========

I'll be waiting for these so-called documents of proof of the
legitmenticy of his story.... stay tuned!

-Chuck K8CPA

http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA/rebuttal.html

31. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:24:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7EF0D.E58524B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39298

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I'm sure from reading the Amateur's Code that there was never any
> > intent to establish a pecking order within the ARS.
>
> So there was only one class of license at the time Mr. Segal penned it?

I don't know the answer as 1928 was before my time. Perhaps Jim can answer
that question.

> I believe I stated that it was never intended for all to become radio
> amateurs. I believe the incoherent have always been left out. Perhaps
> you can start a movement to have them included.

The argument is over the statement, "Anyone can get a ham license." That
is simply not a true statement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

32. NCI Goes On SALE at E$bbay!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:26:30 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CA7EF86.9EF008CC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39299

Fresh No Coder Brains:

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1341648551

33. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:36:26 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uafrd1qqdajl91@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39295

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>You're in the right section, but sitting in the wrong seat.

Well, I could have done worse!

>I have very strong doubts that the ARRL sees the NCI as
>any kind of threat as a "competing organization."

If Ham Radio is in decline then EVERYTHING is a potential
threat, including a stinkbomb like NCI, at least in my view.

>You see, NCI is just a small group of hams who write letters
>to the FCC; it is not a national organization with hundreds of
>thousands of members, in spite of the member "numbers"
>you're seeing. There are probably at most a couple of dozen
>actual NCI members.

I am sure that you are very close here BUT, in certain
situations, and Ham Radio now seems to be shaking
in its boots, a very few people can have a disproportionate
effect, particularly on the erstwhile "leadership" of a group.
I don't think it's NCI itself, it's the fact that ANY organization
at ALL has to be neutralized, given the status what am quo.

>What the ARRL is concerned about is the dismal growth
>record of the ARS of late, and the fact that if more people
>don't become hams, there won't be a source of prospective
>ARRL members, and thus, their membership will decline
>and the League, already in financial difficulty, will face
>extinction. Follow the money, and you will learn the truth.

Well, yes, if this is true then a panicked group of leaders
can very well make mistake after mistake after mistake.
Nothing causes sweaty palms quite like red ink.

>The ARRL had to ditch any notion of supporting the
>status quo in code testing because they knew they can
>attract more potential members with a dumbed-down,
>free-for-all type of licensing structure, than one with
>any practical, meaningful standards.

This would go under the rubric of "pounding the rubble"
and unfortunately does not bode well for long-term
success. It things really are as you say then some kind
of renewal MUST begin soon, so as to insure that the
incoming raw material really DOES advance in the radio

arts, SOMEHOW, so as to hold their interest. What do we know about retention of new Technicians, by age group? I guess those stats are just now starting to come in, would that be right?

Val

34. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:36:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7F1F2.16555B31@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39300

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Remember how screwed up Dr. McCoy got after a mind meld with Spock?
> > Maybe Val's mind meld with Dick is having the same effect?
>
> Was that before or after Spock went into heat?

Spock went into heat on TV. The mind meld with Dr. McCoy spanned
two movies, Star Trek IV (Wrath of Khan) and Star Trek V (Search
for Spock).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

35. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:37:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a88rmp$8d5$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 39301

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'm sure from reading the Amateur's Code that there was never any
> > > intent to establish a pecking order within the ARS.
> >
> > So why do insist on trying to do so all your life??
>
> If you haven't noticed, I simply peck back and up, never down.

What you do I notice, all right. YOU insist on a pecking order as
though there was no alternative. If it doesn't exist on its own you'll
invent it.

You see discontent over the degeneration of the ARS as evidence of a
pecking order, just because you WANT it to be that way. You should be
joining in the effort to build up the ARS, but instead insist on shoving
it even further toward being a (barely) licensed clone of CB.

36. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:46:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a88s8i$9dm$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 39302

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'm sure from reading the Amateur's Code that there was never any
> > > intent to establish a pecking order within the ARS.
> >
> > So there was only one class of license at the time Mr. Segal penned it?
>
> I don't know the answer as 1928 was before my time. Perhaps Jim can answer
> that question.
>
> > I believe I stated that it was never intended for all to become radio
> > amateurs. I believe the incoherent have always been left out. Perhaps
> > you can start a movement to have them included.
>
> The argument is over the statement, "Anyone can get a ham license." That
> is simply not a true statement.

Ah, Gee.... All together now, "Anyone MAY get a ham license".

37. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:49:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7F4D7.260289CF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39303

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Well, by a year ago, er, ah, the die was cast, I think. The time
> for a defense had just about passed by then! No, there's
> something missing from this picture; something does not add
> up.

An objective view of Morse code's relative importance in the
world of the 21st century is what is missing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

38. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 05:57:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a88srl$av0$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 39304

CAM wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Well, by a year ago, er, ah, the die was cast, I think. The time
> > for a defense had just about passed by then! No, there's
> > something missing from this picture; something does not add
> > up.
>
> An objective view of Morse code's relative importance in the
> world of the 21st century is what is missing.

In your individial opinion, but of course you erroneously choose to expand the subject far beyond the ARS to encompass the whole world, most of which doesn't know ham radio even exists. In ham radio CW is still secondary only to voice in use on the air, and there is a LOT of CW activity on the air. That alone gives the lie to your assertion as it applies to ham radio. It IS important.

39. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 06:22:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7FCB6.2296851A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39305

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You see discontent over the degeneration of the ARS as evidence of a
> pecking order, just because you WANT it to be that way.

Nope, I see the pecking order as the basic cause of the degeneration
of the ARS.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

40. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 06:30:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7FE7D.A33FA029@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39306

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > Well, by a year ago, er, ah, the die was cast, I think. The time
> > > for a defense had just about passed by then! No, there's
> > > something missing from this picture; something does not add
> > > up.
> >
> > An objective view of Morse code's relative importance in the
> > world of the 21st century is what is missing.
>
> In your individial opinion, but of course you erroneously choose to
> expand the subject far beyond the ARS to encompass the whole world, most
> of which doesn't know ham radio even exists. In ham radio CW is still
> secondary only to voice in use on the air, and there is a LOT of CW
> activity on the air. That alone gives the lie to your assertion as it
> applies to ham radio. It IS important.

All that shows is that ham radio is out of touch with the times.
How can you possibly use CW to "contribute to the advancement of
the radio art"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

41. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 07:05:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a890r9$kg8$0@208.206.142.84>
Source record: 39307

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You see discontent over the degeneration of the ARS as evidence of a
> > pecking order, just because you WANT it to be that way.
>
> Nope, I see the pecking order as the basic cause of the degeneration
> of the ARS.

Then you're a simple fool.

42. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 07:09:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8913c$l5t$0@208.206.142.84>
Source record: 39308

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > > Well, by a year ago, er, ah, the die was cast, I think. The time
> > > > for a defense had just about passed by then! No, there's
> > > > something missing from this picture; something does not add
> > > > up.
> > >
> > > An objective view of Morse code's relative importance in the
> > > world of the 21st century is what is missing.
> >
> > In your individial opinion, but of course you erroneously choose to
> > expand the subject far beyond the ARS to encompass the whole world, most
> > of which doesn't know ham radio even exists. In ham radio CW is still
> > secondary only to voice in use on the air, and there is a LOT of CW
> > activity on the air. That alone gives the lie to your assertion as it
> > applies to ham radio. It IS important.
>
> All that shows is that ham radio is out of touch with the times.
> How can you possibly use CW to "contribute to the advancement of
> the radio art"?

As always, you twist reality to fit your Agenda. contributing to the
state of the art is only ONE of a number of several of the basis and
purposes of the Service. To say that anyone who supports and uses CW is
out of touch with the times, despite much evidence to the contrary,
shows your true intent, and that is merely to quash CW supporters.
The more you post the more phony you prove yourself to be.

43. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 07:29:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA7FDF6.66C8F872@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39309

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'm sure from reading the Amateur's Code that there was never any
> > > intent to establish a pecking order within the ARS.
> >
> > So there was only one class of license at the time Mr. Segal penned it?
>
> I don't know the answer as 1928 was before my time. Perhaps Jim can answer
> that question.

Jim doesn't need to answer it. The answer is that there was more than
one class of license at that time. That'll save you the trouble of
actually looking it up. Since Paul Segal didn't set up the Amateur
Radio Service, you can save your ire for government.

> > I believe I stated that it was never intended for all to become radio
> > amateurs. I believe the incoherent have always been left out. Perhaps
> > you can start a movement to have them included.
>
> The argument is over the statement, "Anyone can get a ham license." That
> is simply not a true statement.

We've been here before. Don't leave out the dead. Become an advocate
for the rights of the dead and the incoherent. When someone says
something like, "Anyone can get a ham license" the individual does not
refer to people who are comatose, the illiterate, the deceased or your
91 year-old aunt. When someone says, "Anyone can become a Boy Scout",
it is understood by anyone with half a brain that he doesn't mean, those
who are 70 year-old men or those who are girls.

Dave K8MN

44. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 07:36:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA7FF8B.FF8DA2C9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39310

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You see discontent over the degeneration of the ARS as evidence of a
> > pecking order, just because you WANT it to be that way.
>
> Nope, I see the pecking order as the basic cause of the degeneration
> of the ARS.

Did you see the pecking order as the basic cause of degeneration of Intel? There has been a "pecking order" in amateur radio for much of the time the service has existed. There is a pecking order in many of life's endeavors. There is a veritable free market of pecking.

You really need to find something to do with your time. You've gotten your pecking order tangled up with your picking order.

Dave K8MN

45. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 11:38:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401063825.29940.00000154@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 39311

In article <uafq6tajq8r474@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
> [In reply to my comment that the FCC decided in 1975 that the
>code test had "no regulatory purpose."]
>
>>1975 is significant because in that year the FCC proposed
>>a VHF/UHF-only ham license with no code test, as part of a
>>complex restructuring proposal. It would be more accurate to
>>say that the FCC decided in 1975 that code testing was not
>>an absolute necessity for all ham licenses. The "no regulatory
>>purpose" phrase is from the Report and Order (R&O) for 98-143,
>>the restructuring proposal that took effect in April of 2000.
>>In that quarter century, it is clear from FCC actions that their
>>view of the necessity of code testing changed from 'not an
>>absolute necessity for all ham licenses' to 'serves no regulatory
>>purpose for any ham license other than meeeting treatyrequire-
>>ments'. Lot of difference there.
>
>I've read your histories, the most recent one and one you put
>on some time ago, and should have qualified my message
>this morning in this area. That's what happens when you get
>in a hurry on a Sunday morning before church. I should have
>prayed a little more over it! The FCC's code position certainly
>was a slide, not totally precipitous.

I'd say it was a slow evolution over a long period of time, driven by many
factors.
>
>[About "no regulatory purpose being WRONG!]
>
>>I agree. But the FCC doesn't, and they make the rules.
>>The mere fact that FCC does something doesn't make
>>it "right", of course, but it does make it legal.
>
>This is all quite fascinating, about the FCC. It seems to
>be like some kind of Black Box, a mystery wrapped in an
>enigma, it's actions unfathomable. However, I cannot help
>but assume that it's just like other government agencies,
>and under constant bombardment by those with axes to
>grind, including particpants in amateur radio.

Sure. Amateur radio is only one service that the FCC has to oversee.

> That is,
>when I read "The FCC did this out of the blue," well,
>I refuse to give it much credence. That is, it may have
>been out of the blue for SOME folks, but, er, ah, for
>others it sure as heck likely was not! Who do you see
>as the primary influencers of the agency over time,
>vis-a-vis the ARS?

There is no one major influence. Instead, there are many influences, both internal and external. For example, just in the case of the ARS, FCC has at least the following influences (in no particular order):

- ARRL
- other ARS organizations, including but not limited to NCI (NCVEC, W5YI group, etc.
- other radio services asking for spectrum allocated to the ARS
- electronic industry manufacturers
- Congressional and White House mandates to simplify regulations and make other changes
- interested individuals sending in letters, emails and proposals
- budget cuts and limitations
- complaints of interference and rules violations
- changes in FCC personnel
- changes in technology inside and outside the ARS
- changes in growth of the ARS
- demographic changes in the ARS
- trends elsewhere in the world

For example, up until the end of 1997 the maritime services of all nations were required to have Morse capability on all ships over a certain size. This created a demand for commercial radiotelegraph operators, both on the ships and at shore stations. While not all of these ops are/were hams, there was a definite synergy between the two services' operators. But once the Morse capability requirement was removed, the need for those operators evaporated. One less reason for hams to have mandatory code testing.

>There's a major article here, for
>a magazine that does not currently exist in amateur
>radio. That is, I don't think QST would run any historical
>piece that really delved into ALL the possibilities.

I think they would. But such an article would have to have all its facts in order,
and could not rely on speculation.
>
>[About code and "international understanding"]
>
>>Sounds good to me - but the FCC doesn't buy it. Nor
>>any other procodetest reason other than "gotta satisfy
>>the treaty".
>
>Do you have any thoughts on WHY this came about? That
>is, why the desire to get rid of ALL of it, in spite of it's long

>history in the ARS and its demonstrated usefullness? It
>seems like cutting off your nose to spite your face.

See above. If there's any driving purpose, I'd say it was the idea that all
regulations have to constantly prove their need to exist.
>
>
>[To my comments on Ham Radio's "Top Ten]
>
>>Ed's list, as I read it, says that code TESTING is not in
>>the Top Ten. Just his opinion, anyway. But note that FCC
>>received comments on code testing from less than one
>>half of one percent of US hams, even though the comment
>>period was longer than usual and comments could be filed
>>online. Such a small turnout indicates that, indeed, most
>>interested individuals don't really care very much about
>>code testing, one way or another.
>
>Could be. Or, it could be that they thought the ARRL
>was actually interested in preserving the test, right up
>until the wheelchair went into the water! That is, if you
>think your interests are being protected by the people
>who seem to be saying that they're protecting them, well,
>that helps keep you in your chair. Somehow, this whole
>affair has the air of the "sandbag"! See below my
>thoughts about why no "Pro-Code" grass-roots group
>ever appeared.
>
>
>[NCI as a threat to ARRL]
>
>>I don't think so. ARRL's position did not change
>>significantly from the initial proposal. FCC simply
>>decided not to go along.
>
>I'm really sorry, but this last just won't do. It's a bit like
>the old New Yorker cartoon about the scientist with the
>blackboard full of equations, and the "solution" down
>in the lower right-hand corner. But over in the lower
>left-hand corner, in tiny print, was the legend, "then a
>miracle happens," in between two crucial expressions.
>Why, why, why did the FCC "not go along?"

Simple - their opinion of code testing has changed over time. The FCC of 1999,
which wrote the restructuring R&O, is very different from the FCC of, say, 1965
which wrote the restructuring that came to be known as "incentive licensing".

>[More on NCI.]
>
>>No-Code-International has a total historic membership
>>of perhaps 3400 individuals, worldwide. Membership

>>numbers are sequential and started with #1001, and
>>there are no dues and noexpiration date on membership.
>
>Well, yes. BUT, they got a seat at the table, didn't they,
>and from even smaller acorns mighty oaks have grown.

What "seat at the table"? They presented a position, just like ARRL.
They did an ex-parte presentation, just like ARRL. Were any rules
broken? Not that I know of.

Would you have had the FCC turn them away at the door? I wouldn't, even though
I oppose practically all of their positions.

>The bureaucrat's REAL job is to stomp the potential
>opposition, or find a way to neutralize it, BEFORE it
>gets to truly amount to something. Code testing may
>have had to go because it had become the "bete
>noire" of a group with the potential to unite a large
>group of currently un-politicized amateurs. You may
>think this idea nonsense but I do not, based on many
>conversations with local hams, over several years.

NCI has existed perhaps 5 years and has only about 3400
members, all united by a single goal. Hardly a threat to the
ARRL.

There have been several alternative organizations over the years,
and all of them have gone by the wayside because they could not
enlist broadbased support.

It must be remembered, too, that the ARRL is not a monolithic organization
whose members and directors all agree. The ARRL Directors' opinions on code
testing range all over the map, from "ignore the treaty, end it NOW!" to "the
way
it was in 1990 is the way it should still be". The ARRL proposal was, of
necessity, a compromise.
>
>[About the "stab in the back" over code testing.]
>
>>I'm not sure what you mean. Neither organization changed
>>their position when it mattered.
>
>Well, gee, they wouldn't, would they? However, it appears
>to me that at the very least the ARRL top leadership simply
>didn't care enough about the code issue to put up any
>real fight.

What could they have done that was not done?

> Oh, sure, they had an official "position," but,
>hey, Mr. Hare's messages say volumes about what that
>piece of paper actually meant.

Ed Hare does not make policy, the Directors do.

> And, the ARRL's tepid
>"defense" of code, behind a seeming "strong statement,"
>could well have shut off any really effective grass-root
>organizing FOR the code test.

Sure. But recall that the FCC is not bound to follow any particular opinion.

> If it's true that a handful of
>people raised enough stink to kill code testing, well, it's
>sure enough likely that as many people organized to
>DEFEND it, could have stalemated NCI! But, heck, the
>code was seen to have the ARRL behind it! Surely, that
>would be enough to stop the avalanche! Oopsies!

The FCC is not bound to follow majority opinion. They did not follow the majority of comments on code testing. Would a bigger majority have helped? Maybe, but there's no way to tell. It is quite possible that FCC would have ruled the same in the face of overwhelming support of code testing.

It will be interesting to see what happens with the "refarming" proposal.
>
>[About an ARRL/NCI "deal" over code.]
>
>>Sounds like wild speculation to me, Val.
>
>Yes, it is speculation, and maybe it's "wild." But have you
>read today's newspaper? Or yesterday's? Today's "wild
>speculation" is too often the day after tomorrow's old news!
>When something about a situation smells bad, it's usually
>time to start "speculating."

I know that most speculations turn out to be false, too.

Consider the following: At the most recent IARU Region 3 meeting, the member societies reps' had a vote about eliminating the treaty provision requiring code testing. (Of course such a vote does not change the treaty, it just shows their opinions). ALL of the societies except the ARRL voted to abolish the requirement.
Was NCI there? Nope.
>
>>What I think has happened is this: FCC has made it
>>abundantly clear that they want the code test to just go
>>away, for all sorts of reasons. They did not reach this
>>position quickly or because of any single group. Rather,
>>it has developed slowly but steadily for 27+ years. And
>>the USA is not the only country going this way.
>
>Gee, I'm sorry, but this smacks of a "then a miracle happened"
>kind of statement. WHY did the FCC move this way?

See above.

> And
>WHY was there no effective resistance to their attitude, when,
>with the VE's doing the testing, what did the FCC care about
>what test was actuallly given? What was the skin off their nose?
>Who was pushing from behind he scences? Or, maybe, the
>FCC was consulting Quiga boards for it's positions?

Here's one possibility:

FCC has been plagued for years by "freebanders" - illegal stations, mostly in
the
HF range, who simply ignore the rules and go on the air. CB is a quagmire of
users whose respect for the rules varies from some to none.

Ask any of these folks why they're not hams and one of the prime reasons is
"the
code test". By making it easier to get a license and eliminating the code test,
FCC
may hope to reduce freebanding and its associated problems.

And that's just one reason.

>>The ARRL leadership is thus faced with the choice of sup-
>>porting a code test position that has no real chance of suc-
>>cess, OR, taking a neutral stance and focusing its resources
>>on other issues. The ARRL BoD chose the latter route a
>>ittle over a year ago. Has there been massive outcry from
>>the membership? Not that I know of.
>
>Well, by a year ago, er, ah, the die was cast, I think.

Actually more like two years ago.

In fact, way back in 1997 there was a poster here who predicted that the FCC
was about to announce a radical new system. Three classes of license, one 5
wpm code test. Said it was a done deal. Many of us were very skeptical,
'specially considering the 4-class NPRM that came out a few months later. But
it
turned out that poster was absolutely correct on all counts.

> The time
>for a defense had just about passed by then! No, there's
>something missing from this picture; something does not add
>up. And, in the end, if the whole avocation is in danger of
>going down by the stern, well, mistakes are being made by
>the bucketfull.

If my theory about FCC wanting to license freebanders and others is true, then
every time somebody says to the FCC "We'll be overrun by CBers!!" they are
actually supporting FCC's move.
>
>[About people unhappy with the ARRL.]
>
>>Those "unhappy with the ARRL" have a whole laundry list

>>of reasons. Some are still mad about "incentive licensing",
>>even though it was the FCC's idea, not ARRL's. Many
>>don't understand what the ARRL actually does, or why a
>>national organization is needed in the first place. Some
>>are mad about the code test issue - on both sides of the
>>fence. Lots of other stuff. A real challenge to balance all
>>the diverse interests.
>
>No doubt that's true. However, a little honesty might have
>gone a long way where this issue is concerned. Leaders
>have to lead and if they refuse to do that, for whatever reason,
>and then blame the rank and file later for their inactivity, well,
>it looks pretty cheap.

How was anyone dishonest?
>
>>Will NCI up and disappear if/when code testing goes away?
>>We'll just have to wait and see.
>
>If they are as trivial as you say, it doesn't matter what they do
>from here on out. They are just about as much "past history"
>as the code test. This last, I think, will be EASY for me to live
>with! Fair thee well in the Underworld, NCI!

I think the thing to focus on now is what the license structure should be
if/when S25.5 is gone and FCC removes the last vestige of code testing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

46. Re: Reply from WA6ITF

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 12:29:54 UTC
From: Jester <markbeck666@aol.comSPAM>
Message-ID: <6pYp8.181767$Gf.16769611@bin2.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 39312
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Chuck get off the drugs you loser. Mommys calling you for dinner. Hurry run
along now

"Chuck K8CPA" <k8cpa@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:3ca7ed06.5911687@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com...
> it seems Bill thinks this ain't no big deal... Think again.......
>
> see below.
>
> =============
>
> Date: Sun, 31 Mar 2002 20:31:46 -0800
> From: Bill Pasternak <newsline@ix.netcom.com>
> Subject: Re: Your Article on AR Newsline #1285
> X-Sender: newsline@popd.ix.netcom.com
> To: chuck K8CPA <k8cpa@arrl.net>
> X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
>
> 1: I re-read your note. What rec.radio.cb? ARNewsline is only posted
> on
> the Internet to http://www.arnewsline.org. (We do not involve
> ourselves
> with these useless internet discussions because they are based on
> nothing
> more than inuendo, lies and personal assaults. I don't think they
> serve any
> real purpose other than permitting people to vent hatred and there is
> just
> far to much of it in the world. Read the front page of your local
> newspaper if you do not believe me.)
>
> 2: S1nce we never asked you to post a "rebuttal" and we have no
> reason to
> ask you to retract it. As long as you did not change the content of
> our
> material and did not slander either myself or ARNewsline Inc., you are
> free
> to make any comment you like. (If its on one of thise newsgroups you
> reffered to -- well -- have fun.)
>
> 3: We will be happy to share with you material -- but only as time
> permits.
> Besides, every bit of it -- and I do mean e-v-e-r-y bit of it is and

> long
> has been in the public domain. Our sources go back to the late 1950's
> and
> through the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's. Which leads to:
>
> 4: In reality, it is nothing that has not been published and
> republished in
> such venerable vehicles as the old Westlink Report, CQ Magazine, 73
> Magazine (neither of which were/are anti CB) and a great, great deal
> in CB
> Radio News (1957 - 1979)and CB Magazine. The latter two had nothing at
> all
> to do with Amateur Radio and were very, very viruently anti-ham radio.
> Probably the reason that neither is being published any longer. Do
> you
> remember either of these two -- or Wayne Green at 73 taking on the
> Communications Attorney Service Inc. and its 300,000 subscribers who
> each
> paid $50 a piece to a con artist? Or CB Radio Times taking on the CB
> Leagal Service which boasted 50,000 subscribers in 1976? Probably
> not.
>
> Last comment. Maybe you should not bother listening into Part 2 next
> week
> and Part 3 the following week.
>
> de
> Bill P.
>
>
>
>
> ==========
>
> of which I replied.
>
> ==========
>
> Date: Mon, 01 Apr 2002 00:18:25 -0500
> From: chuck K8CPA <k8cpa@arrl.net>
> Subject: Re: Your Article on AR Newsline #1285
> X-Sender: K8CPA/mail.comcast.net@pop3.norton.antivirus
> To: Bill Pasternak <newsline@ix.netcom.com>
> Cc: k8cpa@comcast.net
> X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
>
> At 08:31 PM 3/31/2002 -0800, you wrote:
> >1: I re-read your note. What rec.radio.cb? ARNewsline is only posted on
> >the Internet to http://www.arnewsline.org. (We do not involve ourselves
> >with these useless internet discussions because they are based on nothing

> >more than inuendo, lies and personal assaults. I don't think they serve
any
> >real purpose other than permitting people to vent hatred and there is
just
> >far to much of it in the world. Read the front page of your local
> >newspaper if you do not believe me.)
> >
>
> rec.radio.cb is a internet usenet newsgroup. for someone who CLAIMS to
> be
> quite aquainted with the internet, you sure are in the dark alot. and
> another thing, where'd you learn how to type?
>
> As you see, Bill, I just insulted you twice in the last sentance, this
> is
> what this article was to most CB'ers, an insult, You're basically
> slapping
> all CB'ers in the face and saying the Amateur Radio Service is better
> than
> CB Radio. and futher more, you're trying to whitewash the service and
> make
> like the Amateur service is better. Which it isn't, The Amateur Radio
> Service has it's problems too, K1MAN for instance, 14.313, 75 meters,
> 14.275, the list goes on and on.....
>
> >2: S1nce we never asked you to post a "rebuttal" and we have no reason
to
> >ask you to retract it. As long as you did not change the content of our
> >material and did not slander either myself or ARNewsline Inc., you are
free
> >to make any comment you like. (If its on one of thise newsgroups you
> >reffered to -- well -- have fun.)
> >
>
> Your right, you didn't ask me for anything, I personally took ISSUE
> with
> YOUR SLANDERIOUS COMMENTS towards a radio service that I use on
> occasion, I
> took issue with YOU slapping the faces of every CB'er in the world, by
> indirectly calling them Law-Breakers, Stupid, and basically trying to
> run
> the CB Radio Service into th ground, to make the Amateur Radio Service
> look
> good. Which is in face a LIE. the Amateur Radio Service has it's self,
> in
> face does have problems.
>
>
> >3: We will be happy to share with you material -- but only as time
permits.

> > Besides, every bit of it -- and I do mean e-v-e-r-y bit of it is and
long
> >has been in the public domain. Our sources go back to the late 1950's
and
> >through the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's. Which leads to:
> >
>
>
> So in other words, We'll get it too you, when WE feel like WE have the
> time, sounds to me like I'll never see anything from you. I think your
> trying to weasel out of providing me SOLID facts as to your story.
>
>
> >4: In reality, it is nothing that has not been published and republished
in
> >such venerable vehicles as the old Westlink Report, CQ Magazine, 73
> >Magazine (neither of which were/are anti CB) and a great, great deal in
CB
> >Radio News (1957 - 1979)and CB Magazine. The latter two had nothing at
all
> >to do with Amateur Radio and were very, very viruently anti-ham radio.
> >Probably the reason that neither is being published any longer. Do you
> >remember either of these two -- or Wayne Green at 73 taking on the
> >Communications Attorney Service Inc. and its 300,000 subscribers who each
> >paid $50 a piece to a con artist? Or CB Radio Times taking on the CB
> >Leagal Service which boasted 50,000 subscribers in 1976? Probably not.
> >
>
> And I answer that with.... You ever read the announcements in QTH
> Classifieds??? You ever hear of the scams pulled on E-Bay? BY HAMS TO
> Other
> HAMS??? My point???? Amateur Radio operators ARE NOT these perfect
> little
> people, who never do ANYTHING wrong... and yes, I remember all that
> stuff,
> my father was a active CB'er in the 1970's, I have copies of the CB
> magazine and CB Radio News.
>
>
> >Last comment. Maybe you should not bother listening into Part 2 next
week
> >and Part 3 the following week.
> >
>
> Oh! Not only am I going to listen to it... But I will comment on it,
> and
> If I hear anything that I do not like, I will be posting a rebuttal
> to it
> on my website and in the newsgroups as I see fit.
>

>
> >de
> >Bill P.
>
>
> 73 de k8cpa
>
> -Chuck
>
>
> -Chuck K8CPA
> k8cpa@arrl.net
> web: http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA
>
> ============
>
> I'll be waiting for these so-called documents of proof of the
> legitmenticy of his story.... stay tuned!
>
> -Chuck K8CPA
>
> http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA/rebuttal.html

47. Re: Its been Fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 13:14:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401081427.07880.00001802@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 39313

>No question about it. I would not speak with someone like you. So, no, we
>will not be having a QSO.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Well TIT I just had to respond before I left.I am very upset with your response. I had hopes that after are QSO on 2 Meter CB that you would invite me over for Coffee, or maybe even a couple of "Cold Ones" I dont mean Beer. Who knows maybe we could have kissed and made up. Anyway I will be listening on Channel 19 as I drive by your Trailer Park.

48. Re: Its been Fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 13:26:22 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <h3ogaucuju8us46nk3u7vlfu6cu80ocdl0@4ax.com>
Source record: 39314

On 31 Mar 2002 23:11:34 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

> Thanks guys for the Fun Weekend you to TIT. I have to get ready to take of
>this week on Bussiness, and wont have time to play on the Newsgroups.
> But to keep you all motivated heres some things you can talk about.
>
> 1. Will Carl find a Surgeon who can remove the Tattos with out laughing?
>
> 2. Will Brian figure out his parents ID
>
> 3. And TiT I will be in the Dallas Area part of the week, maybe we can have a
>QSO on your favorite 2 Meter CB Repeater. The Question for the rest of you is
>will TIT and I have the QSO?
>
> Have fun guys be back in a Week or Two, and again thanks for the fun, you guys
>are always good for a Laugh.

Actually, I think we're all breathing a collective sigh of relief at
your impending (however short-lived) departure from the newsgroups.
Have a good business trip. Maybe your ISP will go belly-up while
you're gone...

Oh... BTW.... I'm just a lurker who figured he'd pop in and disturb
the feces... Are you disturbed, ULX?

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

49. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 14:06:54 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uagpadredk5b13@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39315

N2EY wrote, quite a lot of interesting material, most of
which deserves detailed comment. However, in the instant
case the crux of the matter is:

>If there's any driving purpose, I'd say it was the idea that all
>regulations have to constantly prove their need to exist.

Very good, I will accept this as a working hypothesis. Now,
if this has in fact been the case then I can only conclue that
no true defense has been made, since there seem to be cogent
and effective "proofs" available concerning the value of CW
both now and into the indefinite future. Certainly, code testing
could have been retained at the highest level, the Extra, a
most reasonable position that apparently was "suggested"
but not actually fought for, at least in my view. That is, the matter
seems to have been of such little moment to the ARRL (by
the admission of one of their own) that it appears they
got steamrollered by a double handful of people with the
R-A for the code. As for the reasons for this lack of effort,
some of them served up by people close to ARRL, I can only
remind them of the Biblical account of Esau, who sold his
birthright for something of very little value, and came to very
much rue the day.

Val

50. Re: My rebuttal to WA6ITF's SLAM of CB RADIO!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 14:23:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401092322.06639.00000747@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 39316

>Printed on March 29 2002, Here Bill Pasternak,
>WA6ITF's Newsline service took it upon themselves
>to TOTALLY SLAM CB Radio, I, K8CPA Chuck Will pick apart
>these BIASED, OPINIONATED, Comments and provide you with >REAL WORLD ANSWERS!

Actually, what transpires is a typical low-gene-pool, knee-jerk response
to a well balanced news item.

:A NEWSLINE FOLLOW-UP: A POLITICALLY DISORGANIZED 11 METER CLASS D
:SERVICE

Nothing new about this. 11 meter CB has had a handful of
"representitives" over the past 50 years that acomplished absolutely zip.

:A few weeks ago we reported that the FCC has refused to hear an appeal
:by an Illinois C-B operator convicted of Disorderly Conduct for
:interfering with a neighbors home entertainment electronics. In the
:days since that report first aired, it caused quite a stir on several
:Internet discussion groups. Everyone wants to know how a service that
:once boasted 3 out of every 5 Americans with radios in their cars could
:wind up where the local sheriff or policeman could take an operator off
:the air.

>This is because the F.C.C. (mind you, an governmental agency) >decided to
"wash it's hands"
>of this service, and turned over enforcement of this service, to the >local
police,
>because in thier words, "they didn't have the money nor the >resources"!
>is it the fault of the operators???? NO!

Actually, YES it is...If the operators on 11 meter CB WERE following the
rules, then there'd be no reason to complain, now would there?

Such rules do not exist for Amateur (or FRS, or GMRS, etc etc) because
they are not polluted by drunken, deviate, disorderly punks who make the CB
radio service absolutely untenable for any "legitimate" use.

:After a bit of research, the answer seemed pretty clear. In one word:
:Politics. Here is Amateur Radio Newsline's South East Bureau Chief
:David Black, KB4KCH, with part 1 of a multi part look at the strange
:political side of 11 meter C-B.

>And just who did this research? Some, Pin-headed Ham,
>who's got a axe to grind with CB? I bet it was...

As opposed to the "pin-heaaded ham" who created this thread?

:When it comes to having political representation, most communication
:groups are in good shape. Hams have the American Radio Relay League
:looking after their political well being. Broadcasters have the
:powerful National Association of Broadcasters. Cellular telephone
:companies have the CTIA. Even the General Mobile Radio Service, which
:shares frequencies with the Family Radio Service, has representation
:amid the Personal Radio Steering Group. So, what form of communications
:lacks representation? That would be 11 meter, Class D Citizens Band
:radio. What does CB have? This:

>There is one CB Radio group, you even admitted that yourself.
>there's even a CB Radio Newsgroup rec.radio.cb!
>Did you happen to anckowledge that, NO!

The subject is "organized representation". If you call the crap on
rec.radio.cb "organized", you have some serious perception problems.

Only a fool would try to suggest that r.r.cb is "organized representation".

:--
:Sound from 11 meter CB
:--

>And Poorly recorded Sound at that...
>What channel did you get that from, channel 19?

Who cares? They (CB channels) are ALL trashed. I recall only two real
"gentleman's agreements", and that was that 9 was for emergencies, and that SSB
would be relagated to 35 and up only.

Even though 9 is now codified as an "emergency channel", I dare anyone to
get immediate, useful help on it.

And if you try to use the top channels for (legal) SSB, good luck dodging
the hetrodynes.

:Give CB a listen, and you hear lots of people using a service without
:any structure or formalized representation. Some might even call it
:anarchy.

>Oh, bullcrap! If you think CB is so stinking horrible and Ham Radio is >so
damn wonderful,
>go LISTEN to 75 METERS or 14.313 or 14.275
>and tell me how damn organized Ham Radio is... Give me a BREAK >BILL!

Great...YOU can "point" to two or three specific frequencies...WE can
point to everything from 26.600 to 28.000mHz, and even THEN some.

The few "outlaw" operations on Amateur Radio pale in comparison to the
EVERYDAY operations on 11 meters.

:--
:More sound from 11 meters
:--
>More piss poorly recorded sound from the 11 meter band....

So what DOES sound good on 11 meters? Absoluely NOTHING.

:Ironically, CB's lack of political power--as well as its inability to
:defend against bureaucratic attack--is not due to shortage of people
:using the airwaves. Many believe that next to cellular telephones, the
:second largest selling piece of 2-way radio equipment in the 20th
:century has been the CB radio.

>Now this is true.....

Maybe 15 years ago.......

:During the gas crisis in the 1970s, many cars sported some sort of 11
:meter whip and a cheap CB radio under the dash. Low cost 11 meter
:radios by the millions were manufactured, imported and sold. The
:industry had hobby magazines and several newspaper style newsletters
:devoted to CB radio.

>That's because of the CB Craze that hit in the 1970's,
>CB was around alot longer than that.
>Truckers were using CB LONG BEFORE THAT!
>Again more BIASED OPINIONS of Ham's who have an Axe to grind!

What "axe to grind"...?!?! Not a single word of what was said there was
untrue.

:CB operators outnumbered hams by at least 20 to one. And they :outnumber
:GMRS users by 1000 to one.

>They Still do!

And it matters not a bit. CB radio long-ago lost it's utility and
functionality.

:But CB was not able to defend itself from outside pressures either back
:then or today. Why? Part of the reason goes back to CB'ers themselves
:in the 1970s and early 1980s. Most of them were not really interested
:in the service. It was just a utility. A way to help learn where to
:find the cheapest gasoline or avoid speed traps.

>Crazes Come and go, Just like anything else,
>Why slam a hobby to make YOURS LOOK GOOD???? Stupid!

Again, not a single word was untrue. MOST CB operators are not "radio
operators" in the sense that Hams are or that some 11 meter sideband operators
are. CB radio was merely a means-to-an-ends, and that was (and continues to
be...) going faster than the posted speed limit and avoiding law enforcement.

:The CB radio service lacked any real monetary commitment. Without that,
:there was no political commitment. And when fuel prices began to ease,
:many but not all 11 meter operators pulled their radios out of their
:cars--and put them in the attic.

>That's because NO ONE has stepped up to the plate
>and formed a political organization like the ARRL,
>Because Not EVERYONE HAS THE Money backing like the ARRL

>(AKA The Good ol' buddies club)

Oh...I see...Just because the "gud buddies" on 11 meters don't have the
gene pool or the desire to "organize", then everyone else who HAS organized for
thier particular interest is a "Good ol' buddies club"

>Why? Because most Cb'ers Are working class people like Me.
>and don't have the mega bucks, like some hams have...

Oh? Now you are lashing out at those Amateur Radio operators who have
taken advantage of thier rights as citizens and made something of themselves?

We are supposed to stay poor trailer trash like your 10-4 buddies?

:Then there were the few others, the die hard CB hobbyists. They treated
:CB channels 1 through 40 as a sort of ham radio-like hobby. Some
:operated illegally, but would take the chance just to make a DX contact.
:But they never organized. Why?

>Oh, give me a break! You guys have Absolutly NO CLUE what goes >on,
>on the CB Radio Bands! Why does it have be about organizations, >or Clubs?
>for your information, there are still to this day, CB Clubs around the >world!

Because organized groups like the ARRL are where things get done.
Obviously, with the exception of the "clubs" that promote illegal DX use of 11
meters or REACT which has all-but-abandoned 11 meters, there is no desire by
CBers to do anything except "key down" and "ratchet jaw".

>True, nothing to the extent of the ARRL... Why? again, like I said,
>most people don't have the time , nor the Money to invest in such a >matter,
>because, unlike the rich Hams of the world, CB is a working-mans >radio hobby!

Amateur Radio does not "require" any big investment in radio gear to enjoy
any more than a modest CB station. If you WANT to spend more, then the
manuacturers will certainly be glad to accomodate you...but that's YOUR call,
not someone elses.

:Different CB groups formed over the years. Many called themselves
:political messiahs of 11 meters. But many turned out to be bogus.

>Scam artists are in EVERY HOBBY! (Even HAM Radio! GASP!)
>Ever read about the SCAM ARTISTS ON E-BAY?????

Unfortunately they seem to be rampant on CB...remeber Rick Cooper?

:During the late 1970's and early 1980's, C-B radio scam artists were
:busy, trying to separate the 11 meter radio operator from his hard
:earned cash. As group after group appeared and then vanished, it
:became apparent to most using C-B that trusting anyone was too
:expensive. Now, more than 25 years later, trust in any C-B political
:organization seems little more than a remote possibility.

>Just like the scam artists on e-bay, trying to sell Ham Radio >Equipment
>to unsuspecting hams! Ask W8GG, Greg, A disabled Ham,
>who got screwed outta money on a deal on e-bay....

>My point? The Amateur Radio Service is just as bad as CB!

Screwed on eBay? You mean Amateur Radio operators are the ONLY people who get screwed on eBay? Methinks not! ! !

:And what about the legal C-B operators? Those dedicated to public
:service? That part of the story, next week.

>This I got to see!

I bet

Steve Robeson, LPN
K4YZ

:For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm David Black, KB4KCH.

That ought to read, I'm David Biased!

comments? e-mail me at k8cpa@arrl.net

51. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 15:48:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a89vfkavh0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 39317

Valentine Germann wrote:
>

Certainly, code testing
> could have been retained at the highest level, the Extra, a
> most reasonable position that apparently was "suggested"
> but not actually fought for, at least in my view.

What this fails to appreciate is the "victim mentality" so pervasive through No Code Land. You don't think all those code haters will be content to be left out of the Extra class license just because they can't do the code, do you?
That alone is reason enough, and more, for them to make darn sure that no code testing whatever survives. The proof is right here on the NG. Check out all the code bashers who have "upgraded" to Extra since restructuring. CAM and Carl are the poster boys.

There is no longer anything extra about the Extra class license.

52. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 16:00:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204010800.131969b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39319

Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of March 31, 2002:

Novice - 39,009 (decrease of 10,320)
Tech - 238,210 (increase of 32,816)
Tech Plus - 81,626 (decrease of 47,234)
General - 138,924 (increase of 26,247)
Advanced - 85,906 (decrease of 13,876)
Extra - 99,479 (increase of 20,729)
Total - 683,154 (increase of 8,362)

73 de Jim, N2EY

53. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 16:14:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401111448.07863.00001858@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 39320

>Why should ** I ** have to pass ANY tests in this rinky-dink
>"Hamby-Pamby" outfit, huh? Why not just GIVE me the
>license, all the way up to EXTRA, because I was a radio
>whiz years and years ago?

I agree, it seems like the FCC is picking on you,and are being completely
unfair, you should be awarded the EXTRA ASAP.
They give them away right now for alot less effort than you put out.
What you need to do is send the FCC your resume on your Military Experience
and demand that you be AWARDED the EXTRA.
THIS IS VERY UNFAIR TO ARE VETERANS.

54. Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 16:17:42 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uah0viknggjgs01@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39318

Hello, all!

I'm now passing the QRZ tests for General and will
be turning to the code portion in earnest very soon,
pointing toward taking both General elements two
weeks from tonight. Vis-a-vis code, I am bascially
starting from ground zero, though I did begin (and
then stop) the process in 1998. In the interest of
National Defense I will be passing along my experi-
ences with this code business, no matter what the
result, succeed or fail. Stay tuned!

As for all this radio theory stuff, I just don't SEE it,
especially in MY case. Why, back in the late 1960s
I spent MONTHS at Fort Gordon (that's where the
Army Signal School [a REAL radio outfit] was located!).
I went though that program like Sherman did about a
century earlier, showing them southerners the way to go!
And just a few months later I was just about sole support
on the RT-505 radio -- for an entire BRIGADE in South
Vietnam! Men's lives depended on me!

All of this is precisely true!

Why should ** I ** have to pass ANY tests in this rinky-dink
"Hamby-Pamby" outfit, huh? Why not just GIVE me the
license, all the way up to EXTRA, because I was a radio
whiz years and years ago? Huh? And I'm a Veteran, love
my country, go to church every Sunday, am a Kiwanian, and
love my wife and daughter!

Whaaaaah! Whaaaah! I want my LICENSE -- NOW!

WHY am *** I *** having to EXERT myself, huh?

That is, all I want is to be treated FAIRLY!

Val

55. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 16:28:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8a1qggid0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 39321

N2EY wrote:
>
> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
> FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of March 31, 2002:
>
> Novice - 39,009 (decrease of 10,320)
> Tech - 238,210 (increase of 32,816)
> Tech Plus - 81,626 (decrease of 47,234)
> General - 138,924 (increase of 26,247)
> Advanced - 85,906 (decrease of 13,876)
> Extra - 99,479 (increase of 20,729)
> Total - 683,154 (increase of 8,362)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

About 75,000 upgrades and only ~9,500 added licensed hams, in nearly
two years.
I imagine ARRL will go all out on their "Big Project" to make a last
ditch effort to find someone, somewhere to recruit. The future of the
ARS would seem to depend on it. I have doubts about their ability to
interest youth in ham radio these days. These days there is nothing
about radio that is seen as being all that interesting, what with
satellite TV, cell phones, and the Internet. They just can't see what's
the big deal about talking to someone on a radio.

If that doesn't tell the story of the restructuring, nothing could.
NOTHING short of the proverbial ham radio license boxed with your Post
Toasties will really "get the numbers up".

56. Re: Reply from WA6ITF

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 16:30:01 UTC
From: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3ca88a5d.46195959@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
Source record: 39322
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 01 Apr 2002 12:29:54 GMT, "Jester" <markbeck666@aol.comSPAM>
wrote:

>Chuck get off the drugs you loser. Mommys calling you for dinner. Hurry run
>along now

Up yours pal.... come in here with your real name an e-mail address
and tell me that. otherwise, bite the weenie!

57. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 17:03:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204010903.133ff5ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39326

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA7FE7D.A33FA029@IEEE.org>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > > Well, by a year ago, er, ah, the die was cast, I think. The time
> > > > for a defense had just about passed by then! No, there's
> > > > something missing from this picture; something does not add
> > > > up.
> > >
> > > An objective view of Morse code's relative importance in the
> > > world of the 21st century is what is missing.

Not missing - you just refuse to see it, that's all.
> >
> > In your individial opinion, but of course you erroneously choose to
> > expand the subject far beyond the ARS to encompass the whole world, most
> > of which doesn't know ham radio even exists. In ham radio CW is still
> > secondary only to voice in use on the air, and there is a LOT of CW
> > activity on the air. That alone gives the lie to your assertion as it
> > applies to ham radio. It IS important.
>
> All that shows is that ham radio is out of touch with the times.

How so?

> How can you possibly use CW to "contribute to the advancement of
> the radio art"?

Lots of ways. For example, if a ham wants to try out a new circuit or antenna,
CW offers a way to do so with a minimum of equipment.

73 de Jim, N2EY

58. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 18:05:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204011005.71a5f803@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39327

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:<uagpadredk5b13@corp.supernews.com>...
> N2EY wrote, quite a lot of interesting material, most of
> which deserves detailed comment. However, in the instant
> case the crux of the matter is:
>
>
> >If there's any driving purpose, I'd say it was the idea that all
> >regulations have to constantly prove their need to exist.
>
>
> Very good, I will accept this as a working hypothesis.

OK

> Now,
> if this has in fact been the case then I can only conclue that
> no true defense has been made, since there seem to be cogent
> and effective "proofs" available concerning the value of CW
> both now and into the indefinite future.

Of course. But the counterargument is that it's not the MODE but the TEST whose existence must be justified. Whether the value and characteristics of CW/Morse justify a test for the mode is really an opinion question when all is said and done. FCC's opinion on whether a test is needed has evolved from "Yes" to "No" over the years.

Defenses of the mode and the test were presented to the FCC in the form of comments and proposals surrounding 98-143. You can read them on the FCC website, and some (like mine) were posted here. Have you read them?

Did you comment to the FCC, Val?

> Certainly, code testing
> could have been retained at the highest level, the Extra, a
> most reasonable position that apparently was "suggested"
> but not actually fought for, at least in my view.

How does one "fight for" such a thing, besides filing comments and proposals, and doing ex parte presentations? (all of which were done in defense of code testing, btw).

> That is, the matter
> seems to have been of such little moment to the ARRL (by
> the admission of one of their own) that it appears they

> got steamrollered by a double handful of people with the
> R-A for the code.

The only double handful that matter in the decision are all at the FCC.
What could ARRL have done that was not done?

> As for the reasons for this lack of effort,
> some of them served up by people close to ARRL, I can only
> remind them of the Biblical account of Esau, who sold his
> birthright for something of very little value, and came to very
> much rue the day.

I don't see any indication that the ARRL "sold out" in any way on the
code test when the restructuring was underway. The ARRL proposal was
for 0/5/12/12 wpm, which represented a compromise of the various director's
views and the ARRL membership input.

73 de Jim, N2EY

59. How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 18:08:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca8b7fe_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39341

In an effort to debunk the myth that today's ham tests
are a simple matter of word associations, etc. and that
"nobody is really learning the material," I offer the
following results from an ARRL web survey:

Poll date: March 29, 2002
What method did you use to study for your written ham tests?

I tried to completely study and comprehend the material. 70.4 % (815)
I memorized the correct answers with little understanding. 4.4 % (51)
I used a combination of learning, memorizing and lucky guessing. 22.8 %
(264)
I have not yet taken an amateur exam. 2.3 % (27)
Total votes: 1157

Since the 3rd answer (combination) reflects the reality that
some of the material can ONLY be memorized (and, if you
don't know the answer, most people will try for a lucky guess),
it would seem that 70.4% + 22.8% = 93.2% of those responding
actually did work to learn the material, as opposed to "simply
memorizing answers with little understanding".

While "self-selecting" surveys are admittedly not purely "scientific,"
the overhweming minority of people (4.4%) who picked the answer
that the "dumbing down" folks suggest is the norm, rather than the
exception, would seem to blow huge gaping holes in their rants
about the tests.

Also, if the 2.3% of respondents who haven't yet taken an exam
were excluded, the percentage of "learners" to "memorizers"
would be slightly higher yet.

So much for the rubbish that the "dumbing down" crowd
bandies about ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

60. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 18:34:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8A824.43EDA2E3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39328

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You see discontent over the degeneration of the ARS as evidence of a
> > > pecking order, just because you WANT it to be that way.
> >
> > Nope, I see the pecking order as the basic cause of the degeneration
> > of the ARS.
>
> Then you're a simple fool.

Do you think the humans who are members of the ARS set aside their
human nature when they enter the ARS?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

61. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 18:40:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8A9B3.3269754F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39329

Dick Carroll wrote:
> As always, you twist reality to fit your Agenda. contributing to the
> state of the art is only ONE of a number of several of the basis and
> purposes of the Service. To say that anyone who supports and uses CW is
> out of touch with the times, despite much evidence to the contrary,
> shows your true intent, and that is merely to quash CW supporters.
> The more you post the more phony you prove yourself to be.

Dick, please read this posting over and over until it soaks in.
I did NOT say anyone who supports and uses CW is out of touch with the
times. Hams are free to support and use any mode they choose.

However, IMO anyone who supports a mandatory Morse code requirement
is out of touch with the times. CW has enough merits to stand on its
own within a hobby in a free country without a government sponsored
welfare program.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

62. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 18:43:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8AA55.2B68B5E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39330

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The argument is over the statement, "Anyone can get a ham license." That
> > is simply not a true statement.
>
> We've been here before. Don't leave out the dead. Become an advocate
> for the rights of the dead and the incoherent. When someone says
> something like, "Anyone can get a ham license" the individual does not
> refer to people who are comatose, the illiterate, the deceased or your
> 91 year-old aunt.

"Anyone can get a ham license." is a false statement. Why does your
agenda need to encourage false statements?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

63. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 18:48:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8AB91.F7F1AE1B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39331

Dave Heil wrote:
> Did you see the pecking order as the basic cause of degeneration of
> Intel?

Nope, it is necessary in a profit-making business. Hopefully, as
the human race evolves, we'll figure out a way to allow someone
to feel good without making someone else feel bad.

> There has been a "pecking order" in amateur radio for much of
> the time the service has existed. There is a pecking order in many of
> life's endeavors. There is a veritable free market of pecking.

If you haven't noticed, human beings are evolving to the point that
if a pecking order is unnecessary, it is being discarded. We have
discarded racial pecking orders, sexual pecking orders, religious
pecking orders, etc. Don't you think it's time to discard the
unnecessary class-based pecking order in a hobby in a free country?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

64. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 18:57:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8ADA5.96CBB762@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39332

Valentine Germann wrote:
> ... I can only conclue that
> no true defense has been made, since there seem to be cogent
> and effective "proofs" available concerning the value of CW
> both now and into the indefinite future.

CW, the mode, has been admirably defended. Unfortunately, that defense has nothing to do with the mandatory Morse code testing. You continue to fail to comprehend the real issue. The discussion is not about CW, the mode. The discussion is about mandatory Morse code testing. The two issues are relatively unrelated. As long as you concentrate on the merits of CW, the mode, you are looking for your lost keys under the streetlight, where the light is better, rather than looking for them in the dark where you lost them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

65. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 19:00:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA8A04B.BA8857CE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39333

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The argument is over the statement, "Anyone can get a ham license." That
> > > is simply not a true statement.
> >
> > We've been here before. Don't leave out the dead. Become an advocate
> > for the rights of the dead and the incoherent. When someone says
> > something like, "Anyone can get a ham license" the individual does not
> > refer to people who are comatose, the illiterate, the deceased or your
> > 91 year-old aunt.
>
> "Anyone can get a ham license." is a false statement. Why does your
> agenda need to encourage false statements?

Only a twit would believe such a statement to include the deceased, the
illiterate, the comatose and the incoherent.

Dave K8MN

66. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 19:02:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA8A0B1.FF13673A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39334

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Did you see the pecking order as the basic cause of degeneration of
> > Intel?
>
> Nope, it is necessary in a profit-making business. Hopefully, as
> the human race evolves, we'll figure out a way to allow someone
> to feel good without making someone else feel bad.
>
> > There has been a "pecking order" in amateur radio for much of
> > the time the service has existed. There is a pecking order in many of
> > life's endeavors. There is a veritable free market of pecking.
>
> If you haven't noticed, human beings are evolving to the point that
> if a pecking order is unnecessary, it is being discarded. We have
> discarded racial pecking orders, sexual pecking orders, religious
> pecking orders, etc. Don't you think it's time to discard the
> unnecessary class-based pecking order in a hobby in a free country?

I haven't noticed and your claim appears to be unsubstantiated.

Dave K8MN

67. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 19:08:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8B01A.BDC71A62@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39335

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What this fails to appreciate is the "victim mentality" so pervasive
> through No Code Land. You don't think all those code haters will be
> content to be left out of the Extra class license just because they
> can't do the code, do you?

The federal government has to be careful to ensure that federal
requirements are justifiable. If you were an FCC employee, what
argument would you use to justify a skill test within a hobby
for a mode that virtually all other radio services agree is
outdated and has been discarded? Take the 30,000 foot view,
like the FCC has to, and tell us what you see.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

68. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 19:11:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8B0F7.A508B68F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39336

N2EY wrote:
> As of May 14, 2000: Total - 674,792
>
> As of March 31, 2002: Total - 683,154 (increase of 8,362)

A little better than one percent increase per year. Looks
like restructuring is working perfectly.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

69. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 19:14:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8B1B3.5405A025@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39337

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Why should ** I ** have to pass ANY tests in this rinky-dink
> >"Hamby-Pamby" outfit, huh? Why not just GIVE me the
> >license, all the way up to EXTRA, because I was a radio
> >whiz years and years ago?
>
> I agree, it seems like the FCC is picking on you,and are being completely
> unfair, you should be awarded the EXTRA ASAP.

It is not unreasonable to ask someone to prove that they were indeed
a whiz years and years ago, have retained and updated that knowledge,
and have not gone senile in the meanwhile. Those things are proven by
meeting the Extra requirements.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

70. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 19:19:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401141904.02291.00002072@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39338

>We have
>discarded racial pecking orders, sexual pecking orders, religious
>pecking orders, etc. Don't you think it's time to discard the
>unnecessary class-based pecking order in a hobby in a free country?
>--

Cant we all just get along. Everyone is the same, everyone should have the same amout of money, everyone should live in the same house. And for those that cant do this, we should just give it to them.
Nice try Bill.

71. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 19:19:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8B2BF.6E5DB87F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39339

Valentine Germann wrote:
> I'm now passing the QRZ tests for General and will
> be turning to the code portion in earnest very soon,
> pointing toward taking both General elements two
> weeks from tonight. Vis-a-vis code, I am bascially
> starting from ground zero, though I did begin (and
> then stop) the process in 1998.

Uh Oh, Val! You shouldn't have admitted that. From now
on, no matter how much you achieve in the Amateur Radio
Service, you will be forever branded a restructured dumbed-
down ham, lower than the lowest layer of whale dodo on the
bottom of the ocean. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

72. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 19:28:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401142821.02291.00002078@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39340

>It is not unreasonable to ask someone to prove that they were indeed
>a whiz years and years ago, have retained and updated that knowledge,
>and have not gone senile in the meanwhile. Those things are proven by
>meeting the Extra requirements.
>--

You have to be kidding, Right. The Extra proves nothing, other than you have an ability to memorize a bunch of Q@As that have no meaning to most people who take the Test.

73. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 20:00:42 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <K%2q8.8102$ml2.649186@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39343

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote

>
> I fail to see how, in the absence of Congressional or ITU mandate,
> mandatory code testing or use falls into that actegory.
>

Because Val says it does. This gives him a nice issue from which
to "posture".

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

74. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 20:03:40 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uahe76lj35phb1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39342

N2EY wrote, following a lot of other interesting
material that deserves to be commented upon:

>How does one "fight for" such a thing, besides filing
>comments and proposals, and doing ex parte
>presentations? (all of which were done in defense
>of code testing, btw).

The fact that you even ask this question is now very
distrubing to me. That is, if you don't REALLY care
about something, yes, you LIMIT your activities to these
kinds of things. For instance, the ARRL is now cranking
up a campaign to go over the FCC's head where CC&Rs
are concerned. That is, they're doing a LOT more than
just filing paper, a WHOLE lot more! The FCC said,
"We're not going to give you what you want unless you
get the Congress to MAKE us do it." And THIS is in an
area that is VERY sensistive, and could be VERY
dangerous down the road, since it involves political
minefields where professional politicians usually fear
to tread. But, the ARRL is forging ahead, regardless!

Now, WHY are they doing more, on this and on several
other issues as well? Because on the CC&R issue they
flat LOST the paper process and, on these other issues,
they KNOW that if ALL they do is file comments and pro-
posals, and ex parte presentations, then, guess what,
they could very well LOSE there, too! So, since the
ARRL wants TO WIN in these areas, it's balls to the wall!
And as far as losing is concerned: been there, done that,
GOT the bleeping T-shirt! I mean, it's OBVIOUS, isn't it,
that true LEADERSHIP means going FAR beyond the
bureaucratic minimum? I think SO!

>What could ARRL have done that was not done?

See above.

>I don't see any indication that the ARRL "sold out" in any
>way on the code test when the restructuring was underway.
>The ARRL proposal was for 0/5/12/12 wpm, which repre-
>sented a compromise of the various director's
>views and the ARRL membership input.

Shall we say then that they made only the minimum effort
required in order to maintain appearances, and thus keep

the rank and file actually IN the ranks and files? That is,
ONE wildcat organization running around was one too
many! Another one, a "pro-code" one, was hardly in
anyone's interest. I think these comments are MUCH more
than "wild speculation" and are solidly validated by the facts.

Val

75. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 20:06:36 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@cumdudgeon.com>
Message-ID: <g53q8.8110$ml2.583394@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39344

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> NOTHING short of the proverbial ham radio license boxed with your Post
> Toasties will really "get the numbers up".

Where is it writ that the "numbers" need to go up?

76. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 20:13:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8BF79.9181D752@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39345

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA7FE7D.A33FA029@IEEE.org>...
> > An objective view of Morse code's relative importance in the
> > world of the 21st century is what is missing.
>
> Not missing - you just refuse to see it, that's all.

Jim, please put yourself in the FCC's position at 30,000 feet looking down on the entire radio EM spectrum. What are the most important sections of that spectrum? How much of that spectrum uses CW? How in the world can the FCC justify a skill test in a hobby in a mode that virtually all other radio services have given up on? Hams are not likely to advert another Titanic tragedy using CW. Hams use CW for fun. Why should fun require a federally sponsored welfare program? How can such a program be justified by the FCC to their management?

The view from 30,000 feet is entirely different from the view from minus one inch with one's head buried in the sand. IMO, the hand-writing is on the wall. It is up to us hams, individually and collectively, to ensure the health of CW, the mode. The FCC is simply not interested in doing it any longer, for whatever reason.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

77. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 20:28:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8C2D9.E7C585C1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39346

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > "Anyone can get a ham license." is a false statement. Why does your
> > agenda need to encourage false statements?
>
> Only a twit would believe such a statement to include the deceased, the
> illiterate, the comatose and the incoherent.

Please don't forget the Morsely handicapped. If there are people who
can't learn 13wpm and 20wpm, then there probably are people who can't
learn 5wpm. For the record, I know people who can't learn 13wpm and 20wpm.
I am not personally aware of anyone who wants an amateur license who
cannot learn 5wpm but probability suggests that such persons exist
who are otherwise relatively normal. So I ask again: Why does your
agenda need to encourage false statements?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

78. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 20:32:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8C3C3.3E78DE2C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39347

Dave Heil wrote:
> I haven't noticed and your claim appears to be unsubstantiated.

My claim is substantiated by the existence of laws against racial, sexual, age, and religious discrimination. Some people simply will not give up their irrational pecking orders without governmental intervention.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

79. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 20:37:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8C4FD.A8F6BDEF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39348

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >We have
> >discarded racial pecking orders, sexual pecking orders, religious
> >pecking orders, etc. Don't you think it's time to discard the
> >unnecessary class-based pecking order in a hobby in a free country?
>
> Cant we all just get along. Everyone is the same, ...

Everyone is NOT the same but that doesn't preclude "all of us from
just getting along". Dr. Williamson, a PhD in EE, has been chastised
in this newsgroup for being perfectly satisfied with a Tech license.
What the hell is wrong with live and let live?

> Nice try Bill.

Uhhhhhh Bruce, that's not my name.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

80. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 20:42:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8C62E.F9AE6530@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39349

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >It is not unreasonable to ask someone to prove that they were indeed
> >a whiz years and years ago, have retained and updated that knowledge,
> >and have not gone senile in the meanwhile. Those things are proven by
> >meeting the Extra requirements.
>
> You have to be kidding, Right. The Extra proves nothing, other than you have an
> ability to memorize a bunch of Q@As that have no meaning to most people who
> take the Test.

Opinions are like a$$holes - everyone has one. I'm willing to bet that 95%
of the general population cannot pass an Extra exam. Heck, probably 50%
of the coded ham population cannot pass an Extra exam. If they could,
don't you think they would have by now? If passing the Extra exam is
trivial, why aren't all hams Extra's? Inquiring minds want to know.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

81. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 20:47:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8C779.CC0437BA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39350

Valentine Germann wrote:
> I think these comments are MUCH more
> than "wild speculation" and are solidly validated by the facts.

Fortunately (or unfortunately, depending upon which side you're on)
the FCC is going to do what they think is best for the ARS no matter
what you think. Walk a mile in the FCC's shoes and get back to us.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

82. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 21:08:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401160834.01801.00001525@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39451

>I tried to completely study and comprehend the material. 70.4 % (815)

And of course you or ARRL or both, are trying to mislead.
Now this time read the second word in the above sentence.
That word is tried, the word tried doesnt mean the end result. You Guys will
do anything to distort the truth.

83. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 21:13:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401161317.01801.00001528@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39452

>Everyone is NOT the same but that doesn't preclude "all of us from
>just getting along". Dr. Williamson, a PhD in EE, has been chastised
>in this newsgroup for being

Are we back to that Clown?

>Uhhhhhh Bruce, that's not my name.

Well you sure sound like your Buddy Bill

84. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 21:17:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401161730.01801.00001529@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39453

>I'm willing to bet that 95%
>of the general population cannot pass an Extra exam.

REALLY how amazing

.>If passing the Extra exam is
>trivial, why aren't all hams Extra's? Inquiring minds want to know.
>--
>cheers, CAM

By the way it is very trivial, maybe your High Tech Newbies arent interested,
or maybe they just figure they will just WAIT untill it is Dropped also.

85. Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 21:19:43 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <P94q8.8191$ml2.661664@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39454

The following, written by a wise ham, is about 4-5 years old,
but it bears repeating here.

Enjoy

73, de Hans, K0HB

---Begin Forwarded message---

I am an Extra. I was proud of it. I had
a certificate on the wall issued by the FCC to prove it. Then
in 1968 along came incentive licensing. That was in a previous life,
because in 1968 I died and became a bigot. I thought that incentive
licensing was the final achievement, the culmination and triumph
of my being a better radio ham than lowly generals or conditionals.

I gloated with glee when the generals were kicked out of half of each
band. I gloated that I could now operate among my own peer group
on 14, 205. I even could gloat of my linear amplifier and my
102 ft tower that made my signal something to be reckoned with. I
won the CQ WW WPX contest (for Alaska) one year. Oh, man, I was
on top.

But in 1996, folks, the fellows from the local club came to me.
Ramon, help us out. You are an Extra. We need a VE. So I said
okay, I'll go see what these lowlifes are up to and put an end to
this nonsense.

But, it didn't work out that way. I was converted. I saw the light.
I saw that these guys weren't low lifers, they wanted to be HAMS.
I had to recognize that you can't really build the equivalent of
a TS-450. In the old days, CW was the state of the art, you mostly
built your gear. CW testing was appropriate. So I said to myself,
lets hold your tongue and see what these guys are up to. So the club
went on to create a whole new generation of radio hams. These guys
are good. They are polite, they say "roger" and not "10-4 good
buddy" They say "Is this frequency in use, or is anyone listening
on the repeater, instead of "breaker-breaker 19". In other words,
these guys CARED for ham radio, its traditions and its values. They
wanted to BELONG.

Okay, I said, lets go ahead and get the exams from the Anchorage VEC
and put them to the test. Sure enough, they got licensed and are
now on the air. Their calls are a giveaway, like WL7CSG, but by
golly, you couldn't tell them apart from a real ham otherwise. And
why can't you? Because they ARE real hams.

What about the code? Well, like homebuilding it has its time and place. Nowadays a TS-450 costs the same as an old DX-100, or BC-610 or some old time monstrosity. These guys want to get on the air and enjoy the hobby. Go moose hunting, fishing, picnicking and keeping in touch with the crew back in town or over the next hill. Sounds no different than me! Must be real hams. Many have expressed interest in HF. They know the code is a requirement. And they wonder why. They do not intend to use CW. Why take a morse test? The FCC does not give a public speaking test before they allow you to operate on 20 ssb. Why not? Because at the time the test was devised CW was the principal mode, phone was an oddity for experimenters, and the FCC tested in appropriate areas.

But somewhere along the line this principle became corrupted. It has become a symbol of elitism, bigotism, intolerance. And the saddest part is I am a CW man. I like being on 14,005. I like to chase CW DX. But browbeating some one else for what I like is not proper. No sir. Lets test what needs to be tested, and not test what does not need to be tested. Have no fear of the no coders, for they cannot intrude in the cw subbands unless they know the code.

Now if someone was proposing to do away with CW, or eliminate the separation of the various incompatible modes to the detriment of CW, then I think that by golly, I would deem that very prejudicial, elitist, or bigoted and LOUDLY would I protest. But the Code TEST is a different thing altogether. It bears no relationship to what goes on in the cw bands. We did not learn the code at the FCC office. We learned it at home or, in my case, at an old man that was my Elmer. When I took my code test for novice in 1959 I was qualified to operate CW. If there had been no use for CW, I think that with a bit different training I could have been competent to operate on 20 meters a.m. phone. But I was trained on CW. That was the core of amateur radio back then. AS a young child I ran wires all over the neighborhood and hooked up telegraph keys and sounders to other similarly minded kids homes. Lots of fun. But today, CW is not what the public expects of amateur radio. Times have changed. I have changed. I have seen the light.

And as for my Extra class license; all of a sudden I am not ashamed of it anymore, because a few months after my eyes were open I realized that was not a prejudiced s.o.b. upper-class-bigoted-elitist Extra. No sir. I was instead a VE, a teacher, a person around which people gathered to learn from. Sure, I am human, I love the attention and probably some praise, but my attitude about me being BETTER just vanished. Better is relative.

The cycle of life goes on forever. Babies are born, old men die. The torch passes on. The teenager that we are so sure just "doesn't have it" "or it was different in my day" soon enough becomes the daughter of my grandchild. Soon enough she is 28. I am an old man. Soon enough I will die. And I sure do not want people to think "thank god that old idiot died". No, I want them to say, "my teacher,

my Elmer died. I learned a lot from him. And when his time comes, and we as a hobby have evolved into maybe faster than light commo to the stars, using some exotic techniques and modes, the PRINCIPLE will still exist and carry on.

Do we make fun of Marconi because he implemented the coherer detector and the spark transmitter? (I do not say invented). Do we make fun because Sir Hiram Percy Maxim, W1AW, used a spark set? Of course not. In fact, those guys were brave souls at the cutting edge of technology. Think of it: the cutting edge of technology! Things have changed folks, lets get on the bandwagon.

1. Eliminate the code test.
2. Retain cw sub bands.
3. Eliminate incentive licensing.
4. Institute just two license classes. Entry level or apprentice, and full amateur with ALL privileges including the right to operate CW on the cw bands (if he learns how). This is not to create an elite crust, but to provide for an easy entry step.
5. Educate, and maybe test, our new hams in radio operating, ham traditions and values, on the air etiquette, radio lore, and maybe even the dreaded Order of the Wouff Hong! Or the Retisnitch.
6. Lets make each new ham someone we can be proud off, and say, "Hey, he is coming right along!"
7. Lets take over the ARRL from within and make it a society that all hams can be proud to belong to. Let them represent all hams, not just the members. Lets change the system from within. Lets get rid of the creators of incentive licensing.

And let us remember, that upon creation of the incentive licensing program, the Extra Class did not get ONE SINGLE kilocycle of spectrum space, or one single KC of phone band. No sir, what they did is took the existing generals and told them to get out of this portion of the band while us extras enjoy the new freedom from associating with the likes of you.

8. I am not sure yet, haven't made up my mind, but I think that this Vanity call sigh program is aptly named. Vanity. The FCC has always issued call signs in sequential blocks. Started with 1AA in 1922, then W1AA in '27 and now they are up to KD4 or some such. And hams dearly love their calls. Mine is shorter than yours because (insert your favorite excuse here). I am starting to think that this vanity call sign is somehow...smelly. What if the FCC made ALL ham calls 2 x 3, like WA6MNV, and then issued the calls at random. Maybe you and I take the license test same day, I get WA6MNV, you get KD6URL, and a week later the next new ham gets WA6AEF. It would just be the luck of the draw, a totally random, non-elitist call sign program, computer generated etc. No one could say, I am better, or have more years in service, or have done this on that, and that is why I am AL7X and you have the lowly call of WA6VSE or WL7CSG. This program

would entail all brand new calls for everyone. Everyone. AT random. It would generate an instant protest, I am sure, but once done, its a done deal and a whole bunch of squabbling will end.

Just thinking about the above call sign deal, but you can see where I am leading to. A society where all hams are equal, and one that is blind to age, years as a ham, or the holder of a level of license class that is "better" and has "a better call" than that "low life no code over there".

If you think that is extreme, be assured that in the 1950's the W x 3 calls, like W2FCJ started running out (as a novice he would have been WN2FCJ). Anyway, the FCC got to W2ZZZ, and call area by call area went to the K calls. Formerly K calls were overseas territories, like K4 for Puerto Rico, K7 for Alaska. The K x 2 calls like K2GM were mainland us calls, only K x 3 were territories. But the FCC freed this block of calls, by assigning KP4, KH6, KL7 etc to territories, and they started again all over with K2AAA until those were done with. Now, in the late 50's, the W2's had prejudice against the K2's. Remember when Dorothy, K2MGA worked or ran CQ magazine. Big furor. "She is a K2 not a W2!" Already the seeds of elitism had been planted.

There IS a place for elitism. You are elite, when your fellow hams look UP to you, and admire you, and want to be like you. As a teacher, a fine example. But a short call, an Extra Class license, 40 years as a ham, or blind, egotistical pride does not automatically make a person "Elite". That should be a status earned by each individual according to his own performance in society. Hiram Percy Maxim W1AW was not "elite" because he had a short call, one with the letter after number being A. And he was not elite because he was president and founder of ARRL, or because he wrote the Rotten QRM and other articles on Lids and poor operating practices. No sir. He was elite because he earned the instant respect of ALL amateurs when he was instrumental in getting allocations for ham operators from a government (navy) that wanted to keep it to themselves and control it, never share, and prohibit hamming. Now THAT is what he did, and he gave us all a wonderful gift, and in 30 years may his work still be admired and be fruitful.

This attitude that "I passed a 13 wpm, or I passed a 20 wpm code test, so I am better than you no code low life" has got to stop right_now! There is, after all, an easy answer. Say in my case, I became an extra in 1962 or 63 when the license first became available. The test was all on a.m. phone, cw and things like that. All gear was strictly tubes. But a new ham in 1996 could rightfully say to me, and he would be 100% correct in saying "So what Ram&#65533;n. 20 WPM, gee, that is good, but is it relevant? I just took, and passed a test on

solid state rigs, VLSI chips, digital techniques, frequency
synthesizers, narrow band FM, SSTV television and beam antennas."

So, as far as a TEST goes, who is the better ham? Me, because I took a 20 WPM test and a written on topics like heising modulation, rf ammeters, and splatter on a.m. transmitters? Or is he the better ham because his test was on the cutting edge of the amateur radio art, even if it was no-code.

So think about this. In 1962 I took the prescribed test. It was on techniques appropriate to THAT era. He took his test in 1996, and his test reflects THIS era, just like the test in the year 2046 will have questions totally inconceivable to us right now.

Maybe I am the poorer ham. After all, an old geezer with obsolete knowledge. Now of course, I could say, but wait! I have followed the radio art. I repair solid state 2-way commercial radios, I am a computer nerd. I even build plug in cards for my computers here (and some even WORK). BUT all that is moot, because friends, we are talking about tests, not what you know 30 odd years after the test.

So each of us is a full blown ham, and each one has proved his worth by taking the latest version of the ham test at the time it was given. He is a ham. So am I. He is proud of it. I am proud of mine. But I am also happy and proud for HIM, because instead of whining, complaining, etc., he buckled down studied and passed this 1996 test. So he has proven his commitment to the process of becoming a ham.

And that folks is that counts and what sets hams apart from CB'ers who only follow the rule of instant gratification.

So when we say we must keep the code test, we have one word too much in there. We should keep testing, yes, to prove the commitment the individual has to ham radio. But to say that Code, or for that matter a Triode Push Pull R.F. amplifier with link coupling and neutralization is somehow better than one on a DDS frequency synthesizer is totally ridiculous. Its comparing apples to oranges. And I pray that in the year 2046 the test will be appropriate to that age and time, and that my great grandchildren will also sweat the test, spending countless hours studying and visiting the Elmers, and finally get the ticket one October morning, and fire up their Franistat set, and work Rigel 6 on the first call! Now we are talking, fellows. Lets drop the narrow view and get this hobby of ours off its arse and moving ahead!

Ramon, AL7X. VE, CW man. Pro no-code. Anti incentive licensing. Proud of the hobby. Lets see it move
forward. Respect all modes and facets.

86. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 21:31:44 UTC
From: mARTy <marty@mindfulless.com>
Message-ID: <0B053FE6AD686ACC.4003262C7705BAF6.9E178317CF7A0931@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 39455

On a neverending quest for knowledge, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

>**Please don't forget the Morsely handicapped. If there are people who
>**can't learn 13wpm and 20wpm, then there probably are people who can't
>**learn 5wpm. For the record, I know people who can't learn 13wpm and 20wpm.
>**I am not personally aware of anyone who wants an amateur license who
>**cannot learn 5wpm but probability suggests that such persons exist
>**who are otherwise relatively normal.

I'm a new ham....just got my 'ticket' last week. Have been studying code for over a week now
and I can't seem to copy more than 20 or so characters before making a mistake. Is there a waiver available for us 'Morsely handicapped'? E and T have me all messed up and there's only 5 days 'til testing!

And yes, the above was written with tongue firmly in cheek. I actually DO plan to learn & use
code. I fully expect my first HF contact to be CW. Hopefully the lucky recipient won't be one of the half dozen or so people in this group that I've come to pay attention to. Newbies
can be so trying to the more experienced sometimes, and I'd hate to be labeled a LID right off the bat by people I've come to respect!!

I've got the written exam down (according to online testing). 15 hours of reading, re-reading,
flash cards I made up for those 15-20 questions I simply can't grasp (which I decided to just memorize - I hate it when that happens!), and I'm good to go. Now why can't code be that simple??

87. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 22:09:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8DAA7.548BC5DD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39456

WA8ULX wrote:
> >Uhhhhhh Bruce, that's not my name.
>
> Well you sure sound like your Buddy Bill

Of course, all rational people sound alike.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

88. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 22:11:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8DB18.F66334A4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39457

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >If passing the Extra exam is
> >trivial, why aren't all hams Extra's? Inquiring minds want to know.

> By the way it is very trivial, maybe your High Tech Newbies arent interested,
> or maybe they just figure they will just WAIT untill it is Dropped also.

Or maybe, just maybe, you are just blowing smoke.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

89. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 22:14:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401171436.01838.00001924@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39458

>Since the 3rd answer (combination) reflects the reality that
>some of the material can ONLY be memorized (and, if you
>don't know the answer, most people will try for a lucky guess),
>it would seem that 70.4% + 22.8% = 93.2% of those responding

Second thought on your New Spin Tactic, of Lies and Deception.
Since we know the key word was" tried", and not suceed. Then we have to throw your 70.4 figure out the door. And at that point the Survey becomes useless.
Now a better Question would have been Did you really learn the INFO?
But of course NCI, and there great Leader will try and Spin it for you.
Carl a serious question, how much of NCIs BS is distorted? I cant believe any of your Members would believe anything you said after this failed try of distorting Info.

90. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 22:16:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401171635.01838.00001925@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39459

>Of course, all rational people sound alike.
>--
>cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>

Why did I expect that from you, you really do believe BILL was Rational.
By the way Bill really didnt have SEX with Monica.

91. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 22:18:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401171813.01838.00001927@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39460

>Or maybe, just maybe, you are just blowing smoke.
>--
>cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Or maybe, just maybe. you are doing the Same, just like your Buddy Carl try on the ARRL Survey.

92. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 22:24:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8DE0D.D060197D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39461

mARTy wrote:
> And yes, the above was written with tongue firmly in cheek.

Even so, any skill is subject to a bell-shaped curve. My analogy is dunking a basketball. I can dunk a basketball just about as well as I can copy Morse code. Does that mean that everyone can dunk a basketball if he/she would just avoid being lazy and practice? If so, we can replace the Morse code exam with a basketball dunking exam.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

93. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 22:31:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8DFBE.9941ADB6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39462

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Of course, all rational people sound alike.

> Why did I expect that from you, you really do believe BILL was Rational.
> By the way Bill really didnt have SEX with Monica.

Bill Sohl didn't have sex with Monica? That's easy to believe unless
Bill's wife is named Monica.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

94. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 22:34:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA8E05B.31A55F3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39463

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Or maybe, just maybe, you are just blowing smoke.
>
> Or maybe, just maybe. you are doing the Same, just like your Buddy Carl try on
> the ARRL Survey.

IMO, it's pretty obvious just who is blowing smoke. Methinks the court
of public opinion has already reached its verdict.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

95. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 22:36:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401173619.17929.00000200@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 39464

In article <uah0viknggjgs01@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Hello, all!
>
>I'm now passing the QRZ tests for General and will
>be turning to the code portion in earnest very soon,
>pointing toward taking both General elements two
>weeks from tonight. Vis-a-vis code, I am bascially
>starting from ground zero, though I did begin (and
>then stop) the process in 1998. In the interest of
>National Defense I will be passing along my experi-
>ences with this code business, no matter what the
>result, succeed or fail. Stay tuned!

"...in the interest of National Defense...?!?"

Good grief... :-)

>As for all this radio theory stuff, I just don't SEE it,
>especially in MY case. Why, back in the late 1960s
>I spent MONTHS at Fort Gordon (that's where the
>Army Signal School [a REAL radio outfit] was located!).
>I went though that program like Sherman did about a
>century earlier, showing them southerners the way to go!
>And just a few months later I was just about sole support
>on the RT-505 radio -- for an entire BRIGADE in South
>Vietnam! Men's lives depended on me!

Oh, my. Let's look at some tactical facts of radio use in
the Vietnam War. There were a large number of different
radio sets used then, but infantry and armor units depended
primarily on VHF FM Voice in the 30 to 76 MHz range. The
RT-505 is the main receiver-transmitter unit of the AN/PRC-25
(manpack version), AN/VRC-53 (vehicular mounting), AN/GRC-125
(both vehicle and direct field unit operation). The RT-505 has a
fantastic 2 Watts RF power output maximum and is designed
for internal battery operation. The "prick-25" (affectionate name,
just like the "prick-6" of Korean War use, AN/PRC-6) was
designed as a small-unit radio, squad-platoon-company-FO
(forward observer) with channelized tuning to allow switching to
same-band net links to artillery and air support radios.

"Brigade:" In small-unit land force organization in the US Army,
the groupings are about the same as they have been for over
a half century. The smallest unit is the squad, a dozen grunts

led by an NCO; next up is the platoon, four squads, with a platoon sergeant and commissioned officer leading (2nd or 1st john); next is the company, usually four platoons plus a small detachment for administration, cooks, supply, company commander usually a captain (two bars, same as a USN lieutenant). From there up it becomes flexible according to specialty, task, etc., but it is common to have four companies make up a battalion...one company may be a headquarters company if the location is fairly permanent. Several battalions will make up a regiment but organization may have that as a "brigade" instead of regiment, largely a difference in name for unit-self-perq espirit feel.

From '64 to '73, "Nam" infantry and armor field radios were organized approximately the same with the manpack VHF FM sets connecting all. There might be a dozen "prick-25s" in a single infantry company, a few more in an equivalent size armor unit (they still referred to themselves as "cavalry" back then and I didn't pay attention to unit designators at Fort Irwin back in '89 so I call them by the generic "unit"...forgive me old armor types).

As to "being sole support for an entire brigade (with the RT-505)" that is a piece of snow-job self-puffery nonsense. The RT-505 is the main component of the "prick-25" and used in small-unit ops, by squads and patrols of two squads. It is no more the "sole support" than its older counterpart, the "prick-6" was in Korea. The selectable channel feature allows great flexibility in comm to platoon, company, battalion, forward observers, air support, artillery support, and so on. At battalion level and higher, there was a larger variety of radios, more power output, more bands.

You can find all of that referenced in printed media and on the Web. The Vietnam War ended 23 years ago.

>All of this is precisely true!

No. You were NOT the "sole support of a brigade" through some knowledge of the "RT-505" supposedly learned at Fort Monmouth. Use of the "prick-25" was taught to squad members at infantry schools and at armor schools. That's typically a few days, mostly for radio procedure and the hookups for manpack, vehicle, ground locations. The RT-505 has two frequency-select switches, a bandswitch (30-52, 53-75 positions, splitting 6 m), volume, and power-function switch. Definitely not rocket science to operate, about as complicated as today's CB front panel.

The AN/PRC-77 was introduced late in the Nam conflict, had essentially the same features and small-unit net organization. Those were all rendered obsolete by the operational introduction of the SINCGARS family beginning in 1989. That set is 30-88 MHz, voice or data, in-clear or encrypted, is a frequency hopper, and has variable power output up to 4 Watts. More reliable and far more versatile for small-unit ops, it takes two weeks to learn the proper

procedures for all its functions. That is taught at the Signal School
and ordinary civilians may access the site and obtain a very nice
computer-learning course program (public release) to learn how to
twist all the knobs and punch the keypad.

>Why should ** I ** have to pass ANY tests in this rinky-dink
>"Hamby-Pamby" outfit, huh?

You MUST do exactly as you are told by long-timers in the ARS.
You MUST show a willingness to be humiliated by those who
have mastered the morsemanship of the 1930s.
You MUST do all of that to meet the dedication, courage, honor,
respect due the gods of amateur radio.

>Why not just GIVE me the
>license, all the way up to EXTRA, because I was a radio
>whiz years and years ago? Huh?

"Radio whiz?!?" For learning how to twist knobs on a prick-25?

>And I'm a Veteran, love
>my country, go to church every Sunday, am a Kiwanian, and
>love my wife and daughter!

...I think you forgot Mom, apple pie, and the statue of Liberty.

>Whaaaaah! Whaaaah! I want my LICENSE -- NOW!

...then have QRZ give you your license. You passed their
tests, didn't you?

>WHY am *** I *** having to EXERT myself, huh?

...because Dickie told you...?

>That is, all I want is to be treated FAIRLY!

You will not get it for claiming "expertise" in radio obtained by
twisting knobs on an olive-drab CB set or being "sole support"
of an approximate 3500 personnel "brigade." Go tell your
story to the Army Times or the U.S. Army Military History
Institute. They need a levity break, I'm sure...

Leonard H. Anderson
ex RA16408336, Sgt (E-5), United States Army (1952-1960)

96. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 23:22:55 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <jZ5q8.18137$se.1659948@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39465

"K0HB" <K0HB@cumdudgeon.com> wrote in message
news:g53q8.8110$ml2.583394@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > NOTHING short of the proverbial ham radio license boxed with your Post
> > Toasties will really "get the numbers up".
>
> Where is it writ that the "numbers" need to go up?

Admirable question, Hans! Probably closer to the meat of the issue than
anything here in months.

97. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 23:46:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401184648.13743.00001779@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39466

>Subject: Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/01/02 17:36 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020401173619.17929.00000200@mb-fk.aol.com>

>As to "being sole support for an entire brigade (with the RT-505)"
>that is a piece of snow-job self-puffery nonsense.

Of course having also been in Viet Nam, Lennie has full awareness of who
was doing what, when and to whom.....

NOT.

Just can't pass a chance to put YOURSELF up there, can ya, ya Putz?

>No. You were NOT the "sole support of a brigade" through some
>knowledge of the "RT-505" supposedly learned at Fort Monmouth.

Of course you can disprove this with EVIDENCE, Lennie..?!?! you
personally know the CommO of that brigade? You have copies of Operational
Ordes or other operational documents from that unit?

Otherwise it's a he-said/she-said, and the simple matter that YOU are the
"she said" part makes anything you say suspect.

>>license, all the way up to EXTRA, because I was a radio
>>whiz years and years ago? Huh?
>
>"Radio whiz?!?" For learning how to twist knobs on a prick-25?

Why not, Lennie? YOU want the FCC to give YOU a license for a test you
passed in 1950-something.

>Leonard H. Anderson
>ex RA16408336, Sgt (E-5), United States Army (1952-1960)

This is supposed to be "proof" of anything? Are we supposed to be
impressed? THIS is that "patriotic bunting" crap you keep accusing OTHERS of
wrapping themselves in, Your Putziness. You want us to salute now?

Creep.

98. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-01 23:49:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401184946.13743.00001781@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39467

>Subject: Moving forward
>From: "KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG
>Date: 04/01/02 16:19 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <P94q8.8191$ml2.661664@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

Seven point three on the Troll-O-Meter, Hans.

Steve

99. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:13:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401191302.19503.00000209@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 39468

In article <3ca753ff_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Val, you're getting as boring and long-winded as a couple of others

No more so than Mary K. and her affairs with Larry, Dick,
and Schmoe ("wallux"). :-) :-) :-) :-)

100. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:13:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401191302.19503.00000208@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 39469

In article <%ALp8.813$_y2.42129575@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message

>> Prove it with REAL FACTS. You could claim they have 50,000 Members but you
>cant
>> prove it.
>> And of course with no Expiration Date on Membership, you could have SKs
>in
>> those numbers, and your still going to count them.
>
>Like the FCC? Like the ARRL?
>
>Time for you to make your appearance on "Weakest Link."

...he is ALREADY the weakest link... :-)

101. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:13:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401191304.19503.00000211@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 39470

In article <5EFp8.532$h96.31156403@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
>news:uabqt894v2d04d@corp.supernews.com...
>> Hello, all!
>>
>> One again, my original comments will be preceded by arrows,
>> Mr. Hare's comments will be "plain type," and my new comments
>> will be inside [[double brackets]].
>
>Don't trouble yourself. We know who said what.

I'm still looking for "W1FRI" that he is replying to...not in the databases apparently. :-)

102. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:13:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401191304.19503.00000210@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 39472

In article <uae48455h8k8d9@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>The consensus among those who are apparently informed
>is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
>NO regulatrory purpose.

Not quite. The FCC did not declare such a thing until 90-53. That
was 15 years later.

>Taking that at face value, well, it was and is just plain WRONG.

That face has no value...

>The amateur service still has a
>component referring to "promoting international understanding"
>and Morse Code is STILL valuable as a "language" that is
>understood around the world.

No again on two counts. In 97.1 the US regulations define
"promotion of international good will." That's not the same as
"understanding."

All on-off codings are representations of language symbols. They
are NOT "languages" in and of themselves. The so-called "morse
codes" and International Morse Code are representative of most
western alphabets, numerals, and punctuation marks.

>For this reason ALONE the testing
>provision should be retained, at some level, within the ARS,
>over and above its obvious historical and operational value.

No, even if you capitalize it, that "ALONE" is still alone and
not related to the subject of testing.

Since on-off codings were truly the ONLY way to communicate
in early radio, it does have "historic significance."

Radio regulatory agencies are not chartered or empowered to
maintain living museums of the radio arts. If you wish that,
please contact the National Endowment for the Arts in DC.

"Operational value" is questionable and is of curious use there.
Amateur radio is not a common carrier of messages (specifically
not so in the regulations) and is not an arm of some service that
"must get the messages through" as in the military or public
safety radio services. Voice communication modes are the most
popular on both HF and all bands about 30 MHz.

>Having had a couple of days to let Mr. Hare's comments sink
>in, the cavalier atttitude shown toward Morse by him (not even
>in the top ten of things that most hams are concerned about!)
>was BIZARRE and shows once again (to me) that the true
>motives here may never be known.

"...cavalier attitude...true motives...never known." :-)

>I have not mentioned this
>because I thought it was, er, REALLY sorry, but the ACTUAL
>reason for the cave-in by ARRL on this issue (in spite of what
>looks like an "effort" to "save code testing") could well have
>been a FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.

Ah, yes, the "actual reasons." :-)

<snip of a review of a seance...>

>Institutional survival IS job #1 with ANY organization and the
>jettisoning of code might have been a very small price to
>pay to put the NCI threat, the LONG RUN threat, to sleep,
>hopefully for GOOD!

The only "decision" made by the ARRL BoD has been "not to
oppose any changes invoked on ITU-R S25.5" on the code
test issue. The IARU, the International Amateur Radio Union,
had voted to rewrite S25 to remove any ITU-R code test
recommendations. The IARU represents all the other amateur
radio organizations. In that regard on the code test issue, the
ARRL is simply outnumbered.

103. Re: Its been Fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:13:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401191305.19503.00000212@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 39471

In article <h3ogaucuju8us46nk3u7vlfu6cu80ocdl0@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>On 31 Mar 2002 23:11:34 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
>> Thanks guys for the Fun Weekend you to TIT. I have to get ready to take of
>>this week on Bussiness, and wont have time to play on the Newsgroups.
>> But to keep you all motivated heres some things you can talk about.
>>
>> 1. Will Carl find a Surgeon who can remove the Tattos with out laughing?
>>
>> 2. Will Brian figure out his parents ID
>>
>> 3. And TiT I will be in the Dallas Area part of the week, maybe we can have
>a
>>QSO on your favorite 2 Meter CB Repeater. The Question for the rest of you
>is
>>will TIT and I have the QSO?
>>
>> Have fun guys be back in a Week or Two, and again thanks for the fun, you
>guys
>>are always good for a Laugh.
>
>Actually, I think we're all breathing a collective sigh of relief at
>your impending (however short-lived) departure from the newsgroups.

He is risen...from too much yeast...

104. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:21:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8ati9$192$0@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 39473

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > You see discontent over the degeneration of the ARS as evidence of a
> > > > pecking order, just because you WANT it to be that way.
> > >
> > > Nope, I see the pecking order as the basic cause of the degeneration
> > > of the ARS.
> >
> > Then you're a simple fool.
>
> Do you think the humans who are members of the ARS set aside their
> human nature when they enter the ARS?

I think you've just answered all questions about your very belligerent attitude and activities here on this NG. It is now clear that you believe that anyone who held an Extra before restructuring was bent on lording his "rank" over lower class licensees in some sort of a "caste" system. Since you were never able to achieve Extra class status until FCC dropped the requirements, you had to settle for "second class" status, and that really chapped your ass, being so accustomed to being able to bulldoze your way to the top of whatever activity you happened to be involved in at any given time. So you insist on this inane disgusting treatment of any and all who held an Extra class ticket before you finally got one.

Thanks for clearing that up for us. If you think I served as a VE for many years just because I wanted to lord my Extra class license over newcomers, you're even more of a fool than you have shown to be so far.

105. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:32:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8au7n$35r$0@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 39474

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> In an effort to debunk the myth that today's ham tests
> are a simple matter of word associations, etc. and that
> "nobody is really learning the material," I offer the
> following results from an ARRL web survey:
>

Ah. Another "professional" survey from Newington. Just what we need to "prove" a point. And it will surely be as accurate as the last one. Right.

> Poll date: March 29, 2002
> What method did you use to study for your written ham tests?
>
> I tried to completely study and comprehend the material. 70.4 % (815)
> I memorized the correct answers with little understanding. 4.4 % (51)
> I used a combination of learning, memorizing and lucky guessing. 22.8 %
> (264)
> I have not yet taken an amateur exam. 2.3 % (27)
> Total votes: 1157
>
> Since the 3rd answer (combination) reflects the reality that
> some of the material can ONLY be memorized (and, if you
> don't know the answer, most people will try for a lucky guess),
> it would seem that 70.4% + 22.8% = 93.2% of those responding
> actually did work to learn the material, as opposed to "simply
> memorizing answers with little understanding".
>
> While "self-selecting" surveys are admittedly not purely "scientific,"
> the overhweming minority of people (4.4%) who picked the answer
> that the "dumbing down" folks suggest is the norm, rather than the
> exception, would seem to blow huge gaping holes in their rants
> about the tests.

Besides that, more importantly it helps you prove something you want proved, so to hell with science. Works every time! Just like your ranting about "bringing the ARS into the 21st century" while you stuff a SSB mike in your mouth.

>
> Also, if the 2.3% of respondents who haven't yet taken an exam
> were excluded, the percentage of "learners" to "memorizers"
> would be slightly higher yet.
>

> So much for the rubbish that the "dumbing down" crowd
> bandies about ...

Such a poll is so much garbage. Most newcomers don't even know about ARRL and few join, and for darn sure even fewer would make noise about how they memorized to pass the tests. Slide back under your rock.

106. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:36:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8auef$35r$1@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 39475

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > NOTHING short of the proverbial ham radio license boxed with your Post
> > Toasties will really "get the numbers up".
>
> Where is it writ that the "numbers" need to go up?

You don't read the ARRL BOD minutes?

107. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:41:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8aund$35r$2@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 39476

CAM wrote:
>

If passing the Extra exam is
> trivial, why aren't all hams Extra's? Inquiring minds want to know.
>

Well. You told me here some time ago that not only was the Extra
trivial, but the whole of the ARS was trivial. Inquiring minds want to
know when you will make up yours, if ever.

108. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 00:56:14 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <d5327f80d29112e8ef887934d6765c72.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 39477
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

It's a hopeless case. I just saw a transceiver listed in E-Bay's amateur radio section. It was either a 4 or 5 band (A,B,C,D ... you get the idea). AM, SSB, and FM - and, of course, a ROGER BEEP! I doubt any one buying a Radio Shack HT or VHF/UHF mobile rig will be able to use it without a license. They might get away with it, but I doubt for long. Currently, we do have some idiot in the Rochester, NY area (obviously a kid) who occasionally jams the input of our 10 meter repeater. He's smart enough not to stay on more than a few seconds at a time and we only have a general idea of where he is located. Again, I doubt anyone without a license is likely to get much use out of the rig. To use it simply to have fun and jam a repeater is stupid and and expensive way to get your kicks. The real problem (freebanders and especially truckers) is going to take real enforcement, even if it means someone might lose his tractor. I see EEI went bankrupt and the parent company has (apparently) started up another corporation selling the same 'stuff' and even uses 'EEI'. Oh well. Heck, if the CEOs of Enron and Global Crossings can pay themselves millions in bonuses and then the company files for bankruptcy the following day - including the loss of pensions for thousands of employees - I just don't see much likely to happen concerning enforcement of communications regulations.
We have the best government money can buy.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Daniel Hicks" <w8mmq-nospam@email.com> wrote in message news:3c7a8126$0$35576$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net...

>
> What do you think?
>
> Should Radio Shack and other electronic retailers be allowed to sell amateur
> radios to individuals who do not have an amateur radio license? This is a
> growing problem around the country, and now here is your chance to voice
> your opinions.
>
> No License? No Radio!
>
> 73 de,
> Dan, W8MMQ

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

109. Re: My rebuttal to WA6ITF's SLAM of CB RADIO!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:01:19 UTC
From: Jester <markbeck666@aol.comSPAM>
Message-ID: <zp7q8.374864$uv5.31810072@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 39478
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401092322.06639.00000747@mb-mb.aol.com...
> >Printed on March 29 2002, Here Bill Pasternak,
> >WA6ITF's Newsline service took it upon themselves
> >to TOTALLY SLAM CB Radio, I, K8CPA Chuck Will pick apart
> >these BIASED, OPINIONATED, Comments and provide you with >REAL WORLD
ANSWERS!
>
> Actually, what transpires is a typical low-gene-pool, knee-jerk
response
> to a well balanced news item.
>
> :A NEWSLINE FOLLOW-UP: A POLITICALLY DISORGANIZED 11 METER CLASS D
> :SERVICE
>
> Nothing new about this. 11 meter CB has had a handful of
> "representitives" over the past 50 years that acomplished absolutely zip.
>
> :A few weeks ago we reported that the FCC has refused to hear an appeal
> :by an Illinois C-B operator convicted of Disorderly Conduct for
> :interfering with a neighbors home entertainment electronics. In the
> :days since that report first aired, it caused quite a stir on several
> :Internet discussion groups. Everyone wants to know how a service that
> :once boasted 3 out of every 5 Americans with radios in their cars could
> :wind up where the local sheriff or policeman could take an operator off
> :the air.
>
> >This is because the F.C.C. (mind you, an governmental agency) >decided to
> "wash it's hands"
> >of this service, and turned over enforcement of this service, to the
>local
> police,
> >because in thier words, "they didn't have the money nor the >resources"!
> >is it the fault of the operators???? NO!
>
> Actually, YES it is...If the operators on 11 meter CB WERE following
the
> rules, then there'd be no reason to complain, now would there?
>
> Such rules do not exist for Amateur (or FRS, or GMRS, etc etc)
because
> they are not polluted by drunken, deviate, disorderly punks who make the
CB

> radio service absolutely untenable for any "legitimate" use.
>
> :After a bit of research, the answer seemed pretty clear. In one word:
> :Politics. Here is Amateur Radio Newsline's South East Bureau Chief
> :David Black, KB4KCH, with part 1 of a multi part look at the strange
> :political side of 11 meter C-B.
>
> >And just who did this research? Some, Pin-headed Ham,
> >who's got a axe to grind with CB? I bet it was...
>
> As opposed to the "pin-heaaded ham" who created this thread?
>
> :When it comes to having political representation, most communication
> :groups are in good shape. Hams have the American Radio Relay League
> :looking after their political well being. Broadcasters have the
> :powerful National Association of Broadcasters. Cellular telephone
> :companies have the CTIA. Even the General Mobile Radio Service, which
> :shares frequencies with the Family Radio Service, has representation
> :amid the Personal Radio Steering Group. So, what form of communications
> :lacks representation? That would be 11 meter, Class D Citizens Band
> :radio. What does CB have? This:
>
> >There is one CB Radio group, you even admitted that yourself.
> >there's even a CB Radio Newsgroup rec.radio.cb!
> >Did you happen to anckowledge that, NO!
>
> The subject is "organized representation". If you call the crap on
> rec.radio.cb "organized", you have some serious perception problems.
>
> Only a fool would try to suggest that r.r.cb is "organized
representation".
>
> :--
> :Sound from 11 meter CB
> :--
>
> >And Poorly recorded Sound at that...
> >What channel did you get that from, channel 19?
>
> Who cares? They (CB channels) are ALL trashed. I recall only two
real
> "gentleman's agreements", and that was that 9 was for emergencies, and
that SSB
> would be relagated to 35 and up only.
>
> Even though 9 is now codified as an "emergency channel", I dare
anyone to
> get immediate, useful help on it.
>
> And if you try to use the top channels for (legal) SSB, good luck

dodging
> the hetrodynes.
>
> :Give CB a listen, and you hear lots of people using a service without
> :any structure or formalized representation. Some might even call it
> :anarchy.
>
> >Oh, bullcrap! If you think CB is so stinking horrible and Ham Radio is
>so
> damn wonderful,
> >go LISTEN to 75 METERS or 14.313 or 14.275
> >and tell me how damn organized Ham Radio is... Give me a BREAK >BILL!
>
> Great...YOU can "point" to two or three specific frequencies...WE can
> point to everything from 26.600 to 28.000mHz, and even THEN some.
>
> The few "outlaw" operations on Amateur Radio pale in comparison to
the
> EVERYDAY operations on 11 meters.
>
> :--
> :More sound from 11 meters
> :--
> >More piss poorly recorded sound from the 11 meter band....
>
> So what DOES sound good on 11 meters? Absoluely NOTHING.
>
> :Ironically, CB's lack of political power--as well as its inability to
> :defend against bureaucratic attack--is not due to shortage of people
> :using the airwaves. Many believe that next to cellular telephones, the
> :second largest selling piece of 2-way radio equipment in the 20th
> :century has been the CB radio.
>
> >Now this is true.....
>
> Maybe 15 years ago.......
>
> :During the gas crisis in the 1970s, many cars sported some sort of 11
> :meter whip and a cheap CB radio under the dash. Low cost 11 meter
> :radios by the millions were manufactured, imported and sold. The
> :industry had hobby magazines and several newspaper style newsletters
> :devoted to CB radio.
>
> >That's because of the CB Craze that hit in the 1970's,
> >CB was around alot longer than that.
> >Truckers were using CB LONG BEFORE THAT!
> >Again more BIASED OPINIONS of Ham's who have an Axe to grind!
>
> What "axe to grind"...?!?! Not a single word of what was said there
was

> untrue.
>
> :CB operators outnumbered hams by at least 20 to one. And they :outnumber
> :GMRS users by 1000 to one.
>
> >They Still do!
>
> And it matters not a bit. CB radio long-ago lost it's utility and
> functionality.
>
> :But CB was not able to defend itself from outside pressures either back
> :then or today. Why? Part of the reason goes back to CB'ers themselves
> :in the 1970s and early 1980s. Most of them were not really interested
> :in the service. It was just a utility. A way to help learn where to
> :find the cheapest gasoline or avoid speed traps.
>
> >Crazes Come and go, Just like anything else,
> >Why slam a hobby to make YOURS LOOK GOOD???? Stupid!
>
> Again, not a single word was untrue. MOST CB operators are not
"radio
> operators" in the sense that Hams are or that some 11 meter sideband
operators
> are. CB radio was merely a means-to-an-ends, and that was (and continues
to
> be...) going faster than the posted speed limit and avoiding law
enforcement.
>
> :The CB radio service lacked any real monetary commitment. Without that,
> :there was no political commitment. And when fuel prices began to ease,
> :many but not all 11 meter operators pulled their radios out of their
> :cars--and put them in the attic.
>
> >That's because NO ONE has stepped up to the plate
> >and formed a political organization like the ARRL,
> >Because Not EVERYONE HAS THE Money backing like the ARRL
> >(AKA The Good ol' buddies club)
>
> Oh...I see...Just because the "gud buddies" on 11 meters don't have
the
> gene pool or the desire to "organize", then everyone else who HAS
organized for
> thier particular interest is a "Good ol' buddies club"
>
> >Why? Because most Cb'ers Are working class people like Me.
> >and don't have the mega bucks, like some hams have...
>
> Oh? Now you are lashing out at those Amateur Radio operators who
have
> taken advantage of thier rights as citizens and made something of

themselves?
>
> We are supposed to stay poor trailer trash like your 10-4 buddies?
>
> :Then there were the few others, the die hard CB hobbyists. They treated
> :CB channels 1 through 40 as a sort of ham radio-like hobby. Some
> :operated illegally, but would take the chance just to make a DX contact.
> :But they never organized. Why?
>
> >Oh, give me a break! You guys have Absolutly NO CLUE what goes >on,
> >on the CB Radio Bands! Why does it have be about organizations, >or
Clubs?
> >for your information, there are still to this day, CB Clubs around the
>world!
>
>
> Because organized groups like the ARRL are where things get done.
> Obviously, with the exception of the "clubs" that promote illegal DX use
of 11
> meters or REACT which has all-but-abandoned 11 meters, there is no desire
by
> CBers to do anything except "key down" and "ratchet jaw".
>
> >True, nothing to the extent of the ARRL... Why? again, like I said,
> >most people don't have the time , nor the Money to invest in such a
>matter,
> >because, unlike the rich Hams of the world, CB is a working-mans >radio
hobby!
>
> Amateur Radio does not "require" any big investment in radio gear to
enjoy
> any more than a modest CB station. If you WANT to spend more, then the
> manuacturers will certainly be glad to accomodate you...but that's YOUR
call,
> not someone elses.
>
> :Different CB groups formed over the years. Many called themselves
> :political messiahs of 11 meters. But many turned out to be bogus.
>
> >Scam artists are in EVERY HOBBY! (Even HAM Radio! GASP!)
> >Ever read about the SCAM ARTISTS ON E-BAY?????
>
> Unfortunately they seem to be rampant on CB...remeber Rick Cooper?
>
> :During the late 1970's and early 1980's, C-B radio scam artists were
> :busy, trying to separate the 11 meter radio operator from his hard
> :earned cash. As group after group appeared and then vanished, it
> :became apparent to most using C-B that trusting anyone was too
> :expensive. Now, more than 25 years later, trust in any C-B political
> :organization seems little more than a remote possibility.

>
> >Just like the scam artists on e-bay, trying to sell Ham Radio >Equipment
> >to unsuspecting hams! Ask W8GG, Greg, A disabled Ham,
> >who got screwed outta money on a deal on e-bay....
> >My point? The Amateur Radio Service is just as bad as CB!
>
> Screwed on eBay? You mean Amateur Radio operators are the ONLY
people who
> get screwed on eBay? Methinks not! ! !
>
> :And what about the legal C-B operators? Those dedicated to public
> :service? That part of the story, next week.
>
> >This I got to see!
>
> I bet
>
> Steve Robeson, LPN
> K4YZ
>

Steve I agree 100 % with you.

110. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:04:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8b02q$7vv$0@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 39479

CAM wrote:

If there are people who
> can't learn 13wpm and 20wpm, then there probably are people who can't
> learn 5wpm.

If there are people who can't learn 5wpm, there are people with poor reading skills who just can't get that Ohm's law down, to say nothing about all that "math". Aw, what the hay, give 'em all a license.

111. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:09:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8b0bs$8mc$0@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 39480

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > What this fails to appreciate is the "victim mentality" so pervasive
> > through No Code Land. You don't think all those code haters will be
> > content to be left out of the Extra class license just because they
> > can't do the code, do you?
>
> The federal government has to be careful to ensure that federal
> requirements are justifiable.

That's right, the old "victim" mindset can be turned into a real killer tool with which to crucify a bureaucrat who is trying to do his job but gets waylaid by PC.

If you were an FCC employee, what
> argument would you use to justify a skill test within a hobby
> for a mode that virtually all other radio services agree is
> outdated and has been discarded?

Why should it be in any way related to what services which have no relationship to the one in question? Answer: It should not.

Take the 30,000 foot view,
> like the FCC has to, and tell us what you see.

Hmmmmmm... There's Cecil, up there at 300,000 feet, still acting like an alien in the ARS. That would be because he is one.

112. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:10:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8b0dd$8mc$1@208.207.71.152>
Source record: 39481

```
CAM wrote:
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
> > >Uhhhhhh Bruce, that's not my name.
> > >
> > Well you sure sound like your Buddy Bill
>
> Of course, all rational people sound alike.
>

Yeah, you do sound about as rational as Clinton.
```

113. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:20:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401202002.06853.00001299@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39482

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Ah. Another "professional" survey from Newington. Just what we need to
>"prove" a point. And it will surely be as accurate as the last one.
>Right.

Uh, Dick -- the Web page surveys are not intended to be anything more than fun.

If you have any ideas for questions, pass them along to sford@arrl.org.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

114. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:20:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8b15fetd1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39484

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uagpadredk5b13@corp.supernews.com...
>
> N2EY wrote, quite a lot of interesting material, most of
> which deserves detailed comment. However, in the instant
> case the crux of the matter is:
>
>
> >If there's any driving purpose, I'd say it was the idea that all
> >regulations have to constantly prove their need to exist.
>
> Very good, I will accept this as a working hypothesis. Now,
> if this has in fact been the case then I can only conclue that
> no true defense has been made, since there seem to be cogent
> and effective "proofs" available concerning the value of CW
> both now and into the indefinite future.

Yet you offer not ONE such cogent and effective
proof.

> Certainly, code testing
> could have been retained at the highest level, the Extra, a
> most reasonable position that apparently was "suggested"
> but not actually fought for, at least in my view.

Yet even in YOUR view you offer NO cogent
and effective reason for it being so.

> That is, the matter
> seems to have been of such little moment to the ARRL (by
> the admission of one of their own) that it appears they
> got steamrollered by a double handful of people with the
> R-A for the code. As for the reasons for this lack of effort,
> some of them served up by people close to ARRL, I can only
> remind them of the Biblical account of Esau, who sold his
> birthright for something of very little value, and came to very
> much rue the day.

So is that your prophesy for ARRL?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

115. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:22:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401202215.06846.00001450@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39483

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>Whaaaaah! Whaaaah! I want my LICENSE -- NOW!

Can you honestly say that there was any reasonable point to this post?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

116. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:30:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8b1scdfk1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39486

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204011005.71a5f803@posting.google.com...
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:<uagpadredk5b13@corp.supernews.com>...
> > N2EY wrote, quite a lot of interesting material, most of
> > which deserves detailed comment. However, in the instant
> > case the crux of the matter is:
> >
> > >If there's any driving purpose, I'd say it was the idea that all
> > >regulations have to constantly prove their need to exist.
> >
> > Very good, I will accept this as a working hypothesis.
>
> > Now,
> > if this has in fact been the case then I can only conclue that
> > no true defense has been made, since there seem to be cogent
> > and effective "proofs" available concerning the value of CW
> > both now and into the indefinite future.
>
> Of course. But the counterargument is that it's not the MODE but
> the TEST whose existence must be justified. Whether the value and
> characteristics of CW/Morse justify a test for the mode is really
> an opinion question when all is said and done. FCC's opinion on
> whether a test is needed has evolved from "Yes" to "No" over the
> years.

Exactly!

> Defenses of the mode and the test were presented to the FCC in the
> form of comments and proposals surrounding 98-143. You can read them
> on the FCC website, and some (like mine) were posted here. Have you
> read them?

Given Val's statements here, it appears not.

> Did you comment to the FCC, Val?

Really curious to see that response.

> > Certainly, code testing
> > could have been retained at the highest level, the Extra, a
> > most reasonable position that apparently was "suggested"
> > but not actually fought for, at least in my view.
>
> How does one "fight for" such a thing, besides filing comments and
> proposals, and doing ex parte presentations? (all of which were

> done in defense of code testing, btw).

I and others have asked the same thing.
Maybe Val will answer your query with something
more than vapor arguments.

> > That is, the matter
> > seems to have been of such little moment to the ARRL (by
> > the admission of one of their own) that it appears they
> > got steamrollered by a double handful of people with the
> > R-A for the code.
>
> The only double handful that matter in the decision are all at the FCC.
> What could ARRL have done that was not done?

Ditto my last comment.

> > As for the reasons for this lack of effort,
> > some of them served up by people close to ARRL, I can only
> > remind them of the Biblical account of Esau, who sold his
> > birthright for something of very little value, and came to very
> > much rue the day.
>
> I don't see any indication that the ARRL "sold out" in any way on the
> code test when the restructuring was underway. The ARRL proposal was
> for 0/5/12/12 wpm, which represented a compromise of the various
director's
> views and the ARRL membership input.

Val stolls down the propoganda path that tries
to repeat the fabrication often enough that people
ultimately say it must be so.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

117. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:31:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401203154.06846.00001451@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39485

From: David Stinson arc5@ix.netcom.com

>People have attempted to found competing organizations many times,
>some of them funded and quite serious.
***
>Carping and fragmenting into little cults like NCI
>won't solve anything and creates its own problems.

There are many such "cults" in Amateur Radio -- NCI formed to promote the removal of code testing; QRP ARCI (and others) to promote QRP; TAPR to promote digital operation -- and each of these organizations represents the interests of that organization better than ARRL does. I belong to several of them.

But none of those organizations consistently represents the interests of Amateur Radio across its broad spectrum of activities and interests. None of the above offered comments wrt the current 70 cm RFID matter, just as an example.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

118. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:35:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8b2an$b8a$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39491

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uahe76lj35phb1@corp.supernews.com...
>
> N2EY wrote, following a lot of other interesting
> material that deserves to be commented upon:
>
> >How does one "fight for" such a thing, besides filing
> >comments and proposals, and doing ex parte
> >presentations? (all of which were done in defense
> >of code testing, btw).
>
> The fact that you even ask this question is now very
> distrubing to me. That is, if you don't REALLY care
> about something, yes, you LIMIT your activities to these
> kinds of things.

More huff and puff. Val still offers not ONE example
of what he thinks should have been done.

> For instance, the ARRL is now cranking
> up a campaign to go over the FCC's head where CC&Rs
> are concerned. That is, they're doing a LOT more than
> just filing paper, a WHOLE lot more! The FCC said,
> "We're not going to give you what you want unless you
> get the Congress to MAKE us do it." And THIS is in an
> area that is VERY sensistive, and could be VERY
> dangerous down the road, since it involves political
> minefields where professional politicians usually fear
> to tread. But, the ARRL is forging ahead, regardless!

So which is it. The ARRL should have urged
congressional intervention to save code testing
or not?

> Now, WHY are they doing more, on this and on several
> other issues as well? Because on the CC&R issue they
> flat LOST the paper process and, on these other issues,
> they KNOW that if ALL they do is file comments and pro-
> posals, and ex parte presentations, then, guess what,
> they could very well LOSE there, too! So, since the
> ARRL wants TO WIN in these areas, it's balls to the wall!
> And as far as losing is concerned: been there, done that,
> GOT the bleeping T-shirt! I mean, it's OBVIOUS, isn't it,
> that true LEADERSHIP means going FAR beyond the
> bureaucratic minimum? I think SO!

So which is it. The ARRL should have urged
congressional intervention to save code testing
or not?

> >What could ARRL have done that was not done?
>
> See above.

Nothing to see. You like talking in riddles
rather than making a specific recommendation.

> >I don't see any indication that the ARRL "sold out" in any
> >way on the code test when the restructuring was underway.
> >The ARRL proposal was for 0/5/12/12 wpm, which repre-
> >sented a compromise of the various director's
> >views and the ARRL membership input.
>
> Shall we say then that they made only the minimum effort
> required in order to maintain appearances, and thus keep
> the rank and file actually IN the ranks and files? That is,
> ONE wildcat organization running around was one too
> many! Another one, a "pro-code" one, was hardly in
> anyone's interest. I think these comments are MUCH more
> than "wild speculation" and are solidly validated by the facts.

In your mind anyway.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

119. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:37:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401203746.06846.00001452@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39488

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Of course it didn't hurt at all that he knew where PC is, in
>that he didn't dare offend such a horde of "victims".

Are you saying he went with the solution that he felt would "offend" the fewest number of hams?

If so, then you are admitting that the preference for CW testing is the minority.

Or is your use of "PC" and "offend" and victim" trying to evoke an emotional response?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

120. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:38:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA8FD6F.F75C0498@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39487

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > "Anyone can get a ham license." is a false statement. Why does your
> > > agenda need to encourage false statements?
> >
> > Only a twit would believe such a statement to include the deceased, the
> > illiterate, the comatose and the incoherent.
>
> Please don't forget the Morsely handicapped. If there are people who
> can't learn 13wpm and 20wpm, then there probably are people who can't
> learn 5wpm. For the record, I know people who can't learn 13wpm and > 20wpm.

HERE's where the "doctor" who can't find his camping buddies gets
trotted out.

> I am not personally aware of anyone who wants an amateur license who
> cannot learn 5wpm but probability suggests that such persons exist
> who are otherwise relatively normal. So I ask again: Why does your
> agenda need to encourage false statements?

You aren't personally aware. I am not personally aware. There may be
some person somewhere not among the dead, the comatose, the illiterate
and the incoherent who can't learn five word per minute morse but such a
person would be an extreme rarity. So I state again: Only a twit would
belive such a statement to be totally inclusive. Are you stating for
the record that you are a twit?

Dave K8MN

121. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:40:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8b2ao$b8a$2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39492

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uafrd1qqdajl91@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
> >You're in the right section, but sitting in the wrong seat.
>
> Well, I could have done worse!
>
> >I have very strong doubts that the ARRL sees the NCI as
> >any kind of threat as a "competing organization."
>
> If Ham Radio is in decline then EVERYTHING is a potential
> threat, including a stinkbomb like NCI, at least in my view.

"Stinkbomb like NCI"? Why Val, what happened to
your vaulted academia attitude. Such namecalling is
usually that of those without valid arguments.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

122. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:41:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA8FE23.3E5FE735@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39489

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I haven't noticed and your claim appears to be unsubstantiated.
>
> My claim is substantiated by the existence of laws against racial,
> sexual, age, and religious discrimination. Some people simply will
> not give up their irrational pecking orders without governmental
> intervention.

No it isn't. Pecking orders are still in evidence in much of everyday life. Most of them aren't based on race, age, sex or religion. The only term I can come up with for your insistent claim is that you've become a nit pecker.

Dave K8MN

123. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:41:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401204122.06846.00001453@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39490

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>>NCI doesn't seek to compete with the ARRL as best as
>>I can see.
>
>You may need better glasses, or you may not.

Other than on the code-testing issue, where NCI and ARRL (still) have different policy positions, in what way do you think that NCI competes with ARRL?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

124. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:46:13 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <F38q8.9405$nt1.741420@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39493

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8auef$35r$1@208.207.71.152...
>
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > > NOTHING short of the proverbial ham radio license boxed with your Post
> > > Toasties will really "get the numbers up".
> >
> > Where is it writ that the "numbers" need to go up?
>
>
>
> You don't read the ARRL BOD minutes?
>

ARRL is a radio club headquartered in Connecticut. BFD.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

125. W1RFI's tie (was Re: No coders and the ARS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:50:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401205003.06846.00001455@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39494

From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net

>ps - am looking forward to the hamfest at the end of May. The program
>shows that Ed, W1RFI, is going to be soldering together a J-pole for 2
>meters whilst wearing a tie. That alone makes it worth going to! I
>can't wait to see if that is a regular tie, bow tie, or western style!

Why, it is an ARRL tie, of course! :-)

If the program said that I am building a J pole, it is incorrect. It is a novel design for a 4-element, 2-meter Yagi antenna.

See you in Rochester!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

126. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:55:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401205552.06873.00001199@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39496

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> There is no longer anything extra about the Extra class license.

Dick, if my memory serves, when you got your Extra, it conveyed nothing more
than the right to get a 1X2 call sign.

Today, it conveys a lot of Extra priveleges.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

127. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:57:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA91022.A444561F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39498

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It is now clear that you
> believe that anyone who held an Extra before restructuring was bent on
> lording his "rank" over lower class licensees in some sort of a "caste"
> system.

Not "anyone", Dick, just hams like you.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

128. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:58:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401205839.06873.00001200@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39497

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Why should it be in any way related to what services which have no
>relationship to the one in question? Answer: It should not.

Spectrum allocation today inter-relates Services in ways that are pretty complex.

How long do you think Amateur Radio would survive as a Service if it doesn't have relationship to the radio technology of the day?

I bet you were once proud that Amateur Radio was a part and parcel of the radio world. Today you appear to be proud to be unrelated.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

129. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 01:59:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9109F.60F6F68E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39499

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Such a poll is so much garbage.

Have you noticed that anyone and anything that disagrees
with you is "garbage"?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

130. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:01:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA91110.EE3547B9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39500

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Well. You told me here some time ago that not only was the Extra
> trivial, ...

Trivial for members of the super race, Dick, not for everyone.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

131. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:06:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401210600.06873.00001203@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39351

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

> I don't think
>the "threats" are really all that serious...at least not as serious as made
>out to be when one reads the "headline" of concern.

Do you think it unlikely that those who seek to obtain access to Amateur
spectrum will be successful?

>Are there any vast differences in spectrum for amateur radio between then
>and now? If not, then how much of that may have been attributed, actually,
>to a response from the radio amateur community vs. direct action from the
>ARRL on behalf of the radio amateur community?

I think it takes both organizational and individual input to be effective.

The 70 cm threat was a refreshing change of pace with significant amateur
commenting other than ARRL. In many of the areas I have been involved, ARRL has
pretty much gone it alone.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>What I am saying is that "the sky is falling" gets to be old, boring, and
>rather like crying wolf all the time. I guess I take a more detached
>approach than maybe some hams. I wouldn't feel the least bit phased by the
>loss of 70cm--I don't use or listen to it enough to be attached to it and I
>do believe that we either "use it or lose it." The spectrum is extremely
>valuable to commercial interests and maybe that keeps me in a job, keeps me
>talking on my cell phone, keeps me in technologies I really enjoy playing
>with, etc.
>
>Sorry to sound so callous about it, but to tell you the truth I think the
>ARRL makes a grave mistake by focusing so much on stuff like "the sky is
>falling." Where's membership figures? What's the financial status of the
>ARRL? Is the ARRL still as "influential" as it used to be with the FCC?
>Don't "we" use statistical data to ascertain that the approach has failed,
>the mission may need drastic changing, etc.? From a strictly business
>perspective (and that is the nature of my thought--not the emotionalism of
>the hobby), the ARRL needs to do something to fully engage the radio amateur
>community--and band threats don't fully engage the "new breed" of radio
>amateur [in my opinion]. From a strictly business perspective, *what* would
>fully engage the radio amateur community...sheesh..that's the ten-thousand
>dollar question. But band threats ain't it...
>

>How much serious experimentation is there now and will there be in the
>future with amateur radio? It just cannot be maintained as it has been in
>the past. Jobs, family, the speed of lifestyle bar many people from such
>luxury as to sit out in the garage playing with sparks all night. It is
>probably the serious experimentation, and things such as that, where band
>threats would have more impact.
>
>Again, mine is an observation strictly from the perspective of business.
>ARRL gets more members, ARRL gets more impact and is taken much more
>seriously. Band threats and technical drawings in QST just don't cut
>it...at least with me. And, by the indications of statistics...not with
>many more than me also.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

132. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:06:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8b3s4pei1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39355

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401204122.06846.00001453@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >>NCI doesn't seek to compete with the ARRL as best as
> >>I can see.
> >
> >You may need better glasses, or you may not.
>
> Other than on the code-testing issue, where NCI and ARRL (still) have
different
> policy positions, in what way do you think that NCI competes with ARRL?

Ed,
Val just shovels out the bull and never offers anything
that even remotely comes close to a well
reasoned argument or statement to back up
the bull.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

133. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:07:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA91257.A4D1D12D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39353

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Why should it be in any way related to what services which have no
> relationship to the one in question? Answer: It should not.

Answer: One of the main reasons for the Morse code requirement was mitigation of interference with the other services - also for a trained pool of CW operators for the other services including the military. Guess what, Dick? Most of the reasons that the FCC wanted hams to be skillful at CW are buried in the 20th century.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

134. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:07:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401210735.06873.00001204@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 39352

From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net

>Membership issues (BoD minutes, Section News) should not
>be crowded out of the Official Journal to devote more pages to pablum
>like "The Doctor Is In" or "Chinese Radio Sports Association Officials
>Visit ARRL". (I didn't make that one up!) Put that crap on the web.

The Doctor column is the 2nd most popular part of QST, right after Product
Review.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

135. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:09:51 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <Pp8q8.9459$nt1.746536@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39354

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401205552.06873.00001199@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > There is no longer anything extra about the Extra class license.
>
> Dick, if my memory serves, when you got your Extra, it conveyed nothing
more
> than the right to get a 1X2 call sign.

Are you saying that he couldn't operate on the air?

What good would a 1X2 call sign do anyone if that call sign was the only
right their Extra license conveyed?

My Extra license conveyed everything allowed to a Conditional, General, or
Advanced licensee, with the added benefit that I could establish an Amateur
Radio station in space.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

136. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:12:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8b470drr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39356

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uai3u0426vrs39@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
> However, since I did that, and other people, like this "CAM"
> guy, think that THEIR non-Ham radio experience should give
> them a free ride . . . how about a free ride for ME!

Just where did Cecil (CAM) state he wanted a "free ride
because of his non-Ham radio experience?"

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

137. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:14:15 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uai3u0426vrs39@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39495

Hello, all!

I cannot BELIEVE this "Len" moron FELL into my trap,
just as fellow dim bulb "CAM" has done, elsewhere in
this newsgroup! It's just amazing and what a great coup
for me, RA 68042751, Specialist Five, 9th Division, RVN,
1969 - 1970! After the Cambodian invasion I wound up
supporting, by myself for a while, the entire 3rd brigade
on this particular infantry radio. I tried to train another guy
to help me but, well, it never really worked out that well.
That is, training him AND fixing radios was WORSE
than just fixing the radios myself.

The RT-505 was quite reliable, a great radio, and unless
we had a lot of combat damage it was not THAT hard to
put back into the field. So, for a while, about a month,
it WAS possible for me to support the whole brigade, more
or less by myself. But I didn't really LIKE doing it!

However, since I did that, and other people, like this "CAM"
guy, think that THEIR non-Ham radio experience should give
them a free ride . . . how about a free ride for ME!

Val

138. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:14:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8b4b7$b5o$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39358

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401202215.06846.00001450@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >Whaaaaah! Whaaaah! I want my LICENSE -- NOW!
>
> Can you honestly say that there was any reasonable point to this post?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Actually, it states a great deal about the person
that did the posting.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

139. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:16:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA91473.A7F389F1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39359

Dave Heil wrote:
> Are you stating for the record that you are a twit?

If a twit is someone who dislikes false statements, I'm guilty.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

140. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:18:08 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <Ax8q8.9492$nt1.745781@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39357

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

> The Doctor column is the 2nd most popular part of QST, right after Product
> Review.

The "Doctor" column is inane, mostly Novice level techno-drivel. Tell us
you're kidding!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

141. Re: Its been Fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:29:09 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca919d8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39362

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401081427.07880.00001802@mb-mv.aol.com...
> >No question about it. I would not speak with someone like you. So, no,
we
> >will not be having a QSO.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Well TIT I just had to respond before I left.I am very upset with your
> response. I had hopes that after are QSO on 2 Meter CB that you would
invite me
> over for Coffee, or maybe even a couple of "Cold Ones" I dont mean Beer.
Who
> knows maybe we could have kissed and made up. Anyway I will be listening
on
> Channel 19 as I drive by your Trailer Park.
>

Well, Waddles. I see your load wasn't ready for you yet. The only
invitation you'd get from me is to leave as quickly as you came.

Kim W5TIT

142. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:31:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca91a60$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39363

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:DgRp8.1081$nB7.56440097@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:uafm869g3ttda@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > P.S. Does Iraq have the code test? We could kill
> > two birds with one stone there, pretty shortly, by
> > sicking you and your friends on old Saddam, couldn't
> > we? Yeah, the NCI Air Force would no doubt reduce
> > him in seconds, and CNN would be there to record
> > you writing "NCI" on some of your ordinance! My, my,
> > how the WORLD would TREMBLE!
>
> Hey Hans, this guy is advocating murder.
>
>

Ahhhhh, but discretionary actions are OK...you know, the ones with good
reason? :|

Kim W5TIT

143. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:36:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401213609.04378.00002276@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 39361

>Uh, Dick -- the Web page surveys are not intended to be anything more than
>fun.
>

We know that but Carl trys to spin them into facts

144. Go Ahead--Make my Day!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:36:51 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <BY8q8.4424$ku5.418556@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 39364

If you are ready for a high performance multi-band HF mobile antenna, then I ask that you
visit www.qsl.net/k4kwh. This is a very heavy duty screwdriver-type antenna and goes beyond the cheap materials often seen in some others. Here are the basic specs.

Carolina Cyclone I

Full 2" loading coil (compare to 1 1/2" on DK3 copies)
#14 silver plated copper windings (compare to skinny little #16 wire on DK3 derivatives)
Wound at 8 turns per inch (compare to 10 TPI on DK 3)
Extra heavy duty finger stock using 1/4" wide fingers and extra springy for complete contact
(compare to the little copper or brass stuff that breaks easily)

Handles up to 800 watts SSB (Try that with a PVC screwdriver coil!)
impedance matching done with a simple little inductor at the feedpoint. No toroids to
give "finicky" performance/matching up on the higher bands.

And all without breaking the bank like those $300+ versions! Just $240 shipped to the
lower 48 states!

Hey, guys, it's SPRING (at least in the South), and it's time to get out and get that mobile
up and running!

73

Jerry
K4KWH

145. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:46:28 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uai5qhg4g4bic0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39360

Bill Sohl wrote:

>Just where did Cecil (CAM) state he wanted a "free ride
>because of his non-Ham radio experience?"

Don't I get the license to paraphrase? I'm a VETERAN!

Val

146. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:47:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca91e17_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39366

All I can say is...oh buhruther...I may get the Hell outta here while the gettin's good. "Val" seems to be at the front edge of chest thumping. I'll bet it takes him at least 2-3 years to get over himself...y'all have fun handling this one.

He'll be Dick and Larry's mentor in another day or so! ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message news:uai3u0426vrs39@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> I cannot BELIEVE this "Len" moron FELL into my trap,
> just as fellow dim bulb "CAM" has done, elsewhere in
> this newsgroup! It's just amazing and what a great coup
> for me, RA 68042751, Specialist Five, 9th Division, RVN,
> 1969 - 1970! After the Cambodian invasion I wound up
> supporting, by myself for a while, the entire 3rd brigade
> on this particular infantry radio. I tried to train another guy
> to help me but, well, it never really worked out that well.
> That is, training him AND fixing radios was WORSE
> than just fixing the radios myself.
>
> The RT-505 was quite reliable, a great radio, and unless
> we had a lot of combat damage it was not THAT hard to
> put back into the field. So, for a while, about a month,
> it WAS possible for me to support the whole brigade, more
> or less by myself. But I didn't really LIKE doing it!
>
> However, since I did that, and other people, like this "CAM"
> guy, think that THEIR non-Ham radio experience should give
> them a free ride . . . how about a free ride for ME!
>
> Val
>
>
>
>

147. Re: Its been Fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 02:54:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401215419.04378.00002280@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 39365

>I see your load wasn't ready for you yet.

What load, you really didnt believe me did you?

148. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:07:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca9253d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39370

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401210600.06873.00001203@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> > I don't think
> >the "threats" are really all that serious...at least not as serious as
made
> >out to be when one reads the "headline" of concern.
>
> Do you think it unlikely that those who seek to obtain access to Amateur
> spectrum will be successful?
>

No. I don't think it's unlikely at all. But, Ed, really. Let me ask an honest question: why is it that most amateurs are rallied to action on a band that they likely have never heard (in the case of the Gigahertz-type stuff) or bands that are little-used in the amateur spectrum?

Before you are offended, yes, I would hate to seem any transgression into the amateur frequencies. But, I hardly feel it worth the effort to get all upset about *all* the spectrum when lots of it is little used. It isn't just a matter of protecting ham radio as a whole...it is about realizing that some of the battles are going to be lost so picking which "mountain" I think is worth climbing. I think being willing to give on spectrum that is least used is probably good policy. I'd be willing to bet that and spectrum lost in the Gig-range would be little realized by most amateurs--it isn't spectrum most use or are even able to listen to (for lack of receivers). I would not be as prone to action on a Gigahertz matter as I would, say for a 2M matter! Indeed, I'd "be willing" to let the Gigs go to keep 2M, ya know what I mean? I mean, we're going to lose somewhere--we can't keep it all forever.

> >
> >Are there any vast differences in spectrum for amateur radio between then
> >and now? If not, then how much of that may have been attributed,
actually,
> >to a response from the radio amateur community vs. direct action from the
> >ARRL on behalf of the radio amateur community?
>
> I think it takes both organizational and individual input to be effective.
>

Yeah, I agree. The ARRL, as an organization, will act on *every* band threat. That is what I pay you my membership for. I will individually act when I feel the part of the hobby I used most is threatened. I wouldn't

even be disturbed if the ARRL happens to "lose" on spectrum.

Some issues the ARRL undertakes are issues I don't even agree with. I don't agree with Congress being persued for action on the CC&R issue. I think it's a waste of time, won't be won, and don't agree with interfering with existing contractural matters. If someone moves into a neighborhood with restrictive conditions, that is their problem.

>
> The 70 cm threat was a refreshing change of pace with significant amateur
> commenting other than ARRL. In many of the areas I have been involved,
ARRL has
> pretty much gone it alone.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

I suspect that's because 70 cm may be more popular "out there" than it is here; and is certainly a band that will draw many to comment.

Kim W5TIT

149. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:09:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CA92117.7ED5CE31@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39367

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote, following a lot of other interesting
> material that deserves to be commented upon:
>
> >How does one "fight for" such a thing, besides filing
> >comments and proposals, and doing ex parte
> >presentations? (all of which were done in defense
> >of code testing, btw).
>
> The fact that you even ask this question is now very
> distrubing to me. That is, if you don't REALLY care
> about something, yes, you LIMIT your activities to these
> kinds of things.

Uh, yes, Val. What do you propose? The Million Ham march? Civil disobedience? Hunger strikes?

Jim is as pro-code as they get, but I think what he is trying to say is that it really IS a minority position. You work within the system, do what you can, and accept the results. Of course if the code testing is abolished, you can turn in your license if you feel strongly enough that it is the ruination of the ARS.

> Now, WHY are they doing more, on this and on several
> other issues as well? Because on the CC&R issue they
> flat LOST the paper process and, on these other issues,
> they KNOW that if ALL they do is file comments and pro-
> posals, and ex parte presentations, then, guess what,
> they could very well LOSE there, too!

Because it is one huge amount more important than the Morse code issue, THAT is why! While people here are yakking about Morse code and how Extra lites like me are CB'ifying Ham radio, (I can assure you I'm not) and Kim's callsign, as symbolic of the great decay of the Amateur Radio Service, they would be *much* better served by ensuring the Ham's right to put up some kind of antenna, legally.

> Shall we say then that they made only the minimum effort
> required in order to maintain appearances, and thus keep
> the rank and file actually IN the ranks and files? That is,
> ONE wildcat organization running around was one too
> many! Another one, a "pro-code" one, was hardly in
> anyone's interest. I think these comments are MUCH more
> than "wild speculation" and are solidly validated by the facts.

If you want to spectulate that, you can.

It is always wise to pick one's fights carefully. Right now, the issues that need addressing are the old spectrum fight, which is an ongoing battle. The other is that nasty no antenna thing that so many developments have enacted. The ARRL seems to think that is more important to the future of the hobby. I seems to too! CW is pretty far down on the list.

I would suggest that if enough hams who believe that CW is the most important issue were to join the ARRL, they could force the agenda in their favor.

- mike - KB3EIA

150. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:10:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020401221001.19000.00000319@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 39369

In article <3ca8b7fe_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>In an effort to debunk the myth that today's ham tests
>are a simple matter of word associations, etc. and that
>"nobody is really learning the material," I offer the
>following results from an ARRL web survey:
>
>Poll date: March 29, 2002
>What method did you use to study for your written ham tests?
>
>I tried to completely study and comprehend the material. 70.4 % (815)
>I memorized the correct answers with little understanding. 4.4 % (51)
>I used a combination of learning, memorizing and lucky guessing. 22.8 %
>(264)
>I have not yet taken an amateur exam. 2.3 % (27)
>Total votes: 1157

Interesting stuff. However, note that the survey did not limit itself to
newcomers or
those who recently took ham exams. One of those 1157 votes is mine, and the
most recent amateur license test I took was in 1970.

73 de Jim, N2EY

151. Re: Its been Fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:20:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca925e3$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39372

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401215419.04378.00002280@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >I see your load wasn't ready for you yet.
>
> What load, you really didnt believe me did you?

I don't know that you said anything for me to believe, Waddles. Yeah, I figured you're a truck driver--waitin' for a load to take somewhere. Never came through, eh? Oh well...

Kim W5TIT

152. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:28:04 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uai88d65ltavcf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39368

Hello, all!

This is getting to be more fun than humans should
be allowed to have! Inside [single brackets will be
a reference to my original message and following
>>double arrows will be this "Len" guy's moronic
replies to that. Following >single arrows will be Mr.
Robeson's on-target replies to Mr. Double Arrow, and
then inside [[double brackets]] will be my current
comment on their comments! Confusing enough?
Here we go:

[[I mentioned being the sole support of a brigade
in Vietnam as one reason I should just be given an
Extra class license, which seemed reasonable to
me since other people thought their non-Ham
radioi experience gave them special cachet. To
this "Len" wrote:]]

>>As to "being sole support for an entire brigade
>>(with the RT-505)" that is a piece of snow-job
>>self-puffery nonsense.

[[Then Mr. Robeson wrote:]]

>Of course having also been in Viet Nam, Lennie
>has full awareness of who was doing what, when
>and to whom . . . NOT. Just can't pass a chance
>to put YOURSELF up there, can ya, ya Putz?

[[I'm really laughing at THIS deal because I put this
message on (in part) to reel in the BIG ONES,
the FACTORY SHIP TROLLERS, Len and CAM.
And I snagged 'em both! That is, good old CAM
took my wailing about my license as an actual
complaint (!) while this "Len" guy has gone totally
ballistic over the SAME kind of bragging that he
has done continuously for months on this news-
group. The difference is, in my case, that I really
WAS, in effect, the sole support for a brigade, for
about 30 days. Really, it's not that big a deal but,
hey, it rang old Lennies chimes!]]

[[Anyway, then "Len" further wrote:]]

>>No. You were NOT the "sole support of a brigade"
>>through some knowledge of the "RT-505" supposedly

>>learned at Fort Monmouth.

[[And Mr. Robeson then wrote:]]

>Of course you can disprove this with EVIDENCE,
>Lennie..?!?! You personally know the CommO of that
>brigade? You have copies of Operational Orders or
>other operational documents from that unit? Other-
>wise it's a he-said/she-said, and the simple matter
>that YOU are the "she said" part makes anything you
>say suspect.

[[What I think is funny is that I might actually have
out-militaried old "Len," the ultimate cordite sniffer,
and so finally sent him off his rocker! Hilarious!
And I think I mentioned Fort GORDON, not Fort
Monmouth!]]

Continuing, in my original message I satirized "Len"
and "CAM" by wailing that my military experience
should count for a LOT in the Ham Radio world. And
"Len" BIT ON THIS, missing the satire completely!
I said that as a military radio "whiz" I should get some
serious consideration in the here and now.

>>"Radio whiz?!?" For learning how to twist knobs
>>on a prick-25?

And then Mr. Robeson wrote:

>Why not, Lennie? YOU want the FCC to give YOU
>a license for a test you passed in 1950-something.

[[EXACTLY what I was trying to point up! You know, just
when you think you've seen EVERYTHING on UseNet,
some guys like "Len" and "CAM" come trotting along
and show you stupidity that you couldn't possibly have
BELIEVED . . . until you had seen it for yourself! Wow!
Where the reference to the PRC-25 (Prick 25) came
from I don't know. Probably, that's the sum total of
"Len's" actual knowledge of Army radios!]]

Finally, "Len" wrote:

>>Leonard H. Anderson
>>ex RA16408336, Sgt (E-5),
>>United States Army (1952-1960)

And then Mr. Robeson wrote:

>This is supposed to be "proof" of anything? Are we
>supposed to be impressed? THIS is that "patriotic
>bunting" crap you keep accusing OTHERS of
>wrapping themselves in, Your Putziness. You want

>us to salute now? Creep.

[[Why, hell YES, we're supposed to be impressed
with this! Wasn't everyone impressed with MY wonderful
military record? Didn't it just HIT the SPOT, especially
when I satirized using such a thing to make myself
actually DESERVING of SPECIAL treatment with
reference to Ham Radio? It sure lit old "Len's" AB,
didn't it, all the way up to "FULL -- MILITARY!"]]

[[Rarely have I had more fun than this on the net!]]

[[Val]]

153. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:30:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <iB9q8.2163$1V2.392645749@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39371

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uah0viknggjgs01@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> I'm now passing the QRZ tests for General and will
> be turning to the code portion in earnest very soon,
> pointing toward taking both General elements two
> weeks from tonight. Vis-a-vis code, I am bascially
> starting from ground zero, though I did begin (and
> then stop) the process in 1998. In the interest of
> National Defense I will be passing along my experi-
> ences with this code business, no matter what the
> result, succeed or fail. Stay tuned!
>
> As for all this radio theory stuff, I just don't SEE it,
> especially in MY case. Why, back in the late 1960s
> I spent MONTHS at Fort Gordon (that's where the
> Army Signal School [a REAL radio outfit] was located!).
> I went though that program like Sherman did about a
> century earlier, showing them southerners the way to go!
> And just a few months later I was just about sole support
> on the RT-505 radio -- for an entire BRIGADE in South
> Vietnam! Men's lives depended on me!
>
> All of this is precisely true!
>
> Why should ** I ** have to pass ANY tests in this rinky-dink
> "Hamby-Pamby" outfit, huh? Why not just GIVE me the
> license, all the way up to EXTRA, because I was a radio
> whiz years and years ago? Huh? And I'm a Veteran, love
> my country, go to church every Sunday, am a Kiwanian, and
> love my wife and daughter!
>
> Whaaaaah! Whaaaah! I want my LICENSE -- NOW!
>
> WHY am *** I *** having to EXERT myself, huh?
>
> That is, all I want is to be treated FAIRLY!
>
> Val

Can anyone now doubt that this guy's a TROLL?

154. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:34:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_E9q8.2171$8W2.392718553@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39373

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA8B2BF.6E5DB87F@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > I'm now passing the QRZ tests for General and will
> > be turning to the code portion in earnest very soon,
> > pointing toward taking both General elements two
> > weeks from tonight. Vis-a-vis code, I am bascially
> > starting from ground zero, though I did begin (and
> > then stop) the process in 1998.
>
> Uh Oh, Val! You shouldn't have admitted that. From now
> on, no matter how much you achieve in the Amateur Radio
> Service, you will be forever branded a restructured dumbed-
> down ham, lower than the lowest layer of whale dodo on the
> bottom of the ocean. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

What was I saying really frosts my ass on this group? Ft Gordon? Vietnam?
Paid to learn it?

155. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:38:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3J9q8.2173$493.393684148@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39374

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401173619.17929.00000200@mb-fk.aol.com...
> In article <uah0viknggjgs01@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:

> As to "being sole support for an entire brigade (with the RT-505)"
> that is a piece of snow-job self-puffery nonsense. The RT-505 is
> the main component of the "prick-25" and used in small-unit ops,
> by squads and patrols of two squads. It is no more the "sole
> support" than its older counterpart, the "prick-6" was in Korea.
> The selectable channel feature allows great flexibility in comm to
> platoon, company, battalion, forward observers, air support,
> artillery support, and so on. At battalion level and higher, there
> was a larger variety of radios, more power output, more bands.
>
> You can find all of that referenced in printed media and on the
> Web. The Vietnam War ended 23 years ago.
>
> >All of this is precisely true!
>
> No. You were NOT the "sole support of a brigade" through some
> knowledge of the "RT-505" supposedly learned at Fort Monmouth.
> Use of the "prick-25" was taught to squad members at infantry
> schools and at armor schools. That's typically a few days,
> mostly for radio procedure and the hookups for manpack, vehicle,
> ground locations. The RT-505 has two frequency-select switches,
> a bandswitch (30-52, 53-75 positions, splitting 6 m), volume, and
> power-function switch. Definitely not rocket science to operate,
> about as complicated as today's CB front panel.

Len, do you think he was paid to learn code at Ft Gordon?

156. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:40:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NK9q8.2174$td3.393971908@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39375

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uai3u0426vrs39@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> I cannot BELIEVE this "Len" moron FELL into my trap,
> just as fellow dim bulb "CAM" has done, elsewhere in
> this newsgroup! It's just amazing and what a great coup
> for me,

A self-admitted TROLL.

157. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:41:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <yL9q8.2175$8f3.394068202@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39376

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uai5qhg4g4bic0@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Just where did Cecil (CAM) state he wanted a "free ride
> >because of his non-Ham radio experience?"
>
> Don't I get the license to paraphrase? I'm a VETERAN!

Probably a veteran of CB Wars.

158. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:43:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8N9q8.2177$Ti3.394311791@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39377

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a8b4b7$b5o$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020401202215.06846.00001450@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >
> > >Whaaaaah! Whaaaah! I want my LICENSE -- NOW!
> >
> > Can you honestly say that there was any reasonable point to this post?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Actually, it states a great deal about the person
> that did the posting.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Troll

159. *Monthly Pointer to Twistedhed FAQ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:43:57 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0204011943.37d3217f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39378
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

160. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:46:35 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <vQ9q8.2179$Zn3.394645678@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39379

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a88nic$e47$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:uafm869g3ttda@corp.supernews.com...

> > P.S. Does Iraq have the code test? We could kill
> > two birds with one stone there, pretty shortly, by
> > sicking you and your friends on old Saddam, couldn't
> > we? Yeah, the NCI Air Force would no doubt reduce
> > him in seconds, and CNN would be there to record
> > you writing "NCI" on some of your ordinance! My, my,
> > how the WORLD would TREMBLE!
>
> And Val claims his roots are in acadamia?
>
> Still ROTFLMAO.
> Bill K2UNK

Industrial Arts?

161. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 03:52:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <MV9q8.2180$uw3.395190462@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39380

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401191304.19503.00000211@mb-cm.aol.com...
> In article <5EFp8.532$h96.31156403@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> >news:uabqt894v2d04d@corp.supernews.com...
> >> Hello, all!
> >>
> >> One again, my original comments will be preceded by arrows,
> >> Mr. Hare's comments will be "plain type," and my new comments
> >> will be inside [[double brackets]].
> >
> >Don't trouble yourself. We know who said what.
>
> I'm still looking for "W1FRI" that he is replying to...not in the
> databases apparently. :-)

What a total frigging idiot. I Guess Bruce and his sister did have a kid.

162. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:04:34 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <m5aq8.9259$ml2.730761@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39381

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> If someone moves into a neighborhood with
> restrictive conditions, that is their problem.

That's kinda short-sighted, Kim.

How about the teen-aged offspring of someone who already lives in a CC&R-impaired house wants to become a ham?

How about the retired lady who has raised a family, lost her spouse, and now wants to pursue this hobby her grandson loves so much (but she's lived in a CC&R-impaired development since 1971)?

I'm sure there are other examples, but the above two examples are people that I personally know.

Do we just tell them "Kim says tough shit -- deal with it."?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

163. The amazing technology behind Google searches

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:31:03 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <buaq8.9332$ml2.735724@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39382

http://www.google.com/technology/pigeonrank.html

ROTFLMAOWPMP

73, de Hans, K0HB

164. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234031.02252.00000572@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39385

In article <3ca7daca_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Hasn't someone explained to you that schoolyard antics and childish one
>liners aren't the insults you think they are...well, at least once grown up.
>Maybe you're not very grown up...never mind.
>
>Kim W5TIT

This -- from the newsgroup's leading practitioner of schoolyard antics
and childish one-liners -- so she ought to know!

73 de Larry, K3LT

165. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234031.02252.00000573@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39387

In article <20020401202215.06846.00001450@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
>>Whaaaaah! Whaaaah! I want my LICENSE -- NOW!
>
>Can you honestly say that there was any reasonable point to this post?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

I think the point is perfectly clear -- it was a brilliant and amusing satirization of the whining of those who wanted reduced licensing standards in the ARS -- particularly with regard to code testing! He should have satirized the manner in which the ARRL is pandering to them, but that probably wouldn't be quite as funny.

73 de Larry, K3LT

166. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234032.02252.00000575@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39388

In article <3CA8C4FD.A8F6BDEF@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Everyone is NOT the same but that doesn't preclude "all of us from
>just getting along". Dr. Williamson, a PhD in EE, has been chastised
>in this newsgroup for being perfectly satisfied with a Tech license.
>What the hell is wrong with live and let live?

Cecil:

The good Doctor hasn't been chastized for a damn thing in this
newsgripe. However, *you* have been chastized for constantly
dragging him out as your sole example of "live and let live" among
other things. Please provide quotes of any direct criticism of
Dr. Williamson, by name. If you can't, or won't, then stop blaspheming
him in this newsgripe.

73 de Larry, K3LT

167. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234032.02252.00000574@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39390

In article <3CA8DE0D.D060197D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Even so, any skill is subject to a bell-shaped curve. My analogy
>is dunking a basketball. I can dunk a basketball just about as
>well as I can copy Morse code. Does that mean that everyone can
>dunk a basketball if he/she would just avoid being lazy and
>practice? If so, we can replace the Morse code exam with a
>basketball dunking exam.

Cecil:

Incorrect. We can replace Morse code exams with basketball-
dunking exams only if and when basketball-dunking becomes a
practical and useful skill for radio amateurs. Since it is not, and
never could be, there will be no test for it, and you've made yourself
look like a wanker for suggesting it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

168. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234033.02252.00000576@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39383

In article <3CA8A04B.BA8857CE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>Only a twit would believe such a statement to include the deceased, the
>illiterate, the comatose and the incoherent.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

And, as you'll observe, it took a twit to do so!

73 de Larry, K3LT

169. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234033.02252.00000577@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39386

In article <3ca7da4e_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Aw, well maybe I just didn't notice since I took the General,
>> Advanced and Extra writtens at the same setting.
>
>Ya see, for Dick it's all about validating himself. He's got no validation
>without chest thumping... It's all it was ever about for him. There's no
>viagra for folks like little Dick.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

All Dick did was state the facts of how he upgraded. Do you have
a legitimate problem with that, or are you just jealous, as usual?

And BTW, you're the last one who should accuse someone else
of "chest thumping." After all, that's what your callsign is all about!

73 de Larry, K3LT

170. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234034.02252.00000578@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39389
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article , "K0HB"
writes:

[The majority of Hansl's excellent post snipped IOW the Bandwidth
Reduction Act of 1995]

>Rather than continuing to restrict the availability of
>amateur equipment, as though we were selling assault weapons
>or recreational pharmaceuticals, I vote for opening up the market.
>Let's have radios for sale in the strip malls alongside the video
>games, Lionel trains, and mountain bikes. And it won't hurt if a
>few of us put on our Elmer-suits and lurk around to spot the
>likely recruits.
>
>When they outlaw ham gear, only outlaws will be hams.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

I don't disagree with much of what you said. However, the loss of
the local ham radio store is a simple fact of economic life. The
technological changes that brought us shopping through 1-800
numbers and the Internet has also brought about a great
reduction in the interest in ham radio per se. How is ham radio
EVER going to compete with the World Wide Web? What are
the young, bright, technically-inclined prospective hams who no
longer have to endure the code testing "hazing ritual" going to
create that can give me the same abilities to access information
quickly and conveniently as I can with any computer, cell phone,
wireless PDA, etc? Keep in mind, this access has to also be
totally free of all user charges, in order to compete with ham radio!

I have absolutely no problem with wider availability of ham gear,
but the problem is still going to be to keep it out of the hands of
bootleggers -- and their ingenuity will never cease unless some
of them are actually tossed in the slammer or made to write
checks with lots of zeroes. Even then, all we'll have is fewer
bootleggers, but not nearly enough new radio amateurs. The
sad fact is this -- ham radio doesn't have a very bright future at
the moment. And, unfortunately, in our desperation to evoke some
growth -- ANY growth, all we've managed to do is create a highly
Balkanized ham radio culture, based on the fact that a certain
few people are too lazy to learn a practical, useful communications
skill, and don't want the rest of us speaking the truth about them!

BTW -- I've been in a lot of ham radio stores, past and present, and don't recall a single one of them having a coffee pot to hang out at -- but they usually did have a manager who didn't want you taking up his valuable floor space unless you had your credit card in hand! It may have been like that in the old days when hams had to make regular visits to replace burned-out vacuum tubes, but it was never like that at any time in my ham career, which essentially began in the early '80's. I can understand your longing for a return to the good 'ole days of the '50's thru the '70's, but that's not the way it is now, and it will never be that way again.

73 de Larry, K3LT

171. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234035.02252.00000580@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39384

In article <3CA8B0F7.A508B68F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>N2EY wrote:
>> As of May 14, 2000: Total - 674,792
>>
>> As of March 31, 2002: Total - 683,154 (increase of 8,362)
>
>A little better than one percent increase per year. Looks
>like restructuring is working perfectly.

Cecil:

I'll bet that's not what they're saying at ARRL HQ.

73 de Larry, K3LT

172. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234035.02252.00000579@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39392

In article <g53q8.8110$ml2.583394@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<K0HB@cumdudgeon.com> writes:

>
>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
>> NOTHING short of the proverbial ham radio license boxed with your Post
>> Toasties will really "get the numbers up".
>
>Where is it writ that the "numbers" need to go up?

Hansl:

I've been axing the same thing for years. However, since you seem
to approve of the "dumbing down" of licensing standards, particularly
WRT code testing, one would seem to think you are one of those
who want the "numbers" to increase. No matter; this marginal growth
trend will not increase, and it will, in fact, turn into a downward
spiral all too soon. I wish I was wrong, but I don't have that kind of
luck.

73 de Larry, K3LT

173. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:40:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020401234037.02252.00000581@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39391

In article <uafrd1qqdajl91@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
>>You're in the right section, but sitting in the wrong seat.
>
>Well, I could have done worse!
>
>
>>I have very strong doubts that the ARRL sees the NCI as
>>any kind of threat as a "competing organization."
>
>If Ham Radio is in decline then EVERYTHING is a potential
>threat, including a stinkbomb like NCI, at least in my view.

Val:

The "stinkbomb" comment notwithstanding, I guess I can see your
point, part way. I'll admit that NCI did have a more profound effect
on the recent changes to the licensing standards than a larger
group, FISTS, had.

>>You see, NCI is just a small group of hams who write letters
>>to the FCC; it is not a national organization with hundreds of
>>thousands of members, in spite of the member "numbers"
>>you're seeing. There are probably at most a couple of dozen
>>actual NCI members.
>
>I am sure that you are very close here BUT, in certain
>situations, and Ham Radio now seems to be shaking
>in its boots, a very few people can have a disproportionate
>effect, particularly on the erstwhile "leadership" of a group.
>I don't think it's NCI itself, it's the fact that ANY organization
>at ALL has to be neutralized, given the status what am quo.

I think the thing that has Ham Radio, and the ARRL, "shaking in
it's boots" is the effect of the Internet and the explosion of wireless
technology. These days, being able to communicate without being
physically tied to a wall outlet of some sort is a common, everyday
occurrence experienced by anyone with the wherewithal to acquire
the technology. Quite frankly, we (radio amateurs) will never be
able to come close to duplicating the capability of even one of
the most ubiquitous cell phones, and do so without cost to the

user. Sure, we can talk worldwide with our fellow hams with very portable equipment, but not equipment that is shirt-pocket sized, and can connect to particular individuals at a time of the user's choosing.

>>What the ARRL is concerned about is the dismal growth
>>record of the ARS of late, and the fact that if more people
>>don't become hams, there won't be a source of prospective
>>ARRL members, and thus, their membership will decline
>>and the League, already in financial difficulty, will face
>>extinction. Follow the money, and you will learn the truth.
>
>Well, yes, if this is true then a panicked group of leaders
>can very well make mistake after mistake after mistake.

Oh, they've done that, all right. Their mistake was to think that "dumbing down" our licensing standards would actually have the effect of reversing the trend toward negative growth in the numbers of licensees. Right now, there may be evidence that this is so; unfortunately, in a few years, when the licenses of the No-Code Tech generation start expiring, we're going to find that we're no longer staying ahead of our losses.

>Nothing causes sweaty palms quite like red ink.

Well, the ARRL has had to face a lot of that, as well.

>>The ARRL had to ditch any notion of supporting the
>>status quo in code testing because they knew they can
>>attract more potential members with a dumbed-down,
>>free-for-all type of licensing structure, than one with
>>any practical, meaningful standards.
>
>This would go under the rubric of "pounding the rubble"
>and unfortunately does not bode well for long-term
>success.

No, it does not. However, they feel as though they must do whatever is "politically correct" in order to ensure that they are not offending those who disagree with code testing.

>It things really are as you say then some kind
>of renewal MUST begin soon, so as to insure that the
>incoming raw material really DOES advance in the radio
>arts, SOMEHOW, so as to hold their interest. What do
>we know about retention of new Technicians, by age
>group? I guess those stats are just now starting to come
>in, would that be right?

Right now, the raw numbers of hams in all license classes seems to have reached a stable plateau; it is even showing marginal growth. However, this is not going to persist. And ten years from now, there will be a definite downward trend.

"Give away" licensing has not had the effect that the ARRL desired. Their organization is in severe jeopardy. They will have to change in some fundamental way in order to remain viable. They will have to become an organization of "ALL" communications hobbyists, including CB'ers, FRS'ers, SWL's, Marine HF/VHF users, in addition to radio amateurs. They will have to somehow figure out a way to use what's left of our VHF/UHF frequencies to develop a nationwide system of "virtual" cell-phone service, available without by-the-minute airtime charges, to augment our present system of 2-way repeaters. They will have to clamp down totally on radio "badboys" who make frequencies unusable by sending violators to jail and/or bankruptcy with stiff sentences and collection of heavy fines. The only thing they won't do is retain the status quo in our band/mode allocations. They will give away as much present exclusive CW spectrum as possible to expand HF phone. This is the big mistake.

I'm afraid to say it, my friend, but you waited too long to get involved in ham radio. You've missed out on the best days it ever had, and ever will have. It's all downhill from here.

73 de Larry, K3LT

174. Re: WA6ITF's Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:52:44 UTC
From: "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
Message-ID: <a8bdhh02rat@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39398
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chuck K8CPA" <k8cpa@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:3ca7d963.883644@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com...
> >You made most CB'ers sound like
> >IDIOTS! > >

Which is more than they deserve.
--
- - -

Regards,
Joe S.

175. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:54:06 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <OPaq8.9406$ml2.740542@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39393

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

>
> Aw, well maybe I just didn't notice since I took the General,
> Advanced and Extra writtens at the same setting.
>

You must be a new guy. Us Real Hams(tm) had to have time
in grade before taking their Amateur Extra exam.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

176. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 04:58:54 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <iUaq8.9418$ml2.741051@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39394

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> BTW -- I've been in a lot of ham radio stores, past and present, and
> don't recall a single one of them having a coffee pot to hang out at --
> but they usually did have a manager who didn't want you taking
> up his valuable floor space unless you had your credit card in hand!

Next time you're in Mounds View, MN stop in at "Radio City",
or the next time you're in Watertown, SD stop in at Burghardts.
Both stores will brew you up a fresh pot if the current one is
too stale for your refined Eastern taste buds.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

177. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:13:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402001340.06459.00000199@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 39396

In article <9f4bfe89.0204010800.131969b7@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired >FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

Very nice typing. The arrangement of numbers seems to confuse the issue more than presenting anything clearly.

From the AH0A website on amateur statistics, end of March 2000 to end of March 2002, the number of NEW licensees in each class were:

Technician: 38,362
General: 1868
Extra: 419

The ratio of New Technician to New General plus New Extra was 16.77:1. Note that these are NEW licensees, not "upgraders."

The total number of licensees increased by 2400 in that two year period; 677,784 to 680,184. It should be clear that the total number increase is due to the NEW Technician license and also that Novice-thru-Extra classes have been EXPIRING, their total numbers dropping.

If there were no Technician class, the total number of ARS licensees in the same period would have dropped to 641,822 or down to 94.69% of what it was two years before (the month before restructuring).

178. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:13:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402001342.06459.00000200@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 39397

In article <20020401184648.13743.00001779@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>As to "being sole support for an entire brigade (with the RT-505)"
>>that is a piece of snow-job self-puffery nonsense.
>
> Of course having also been in Viet Nam, Lennie has full awareness of who >was doing what, when and to whom.....

No need to have been in Viet Nam or French Indochina. In the 29 years since the US involvement ended (1973), there has been a great deal of information written about it, the tactics, the unit organizations, the campaigns, including detailed information on radio use.

> NOT.

I've never been to southeast Asia. I know many who have been there. Steebie isn't one of them...

> Just can't pass a chance to put YOURSELF up there, can ya, ya Putz?

I'm just correcting someone's self-puffery and effrontery to state they were the "sole support of a brigade" by knowing only a small-unit radio. :-)

>>No. You were NOT the "sole support of a brigade" through some
>>knowledge of the "RT-505" supposedly learned at Fort Monmouth.
>
> Of course you can disprove this with EVIDENCE, Lennie..?!?! you >personally know the CommO of that brigade? You have copies of Operational >Ordes or other operational documents from that unit?

The "brigade" was never specified so it is impossible to know all of the commanding officers of a brigade (minimum commissioned rank a full bird colonel, more likely a brig general). Op orders aren't needed since others IN the US Army have already sifted through all that and put into a number of different US Army documents, including analyses of Army radio operations in Viet Nam found at CENCOM (US Army CENtral electronics COMmand, Fort Monmouth) and Fort Gordon, GA, and a few other Army places. A good place for civilians to browse is the TRADOC site (TRAining and DOCtrine) digital library on the Web (I've given that site before). One can start with FM-100-5 and work upward from there.

With a little REAL research, it is possible to find detailed reports on the last use of OOK CW in US military in southeast Asia.

Some have shared their experiences first-hand on various web sites, both in the USA and abroad. That includes radio procedures and intimate details of certain radio use. The prick-25 is popular with military radio collectors and one need only do a web search to find all sorts of information on AN/PRC-25 and "RT-505." One historian of the prick-25 even has a full manufacture history, contract awards, etc., for its entire production-operational life. Interesting stuff in my opinion but probably would not be to those who need to destroy others in messaging to make themselves look good.

> Otherwise it's a he-said/she-said, and the simple matter that YOU are
>the "she said" part makes anything you say suspect.

Not at all. Just do a Search for either "PRC-25" or "RT-505" and see what sites turn up, go to them and read them. As to US Army unit organization from squad on up, that is found in many Army web sites. The US Government Printing Office has many documents on sale that describe that. That hasn't changed since WW2 days.

>>"Radio whiz?!?" For learning how to twist knobs on a prick-25?
>
> Why not, Lennie? YOU want the FCC to give YOU a license for a test you
>passed in 1950-something.

No again. That supposition has been raised by the rabies-infected, frothing at the message mouth. I am not demanding, expecting, or otherwise desiring an amateur radio license, just arguing against some in here who attempt snow-jobs year around. :-)

I've twisted the knobs on a prick-25, about as hard to do as twist the same number of knobs on an old Narco NavComm radio while in flight in 1962 or any one of a dozen CB sets of the last two decades. I've twisted the knobs on a lot of different radios, some military, others civilian, none of which needed an amateur radio license to operate or transmit RF. Most of them didn't even need a civilian radio license of any kind! All perfectly legal too! [don dat frost yer doughynuts? :-)]

>>Leonard H. Anderson
>>ex RA16408336, Sgt (E-5), United States Army (1952-1960)
>
> This is supposed to be "proof" of anything? Are we supposed to be
>impressed?

Steebie, you should be...you've never admitted to ANY USMC radio operation of any kind, can't immediately call to mind any radio nomenclatures, have postured about shouting obscenities of many kinds (some you aren't familiar with) and haven't hit a damn thing.

>THIS is that "patriotic bunting" crap you keep accusing OTHERS of
>wrapping themselves in, Your Putziness.

No, just a point of reference. Snow-job con-men are found everywhere. In here they rely on most radio amateurs NOT having been in military service...or, if they served, did not do so involving radio. That way they

can make out like they were next to being War Heroes...or were the father of one (famous story of one whose "son was behind enemy lines in Iraq sending intel via CW during Gulf War"...priceless stuff!).

I've been involved with military radio for half a century as both service-man and civilian. I claim nothing outstanding there, never have, just did my job and got on with it. I've only contributed a little tiny part to the enormity of the entire radio world, but I've never told any lies about it nor attempted to exaggerate anything. Indeed, I've heard many a tale, many a falsehood, lots of differing merde on what others have claimed, have refuted those with recorded history. That infuriates the tale-tellers and con-men and also brings a smile to my face. The truth shall set us all free, lies result in a perverse personality that tries to "battle" those that don't permit posturing and self-glorification.

>You want us to salute now?

It won't hurt you, even using all five fingers. :-)

I tuned up and keyed-down my first HF transmitter before you were conceived...1 KW BC-339 running FSK RTTY. Chronological fact. By the time you were born I was working my MOS 281.6 as a microwave supervisor with three-up-and-one-down on the sleeve.

> Creep.

I know that pisses you off no end and you can't help but "reply" in such terms, so I "salute" you with upraised middle finger of my left hand. That's more than you deserve. :-)

179. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:14:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA93E28.63A00321@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39395

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> ... this marginal growth
> trend will not increase, and it will, in fact, turn into a downward
> spiral all too soon.

What ever happened to all those hordes of CBers who were
predicted to overrun the ARS?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

180. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:33:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bfr0ihs0@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39399

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a8auef$35r$1@208.207.71.152...
> >
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> > >
> > > > NOTHING short of the proverbial ham radio license boxed with your Post
> > > > Toasties will really "get the numbers up".
> > >
> > > Where is it writ that the "numbers" need to go up?
> >
> >
> >
> > You don't read the ARRL BOD minutes?
> >
>
> ARRL is a radio club headquartered in Connecticut. BFD.

I'm wid u, OM. But they seem to think it's a BFD.

181. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:38:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bg4ejnq0@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39400

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > There is no longer anything extra about the Extra class license.
>
> Dick, if my memory serves, when you got your Extra, it conveyed nothing more
> than the right to get a 1X2 call sign.

Nope, it just got me back to where I was as a Conditional-General a few months before taking the Extra tests (along with the General and Extra writtens, 13 and 20wpm code, since Conditionals got credit for only the Novice)

> Today, it conveys a lot of Extra priveleges.

So? When it all settles out to the Proletarian "one class" service, everyone will have all of them. Not they they will be able to actually use them.

182. March Top Ten

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:39:42 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <yubq8.9583$ml2.749763@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39401

[519] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 15.9%
[353] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 10.8%
[318] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 9.7%
[228] Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> 7.0%
[173] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 5.3%
[160] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.9%
[154] Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> 4.7%
[150] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 4.6%
[124] Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> 3.8%
[118] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.6%

183. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:39:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bg74jnq1@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39402

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > Why should it be in any way related to what services which have no
> >relationship to the one in question? Answer: It should not.
>
> Spectrum allocation today inter-relates Services in ways that are pretty
> complex.
>
> How long do you think Amateur Radio would survive as a Service if it doesn't
> have relationship to the radio technology of the day?
>
> I bet you were once proud that Amateur Radio was a part and parcel of the radio
> world. Today you appear to be proud to be unrelated.

The closer ham radio moves toward CB, and for darn sure it has already
moved a long way in that direction, the less favorably it can be viewed
by anyone.

184. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:40:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bg8cjnq2@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39403

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > It is now clear that you
> > believe that anyone who held an Extra before restructuring was bent on
> > lording his "rank" over lower class licensees in some sort of a "caste"
> > system.
>
> Not "anyone", Dick, just hams like you.

That's merely the product of a sick mind - yours.

185. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:42:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bgbrjnq3@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39404

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Such a poll is so much garbage.
>
> Have you noticed that anyone and anything that disagrees
> with you is "garbage"?

No, and if you noticed that it was another figment of your sick mind.
Have you visited your shrink lately? Call soon for an appointment, maybe
(s)he can help with your fantasizing.

186. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:45:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bgigjnq4@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39405

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
> > The Doctor column is the 2nd most popular part of QST, right after Product
> > Review.
>
> The "Doctor" column is inane, mostly Novice level techno-drivel. Tell us
> you're kidding!

You credit the membership of the ARS and the ARRL with far too much
technical savvy, Hans. Sure he's right.

187. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 05:47:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bgl3jnq5@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39406

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Are you stating for the record that you are a twit?
>
> If a twit is someone who dislikes false statements, I'm guilty.

You may dislike them but you sure make more than your share. Take that
up with your shrink next visit, maybe it'll help him straighten you out.

188. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:02:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bhi9jnq6@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39407

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>

.... We can replace Morse code exams with basketball-
> dunking ......

I might be persuaded to trade Morse code for a Cecil dunking.

189. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:07:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402010731.18297.00000264@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 39409

In article <20020401221001.19000.00000319@mb-fm.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Interesting stuff. However, note that the survey did not limit itself to
>newcomers or
>those who recently took ham exams. One of those 1157 votes is mine, and the
>most recent amateur license test I took was in 1970.

Heh heh heh...one of those numbers is mine and I've never taken
an FCC amateur radio test. :-)

190. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:07:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402010732.18297.00000265@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 39408

In article <iB9q8.2163$1V2.392645749@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>Can anyone now doubt that this guy's a TROLL?

...he's the worst kind of TROLL, them with an offended EGO.

:-)

191. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:07:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402010733.18297.00000266@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 39410

In article <uai88d65ltavcf@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>[[I mentioned being the sole support of a brigade
>in Vietnam as one reason I should just be given an
>Extra class license, which seemed reasonable to
>me since other people thought their non-Ham
>radioi experience gave them special cachet. To
>this "Len" wrote:]]
>
>>>As to "being sole support for an entire brigade
>>>(with the RT-505)" that is a piece of snow-job
>>>self-puffery nonsense.
>
>[[Then Mr. Robeson wrote:]]
>
>>Of course having also been in Viet Nam, Lennie
>>has full awareness of who was doing what, when
>>and to whom . . . NOT. Just can't pass a chance
>>to put YOURSELF up there, can ya, ya Putz?

Steebie ain't been there, has rarely been out of CONUS.
He's been hanging out with his buddy Jack Mehoff a lot
since Jack stopped posting in here.

>group. The difference is, in my case, that I really
>WAS, in effect, the sole support for a brigade, for
>about 30 days. Really, it's not that big a deal but,
>hey, it rang old Lennies chimes!

A "brigade" of WHAT? NVN?

What you MIGHT be the "sole support" of would be a
boot-repair unit.

>[[What I think is funny is that I might actually have
>out-militaried old "Len," the ultimate cordite sniffer,
>and so finally sent him off his rocker! Hilarious!
>And I think I mentioned Fort GORDON, not Fort
>Monmouth!]]

No. A small slip of the fingers considering that Fort
Monmouth was THE Signal School in the 1950s while
CAMP Gordon was Signal basic training in that
same period. As time progressed and radio-electronics
became more prominent, Monmouth became CENCOM

and Gordon was renamed as a Fort and the center of
Signal Corps technical training. I've been to Monmouth
several times as a civilian since then, only once to
Fort Gordon as a civilian.

>Continuing, in my original message I satirized "Len"
>and "CAM" by wailing that my military experience
>should count for a LOT in the Ham Radio world. And
>"Len" BIT ON THIS, missing the satire completely!

Poor baby, sniffling over bad writing skills again?

>I said that as a military radio "whiz" I should get some
>serious consideration in the here and now.

You are a whizzer, but it's not for radio knowledge.

>>>"Radio whiz?!?" For learning how to twist knobs
>>>on a prick-25?
>
>And then Mr. Robeson wrote:
>
>>Why not, Lennie? YOU want the FCC to give YOU
>>a license for a test you passed in 1950-something.
>
>[[EXACTLY what I was trying to point up! You know, just
>when you think you've seen EVERYTHING on UseNet,
>some guys like "Len" and "CAM" come trotting along
>and show you stupidity that you couldn't possibly have
>BELIEVED . . . until you had seen it for yourself! Wow!
>Where the reference to the PRC-25 (Prick 25) came
>from I don't know. Probably, that's the sum total of
>"Len's" actual knowledge of Army radios!]]

Noooo...it's more extensive than that, sonny.

It includes USAF radios and a few USN radios...not that
the service branch makes much difference since the
"AN" preceding the slash on the radio system nomenclature
means "Army-Navy" or use by all branches. Heck, even the
State Department has used military radio equipment...:-)

Do you need an instruction on twisting the knobs on the
"RT-505"? You can get a partial repro of the operator's
instruction manual from Fair Radio Sales for $20. They will
even sell a used-but-working RT-505B for $300, handset is
$18 extra. Live it up, buy one for yourself and pretend you
are still in 'Nam playing "sole support for a whole brigade!"

>[[Rarely have I had more fun than this on the net!]]

Poor baby, haven't lived much, have you?

192. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:07:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402010734.18297.00000267@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 39411

In article <a8b1scdfk1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Val stolls down the propoganda path that tries
>to repeat the fabrication often enough that people
>ultimately say it must be so.

That's the "Big Lie" technique to a tee. :-)

The PCTAs have done that for years, but, shhhhh, don't say
that to them, they'll get so terribly furious! :-)

Be kind to Val. He was the "sole support of a brigade" in 'Nam
due to his unique knowledge of the AN/PRC-25 and all five
controls on its front panel.

193. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:10:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bi13nga0@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39412

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Aw, well maybe I just didn't notice since I took the General,
> > Advanced and Extra writtens at the same setting.
> >
>
> You must be a new guy. Us Real Hams(tm) had to have time
> in grade before taking their Amateur Extra exam.

Yeah, I'm fairly new, only got on board in early '57. In fact I'd still be a happy Conditional if not for the advantages of Incentive Licenseing, notwithstanding Cecil the Jerk's condemnation of me as some sort of Extra Class Elitist. Jealous dolt.

194. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:11:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bi3dnga1@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39413

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > ... this marginal growth
> > trend will not increase, and it will, in fact, turn into a downward
> > spiral all too soon.
>
> What ever happened to all those hordes of CBers who were
> predicted to overrun the ARS?

***ONE MORE TIME*** -- THEY'RE ALREADY HERE!!!!
```

195. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:33:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402013302.14735.00000284@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 39414

In article <vQ9q8.2179$Zn3.394645678@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> And Val claims his roots are in acadamia?
>>
>> Still ROTFLMAO.
>> Bill K2UNK
>
>Industrial Arts?

...shoe and boot repair. Hey, don't knock it, it's useful...

196. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:33:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402013302.14735.00000283@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 39415

In article <3J9q8.2173$493.393684148@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> schools and at armor schools. That's typically a few days,
>> mostly for radio procedure and the hookups for manpack, vehicle,
>> ground locations. The RT-505 has two frequency-select switches,
>> a bandswitch (30-52, 53-75 positions, splitting 6 m), volume, and
>> power-function switch. Definitely not rocket science to operate,
>> about as complicated as today's CB front panel.
>
>Len, do you think he was paid to learn code at Ft Gordon?

Hard to tell. CAMP Gordon was the Signal School for Field Radio MOSs in the 50s and those had to learn morsemanship (or wind up in the infantry or someplace). I didn't follow what happened later since my civilian pay-check awarders weren't interested in morsemanship. :-)

I gonna hafta research the PRC-25 a bit more on the web when there's time, see if that thing was operational by the Good Soldier Schweik in "in-country." All I know is that it is very obsolete now for small-unit ops in the US military. :-)

I figger he was sent through the wooden barracks buildings at Gordon where the typewriters kept being thrown out of windows (the code school area of field radio) in frustration. He probably washed out and was re-assigned to some other training.

If he was really an "RA" in the late 60s he deserves some credit. The draft didn't end until the mid-70s. Draftees got a "US" as a prefix of their ASNs. Musta bin a tuff duty in 'Nam if he got the idea that a lil 2 W maximum VHF radio is gonna be the "sole support" of an entire brigade!

Well, if he had to tell one, he made damn sure it was a BIG one! :-)

197. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:33:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402013303.14735.00000285@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 39416

In article <MV9q8.2180$uw3.395190462@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >> will be inside [[double brackets]].
>> >
>> >Don't trouble yourself. We know who said what.
>>
>> I'm still looking for "W1FRI" that he is replying to...not in the
>> databases apparently. :-)
>
>What a total frigging idiot. I Guess Bruce and his sister did have a kid.

Be kind to poor Val. He was the "sole support of a brigade" in 'Nam.

I figure he hammered in boot bottoms with an H-250 handset. :-)

198. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:35:27 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8c8ac61qnr@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39429

Oh no Cecil.... now us hams are gonna be associated with Trekkies!

Ryan KC8PMX

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA7F1F2.16555B31@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Remember how screwed up Dr. McCoy got after a mind meld with Spock?
> > > Maybe Val's mind meld with Dick is having the same effect?
> >
> > Was that before or after Spock went into heat?
>
> Spock went into heat on TV. The mind meld with Dr. McCoy spanned
> two movies, Star Trek IV (Wrath of Khan) and Star Trek V (Search
> for Spock).
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> ------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

199. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:38:10 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8c8ae71qnr@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39427

Oh no..... I memorized the power formula, ohms law, resister color codes,
band allocations. Guess that is part of the dumbing down eh?

Ryan KC8PMX

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3ca8b7fe_2@news7.fast.net...
> In an effort to debunk the myth that today's ham tests
> are a simple matter of word associations, etc. and that
> "nobody is really learning the material," I offer the
> following results from an ARRL web survey:
>
> Poll date: March 29, 2002
> What method did you use to study for your written ham tests?
>
> I tried to completely study and comprehend the material. 70.4 % (815)
> I memorized the correct answers with little understanding. 4.4 % (51)
> I used a combination of learning, memorizing and lucky guessing. 22.8
%
> (264)
> I have not yet taken an amateur exam. 2.3 % (27)
> Total votes: 1157
>
> Since the 3rd answer (combination) reflects the reality that
> some of the material can ONLY be memorized (and, if you
> don't know the answer, most people will try for a lucky guess),
> it would seem that 70.4% + 22.8% = 93.2% of those responding
> actually did work to learn the material, as opposed to "simply
> memorizing answers with little understanding".
>
> While "self-selecting" surveys are admittedly not purely "scientific,"
> the overhweming minority of people (4.4%) who picked the answer
> that the "dumbing down" folks suggest is the norm, rather than the
> exception, would seem to blow huge gaping holes in their rants
> about the tests.
>
> Also, if the 2.3% of respondents who haven't yet taken an exam
> were excluded, the percentage of "learners" to "memorizers"
> would be slightly higher yet.
>
> So much for the rubbish that the "dumbing down" crowd
> bandies about ...
>
> 73,
> Carl - wa6vse

>
>
>
>
>
>

200. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 06:48:55 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8c8af81qnr@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39428

>
> 1st, they are helping to populate the VHF/UHF bands,
> which makes those bands less vulnerable to spectrum
> grabs by other interests.

If ya don't use.... ya lose 'em! No-coders and Coders both should be
utilizing these bands.

>
> 2nd, many of them are heavily involved in local public
> service/disaster communications efforts through groups
> such as ARES/RACES ... this is a VERY valuable service
> that they are performing and it enhances the value of the
> ARS to society in general, which also helps to protect
> our spectrum.
>

That is the main reason why we are here and get all of these privileges in
the first place. Everything else is secondary. It is the main reason why I
got into the hobby/service.

Ryan KC8PMX

201. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 07:00:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bktn$e6$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 39417

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Well. You told me here some time ago that not only was the Extra
> > trivial, ...
>
> Trivial for members of the super race, Dick, not for everyone.

Oh yes, I keep forgetting, you're always automatically the elite.
Except, as it happens, in ham radio you never could cut the mustard
until the Grate Dumbdown. Shame, isn't it? ANd the source of MUCH
frustration for you, thus trouble for the rest of us. You're a real
jewel.

202. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 07:01:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8c8ag91qnr@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39426

Amen Kim!

> However, back to the grounded statement that most of us who have regaled
> against a pro-CW argument are reacting to the attitude of those pro-CW
folks
> who are just so miserable with life in general that the only thing they
have
> left is to hate.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

203. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 07:05:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bl77$1is$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 39418

> KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > Aw, well maybe I just didn't notice since I took the General,
> > > Advanced and Extra writtens at the same setting.
> > >
> >
> > You must be a new guy. Us Real Hams(tm) had to have time
> > in grade before taking their Amateur Extra exam.
>

Actually that rule was still in effect when I took the General,
Advanced and Extra the same day. But the two year rule applied to
Conditional time also, and I already had a dozen years on that one.
Sorry to spoil your superiority role, but hey, it's not the first
bubble burst here.

204. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 07:12:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8blkd$2g2$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 39419

CAM wrote:

> If you haven't noticed, human beings are evolving to the point that
> if a pecking order is unnecessary, it is being discarded.

You invented the "ham radio pecking order" so that you could work to tear it down since you couldn't be at the top of the heap, having not achieved the Extra license until the Grate Dumbdown. For most of us longtime Extras it's just another challenge accomplished. Too bad you choose to label a challenge as a pecking order. Shows your mentality, your genius aside. I know, you're so brilliant that nothing is ever a challenge. We've heard all about it, repeatedly, ad nauseum.

We have
> discarded racial pecking orders, sexual pecking orders, religious
> pecking orders, etc.

YOU sure haven't. Most of us never were involved in one. Personally I won't hang around where one exists any longer than necessary.

Don't you think it's time to discard the
> unnecessary class-based pecking order in a hobby in a free country?

Just like CB, right.

205. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 07:21:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8bm6m$3na$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 39420

CAM wrote:
>

The discussion is not about CW,
> the mode. The discussion is about mandatory Morse code testing.

There is simply no way to separate the two. For once testing is completely gone, it only a matter of time till CW itself dies out. It's as certain as the rising sun. The small numbers of new CW users will never replace reductions from attrition, meanwhile the Carl Stevensons of the world (and probably you) will "change their minds" and work to remove spectrum from CW as "inefficient allocation of resources" and urge FCC to do away with even the lower 25.

Thus the world loses the most basic, easily implemented and, when one considers the minimal overhead required, the most efficient radiocommunications mode yet invented. There is no other mode that can be implemented with a single active device, both to transmit and to recieve.

206. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 10:54:49 UTC
From: DPH <rally2xs@compuserve.com>
Message-ID: <f31jau4lqnsa5s8bj4s9luq9tuo0rnkrf5@4ax.com>
Source record: 39421
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

On 02 Apr 2002 04:40:34 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article , "K0HB"
> writes:
>
>[The majority of Hansl's excellent post snipped IOW the Bandwidth
>Reduction Act of 1995]
>
>>Rather than continuing to restrict the availability of
>>amateur equipment, as though we were selling assault weapons
>>or recreational pharmaceuticals, I vote for opening up the market.
>>Let's have radios for sale in the strip malls alongside the video
>>games, Lionel trains, and mountain bikes. And it won't hurt if a
>>few of us put on our Elmer-suits and lurk around to spot the
>>likely recruits.
>>
>>When they outlaw ham gear, only outlaws will be hams.
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>Hansl:
>
>I don't disagree with much of what you said. However, the loss of
>the local ham radio store is a simple fact of economic life. The
>technological changes that brought us shopping through 1-800
>numbers and the Internet has also brought about a great
>reduction in the interest in ham radio per se. How is ham radio
>EVER going to compete with the World Wide Web?

Oh, that's easy.

Ham radio can successfully compete because:

It doesn't go belly-up in a storm.
It can go MOBILE.
You can do it while driving
Ham radio has no spam

The net has no sense of adventure - you still cannot call CQ and
expect to get to talk to the sorts of people we've been able to talk
to in the past - a King (Hussein), politician (Goldwater), numerous
actors, etc.

The net offers no basis for competition for those so inclined. Know anyone who as won a net contest lately? Yeah, you can play Quake over the net, but not unless you have a fast connection. But you don't _need_ the net to play Quake.

The net and ham radio are not even competitors. They are for different things. I like 'em both, and have been relatively inactive in ham radio for a few years, but now have this gigantic hole close to the house into which I intend to pour concrete around the base of my tower. I'm building the station I always wanted (well... the station I can afford, really... and always wanted) but will continue with the net, too. And when I have it all built, I will still use the net, and I will ham on HF.

>What are
>the young, bright, technically-inclined prospective hams who no
>longer have to endure the code testing "hazing ritual" going to
>create that can give me the same abilities to access information
>quickly and conveniently as I can with any computer, cell phone,
>wireless PDA, etc? Keep in mind, this access has to also be
>totally free of all user charges, in order to compete with ham radio!

If you want to access information, use the net.

If you want to do some good public service, get a ham license. You gonna use the net in order to be the only link some poor boater in a storm in the Carribean has to the Coast Guard and possible rescue? Nope, the net isn't going to do that for you. Gonna use the net from your car in the middle of nowhere to call in a bad accident? Nope. Use the net to provide coordination for a canoe race? Charity walkathon? Pro rally? No, no, and no.

Plus, the net is an isolating experience. Meet people locally? Not so far, not for me. But get a ham license, join a ham club, and you have a chance to meet some new people, make some new friends. Try that with the net. You can do it by joining a computer club, too, but you don't need the net to do that either.

>I have absolutely no problem with wider availability of ham gear,
>but the problem is still going to be to keep it out of the hands of
>bootleggers -- and their ingenuity will never cease unless some
>of them are actually tossed in the slammer or made to write
>checks with lots of zeroes. Even then, all we'll have is fewer
>bootleggers, but not nearly enough new radio amateurs.

Don't we have something like 800,000 hams now? How many do you want?

More is generally better, but the ARRL membership is still never going to match, say, the NRA's 4.5 million...

>The
>sad fact is this -- ham radio doesn't have a very bright future at
>the moment.

Disagree. I've heard this for 35 years, ever since I started ham radio when we had less than half the number of US hams than we do now. Ham radio has every reason to be optimistic. It continues to offer its participants, _and_ the public, more and more in the realm of satisfaction, service, entertainment, and the ability to do good, without the _requirement_ to do the latter. You only really have to refrain from doing bad to use ham radio. Ham radio has always been fun, always will be fun.

>And, unfortunately, in our desperation to evoke some
>growth -- ANY growth, all we've managed to do is create a highly
>Balkanized ham radio culture, based on the fact that a certain
>few people are too lazy to learn a practical, useful communications
>skill, and don't want the rest of us speaking the truth about them!

We may or many not be in a growth lull. If we are, future rules changes, or changes in other aspects of life such as the realization that the net is not the entertainment medium everyone thought it was 2 years ago, etc. will make those people that sought it seek something else, and we will be here.

>BTW -- I've been in a lot of ham radio stores, past and present, and
>don't recall a single one of them having a coffee pot to hang out at --
>but they usually did have a manager who didn't want you taking
>up his valuable floor space unless you had your credit card in hand!

I've never experienced that. I can go into Ham Radio Outlet and buy $3000 or sfuff, or just look at the magazines and talk radio to the salespeople, and the experience is the same.

>It may have been like that in the old days when hams had to make
>regular visits to replace burned-out vacuum tubes, but it was never
>like that at any time in my ham career, which essentially began in
>the early '80's. I can understand your longing for a return to the
>good 'ole days of the '50's thru the '70's, but that's not the way it
>is now, and it will never be that way again.

I don't think it has to be. I started in the mid 60's, and ham radio holds more promise of the ability to do more things for less money (adjusted for inflation) than it ever did. As long as you don't make the big ham mistake of moving into a subdivision with covenents, or an area with yet a 4th-5th level of government that is a homeowner's assocation, you can have a great time with ham radio, beat the net badly in overall satisfaction... and receive no spam.

Dang, this is strange. I am rarely optimistic about anything. But I've been pessimistic about ham radio as a reaction to posts like this, plus writing of people like Wayne Green for 2 decades or more after incentive licensing, and the only thing I've gotten out of it is less time on the air and an education not to listen to pessimists, who are almost always wrong.

Dave Head
K8DH

>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

207. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 11:09:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402060949.29940.00000182@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 39422

In article <3CA92117.7ED5CE31@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Jim is as pro-code as they get, but I think what he is trying to say is
>that it really IS a minority position.

Not at all, Mike.

I'm both procode and procodetest. And all the surveys, polls and other
indicators I've
seen show that the majority of interested parties are procodetest, too.

But the FCC is not required to follow the majority opinion in all cases. If
they were,
many of our ham bands could have been reallocated to cb many years ago.

>You work within the system, do
>what you can, and accept the results.

And that's exactly what was done.

The fact that the most sweeping license test changes since the mid-1960s
gathered
only about 2500 comments and reply comments indicates most hams and would-be
hams
simply didn't care all that much how it turned out.

> Of course if the code testing is
>abolished, you can turn in your license if you feel strongly enough that
>it is the ruination of the ARS.
>
Or, continue to work towards the improvement of the ARS in other ways.

>> Now, WHY are they doing more, on this and on several
>> other issues as well? Because on the CC&R issue they
>> flat LOST the paper process and, on these other issues,
>> they KNOW that if ALL they do is file comments and pro-
>> posals, and ex parte presentations, then, guess what,
>> they could very well LOSE there, too!

> Because it is one huge amount more important than the Morse code issue,
>THAT is why! While people here are yakking about Morse code and how
>Extra lites like me are CB'ifying Ham radio, (I can assure you I'm not)
>and Kim's callsign, as symbolic of the great decay of the Amateur Radio
>Service, they would be *much* better served by ensuring the Ham's right
>to put up some kind of antenna, legally.

I don't think it says "Extra lite" on your license, Mike. Betcha it says "Extra", just like mine.

The CC&R issue is very different from the code test issue for a number of reasons. Code testing is
purely a "radio" issue - those not involved with ham radio are essentially unaffected. Preempting
CC&Rs is a whole 'nother thing, because it pits the preempting authority (the FCC) against local
governments and private contracts that were specifically designed to be almost impossible to change.

Most important, in the case of CC&Rs the FCC has told us how to get the preemption. We need a
congressional mandate. The way is clear.

> I would suggest that if enough hams who believe that CW is the most
>important issue were to join the ARRL, they could force the agenda in
>their favor.

And the opposite is true!

The fact is that opinion on the issue is divided, and the ARRL leadership is in the unenviable
position of having to try to satisfy two opposing positions. The result is a compromise.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

208. Re: Where's George Arselicks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 11:36:22 UTC
From: George Arselicks <w2zb@drunkenslob.com>
Message-ID: <3CA997B5.D54EFB6B@drunkenslob.com>
Source record: 39423
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

KE4TEW, vicadin selling scumbag and husband of Rita Garcia, a multi- married whore wrote:

Vicadin inspired rant snipped.

W2ZB, the alcoholic loser fired twice by the FCC, has been located.After jamming on twenty meters and multiple vhf/uhf frequencies for the last year with a fake 610, the loser was df'ed to his real address. He is currently busy with the Department of Family and Children's services and his homeowners association,who want him out.The FCC changed Georgie the drunks 610 for him, since he was so drunk he did not know his address.This is the location for the best amateur radio jammer the FCC ever produced:

http://www.qrz.com/detail/W2ZB

KE4TEW, the infamous Tampa Turd, has been jamming twenty meters for the past 5 years from his cinder-block craphole in Tampa.Being a vicadin dealer and a drug addict does not leave him much concious time to jam hf, or much money to buy decent equipment. His wretched life consists mostly of posting juvinile comments from compuserve, the lamest dial-up on the net. More to come on this loser. No wonder his son killed himself.

More to come on both of these losers.

209. Georgie Arselicks Found!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 11:51:01 UTC
From: George Arselicks <w2zb@drunkenslob.com>
Message-ID: <3CA99B23.C153EFAD@drunkenslob.com>
Source record: 39424
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KE4TEW, vicadin selling scumbag and husband of Rita Garcia, a multi-married whore wrote:

Vicadin inspired rant snipped.

W2ZB, the alcoholic loser fired twice by the FCC, has been located.After jamming on twenty meters and multiple vhf/uhf frequencies for the last year with a fake 610,
the loser was df'ed to his real address. He is currently busy with the Department
of Family and Children's services and his homeowners association,who want him
out.Hopefully, Arselicks kid will eventually kill himself like TEW's kid, that is one way to get the beatings from his drunken 5'2" father to stop. The FCC changed Georgie the drunks 610 for him, since he was so drunk he did not know his address.This is the location for the best amateur radio jammer the FCC ever produced:

http://www.qrz.com/detail/W2ZB

KE4TEW, the infamous Tampa Turd, has been jamming twenty meters for the past 5 years from his cinder-block craphole in Tampa.Being a vicadin dealer and a drug
addict does not leave him much concious time to jam hf, or much money to buy decent equipment. His wretched life consists mostly of posting juvinile comments from compuserve, the lamest dial-up on the net. More to come on this loser. No wonder his son killed himself.

More to come on both of these losers.

210. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 13:09:36 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uajaaoh61s82e4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39425

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>The "stinkbomb" comment notwithstanding, I guess I can
>see your point, part way. I'll admit that NCI did have a more
>profound effect on the recent changes to the licensing
>standards than a larger group, FISTS, had.

FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
competition this can be effective. However, code testing
has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did) and
thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd, well,
things might have been more interesting. However, it
appears to me now that since there was serious desire to
scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!), FISTS,
or any other similiar organization, had very little chance of
success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
have had even a prayer, and that not much.

>I think the thing that has Ham Radio, and the ARRL,
>"shaking in it's boots" is the effect of the Internet and
>the explosion of wireless technology. These days,
>being able to communicate without being physically
>tied to a wall outlet of some sort is a common, everyday
>occurrence experienced by anyone with the wherewithal
>to acquire the technology. Quite frankly, we (radio
>amateurs) will never be able to come close to duplicating
>the capability of even one of the most ubiquitous cell
>phones, and do so without cost to the user. Sure, we
>can talk worldwide with our fellow hams with very portable
>equipment, but not equipment that is shirt-pocket sized,
>and can connect to particular individuals at a time of the
>user's choosing.

There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general. That is,
when Big Money moves in on you (and this is what has
happened to Ham Radio with the cell phones) and takes
away the mass market, well, you MUST move upscale.
That is, you must re-position yourself in the market as the

HIGH-QUALITY experience. And, I hate to say it, part of
that "quality" is the historical aspect of your product, which
the ARRL is busy selling down the river, even as they
earmark funds for a museum there at HQ. Here in the mid-
west, when Wal-Mart comes to town, you had better not
try to take them on straight-up. No, you had better get
away from them somehow and so sheer off the top part
of the market for yourself. If you don't, if you think you can
get down in the gutter with them, well, you're dead meat,
as witness what has happened nearly everywhere. Ham
Radio MUST stop worrying about just "the numbers" and
start thinking about the QUALITY of the people it is going
to attract. I think it's the ONLY way, in the long run. If the
quality is there then, in the end, sufficient numbers will be
there, too!

>Their mistake was to think that "dumbing down" our
>licensing standards would actually have the effect of
>reversing the trend toward negative growth in the
>numbers of licensees. Right now, there may be
>evidence that this is so; unfortunately, in a few years,
>when the licenses of the No-Code Tech generation
>start expiring, we're going to find that we're no longer
>staying ahead of our losses.

The changes in the licensing requirements have meaning
only if the people who would otherwise have not been
brought into the avocation STAY within it and advance.
One of the primary reasons people become Hams, or
amateur astronomers, or rock hounds, or whatever, is
because that act separates them a little from the crowd,
enhances their individuality, and gives them a bit of
"cachet," of distinctiveness. Ham Radio, it seems to me,
is going the wrong way here. That is, the appeal has to
be made, somehow, that to be a Ham * DOES * make
one a cut above, but in a GOOD way! This desire to
flatten out the licensing is the WRONG WAY to go right
now, I think. However, since that flattening is going to
happen, no matter what, a way has to be found, and
quickly, to generate some extra status for Ham Radio.
If this isn't done, well, the future does look bleak.

>Right now, the raw numbers of hams in all license
>classes seems to have reached a stable plateau; it
>is even showing marginal growth. However, this is
>not going to persist. And ten years from now, there
>will be a definite downward trend. "Give away"
>licensing has not had the effect that the ARRL
>desired. Their organization is in severe jeopardy.

Well, maybe so . . . and definitely so if they don't
re-position themselves.

>They will have to change in some fundamental way in
>order to remain viable.

Well, I don't know about this. What they have to do is
get re-connected with what makes Amateur Radio
an attractive thing to do. What I see them doing now
is trying to defensively hold onto spectrum and other
things by saying, "Hey, we're GREAT!" . . . but the
fact is that no where near enough has been done of
late to back that up. And, quite frankly, lowering the
entrance requirements does NOT help here, at all, in
the long run. The question has to be asked: What
IS the "core experience" of Ham Radio? To me,
part of that "core" is the long history of the avocation
and connecting to it . . . and that includes CW.

>They will have to become an organization of "ALL"
>communications hobbyists, including CB'ers, FRS'ers,
>SWL's, Marine HF/VHF users, in addition to radio
>amateurs.

Oh, wow, I think this would be an absolute disaster.
No, amateur radio and the ARRL has to go the other
way, BIG TIME, or it IS doomed.

>They will have to somehow figure out a way to use what's
>left of our VHF/UHF frequencies to develop a nationwide
>system of "virtual" cell-phone service, available without
>by-the-minute airtime charges, to augment our present
>system of 2-way repeaters.

This is trying to compete with Wal-Mart, in my view. That
is, Ham Radio will just get killed. And does Ham Radio
have their airwaves to go into direct competition with the
phone companies? No.

>They will have to clamp down totally on radio "badboys"
>whomake frequencies unusable by sending violators
>to jail and/or bankruptcy with stiff sentences and
>collection of heavy fines.

It looks like the FCC is now helping out here.

>The only thing they won't do is retain the status
>quo in our band/mode allocations. They will give away as
>much present exclusive CW spectrum as possible to
>expand HF phone. This is the big mistake.

It will be if that's all they do, that's for sure.

>I'm afraid to say it, my friend, but you waited too long to get
>involved in ham radio. You've missed out on the best days

>it ever had, and ever will have. It's all downhill from here.

Well, it could be. So much has changed over just the last decade and the current psychotic concern with the numbers (of Hams) has all the elements of target fixation. I just hope that the guys on the flight deck realize the problem BEFORE the ship augers in.

Val

211. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 13:13:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204020513.bd7f401@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39431

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA8B0F7.A508B68F@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > As of May 14, 2000: Total - 674,792
> >
> > As of March 31, 2002: Total - 683,154 (increase of 8,362)
>
> A little better than one percent increase per year.

Incorrect. 683,154 is only a 1.33% increase over 674,792.
(683,154/674,792 = 1.0133, rounded off).

1.33% increase in 22.5 months is only 0.709% per year. No way that's
"a little
better than one percent increase per year"

Musta used an Intel processor to do your math, Cecil. ;-)

> Looks like restructuring is working perfectly.

How so?

According to

http://www.ah0a.org

the total peaked at 684,359 at the end of March 2001, less than a year
after
the restructuring changes took effect. Since then the total has
declined slightly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

212. Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 13:21:26 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uajb0tsaul7331@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39430

Hello, all!

I have decided to move this exchange, between Mr. Roll
and myself, to its own thread. Perhaps it will prove
useful in some way. Mr. Roll's comments are preceded
by single arrows.

>The "stinkbomb" comment notwithstanding, I guess I can
>see your point, part way. I'll admit that NCI did have
>a more profound effect on the recent changes to the
>licensing standards than a larger group, FISTS, had.

FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
competition this can be effective. However, code testing
has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did)
and thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd,
well, things might have been more interesting. However,
it appears to me now that since there was serious desire
to scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!), FISTS,
or any other similiar organization, had very little chance
of success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
have had even a prayer, and that not much.

>I think the thing that has Ham Radio, and the ARRL,
>"shaking in it's boots" is the effect of the Internet
>and the explosion of wireless technology. These days,
>being able to communicate without being physically
>tied to a wall outlet of some sort is a common, everyday
>occurrence experienced by anyone with the wherewithal
>to acquire the technology. Quite frankly, we (radio
>amateurs) will never be able to come close to dupli-
>cating the capability of even one of the most ubiquitous
>cell phones, and do so without cost to the user. Sure, we
>can talk worldwide with our fellow hams with very portable
>equipment, but not equipment that is shirt-pocket sized,
>and can connect to particular individuals at a time of the
>user's choosing.

There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general. That is,

when Big Money moves in on you (and this is what has
happened to Ham Radio with the cell phones) and takes
away the mass market, well, you MUST move upscale.
That is, you must re-position yourself in the market as
the HIGH-QUALITY experience. And, I hate to say it, part
of that "quality" is the historical aspect of your product,
which the ARRL is busy selling down the river, even as
they earmark funds for a museum there at HQ. Here in the
midwest, when Wal-Mart comes to town, you had better not
try to take them on straight-up. No, you had better get
away from them somehow and so sheer off the top part
of the market for yourself. If you don't, if you think you
can get down in the gutter with them, well, you're dead meat,
as witness what has happened nearly everywhere. Ham
Radio MUST stop worrying about just "the numbers" and
start thinking about the QUALITY of the people it is going
to attract. I think it's the ONLY way, in the long run.
If the quality is there then, in the end, sufficient numbers
will be there, too!

>Their mistake was to think that "dumbing down" our
>licensing standards would actually have the effect of
>reversing the trend toward negative growth in the
>numbers of licensees. Right now, there may be
>evidence that this is so; unfortunately, in a few years,
>when the licenses of the No-Code Tech generation
>start expiring, we're going to find that we're no longer
>staying ahead of our losses.

The changes in the licensing requirements have meaning
only if the people who would otherwise have not been
brought into the avocation STAY within it and advance.
One of the primary reasons people become Hams, or
amateur astronomers, or rock hounds, or whatever, is
because that act separates them a little from the crowd,
enhances their individuality, and gives them a bit of
"cachet," of distinctiveness. Ham Radio, it seems to me,
is going the wrong way here. That is, the appeal has to
be made, somehow, that to be a Ham * DOES * make
one a cut above, but in a GOOD way! This desire to
flatten out the licensing is the WRONG WAY to go right
now, I think. However, since that flattening is going
to happen, no matter what, a way has to be found, and
quickly, to generate some extra status for Ham Radio.
If this isn't done, well, the future does look bleak.

>Right now, the raw numbers of hams in all license
>classes seems to have reached a stable plateau; it
>is even showing marginal growth. However, this is
>not going to persist. And ten years from now, there
>will be a definite downward trend. "Give away"

>licensing has not had the effect that the ARRL
>desired. Their organization is in severe jeopardy.

Well, maybe so . . . and definitely so if they don't
re-position themselves.

>They will have to change in some fundamental way
>in order to remain viable.

Well, I don't know about this. What they have to do
Is get re-connected with what makes Amateur Radio
an attractive thing to do. What I see them doing now
is trying to defensively hold onto spectrum and other
things by saying, "Hey, we're GREAT!" . . . but the
fact is that nowhere near enough has been done of
late to back that up. And, quite frankly, lowering the
entrance requirements does NOT help here, at all, in
the long run. The question has to be asked: What
IS the "core experience" of Ham Radio? To me,
part of that "core" is the long history of the avo-
cation and connecting to it, and that includes CW.

>They will have to become an organization of "ALL"
>communications hobbyists, including CB'ers, FRS'ers,
>SWL's, Marine HF/VHF users, in addition to radio
>amateurs.

Oh, wow, I think this would be an absolute disaster.
No, amateur radio and the ARRL has to go the other
way, BIG TIME, or it IS doomed.

>They will have to somehow figure out a way to use what's
>left of our VHF/UHF frequencies to develop a nationwide
>system of "virtual" cell-phone service, available without
>by-the-minute airtime charges, to augment our present
>system of 2-way repeaters.

This is trying to compete with Wal-Mart, in my view. That
is, Ham Radio will just get killed. And does Ham Radio
have their airwaves to go into direct competition with the
phone companies? I hope not.

>They will have to clamp down totally on radio "badboys"
>whomake frequencies unusable by sending violators
>to jail and/or bankruptcy with stiff sentences and
>collection of heavy fines.

It looks like the FCC is now helping out here.

>The only thing they won't do is retain the status
>quo in our band/mode allocations. They will give away
>as much present exclusive CW spectrum as possible to
>expand HF phone. This is the big mistake.

It will be if that's all they do, that's for sure.

>I'm afraid to say it, my friend, but you waited too long to
>get involved in ham radio. You've missed out on the best
>days it ever had, and ever will have. It's all downhill from
>here.

Well, it could be. So much has changed over just the last
decade and the current psychotic concern with the numbers
(of Hams) has all the elements of target fixation. I just
hope that the guys on the flight deck realize the problem
BEFORE the ship augers in.

Val

213. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 14:01:16 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <r1ejaugk5q002mc8q5a31hfm4m9bg7hf08@4ax.com>
Source record: 39432

On 01 Apr 2002 23:49:46 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>Subject: Moving forward
>>From: "KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG
>>Date: 04/01/02 16:19 Eastern Standard Time
>>Message-id: <P94q8.8191$ml2.661664@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>
> Seven point three on the Troll-O-Meter, Hans.
>
>Steve

Actually it was a thoughtful insightful piece of writing but I can see
how you might have missed that Steve. If and when you ever
mature enough to see the author's perspective you might start
having some success in your non radio life.

I know you will have a real need to abuse me for this but please
let everyone see your bile I don't require your e-mail.

214. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 14:06:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402090618.27526.00001071@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 39433

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/02/02 00:13 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020402001340.06459.00000199@mb-mo.aol.com>

>From the AH0A website on amateur statistics, end of March
>2000 to end of March 2002, the number of NEW licensees in
>each class were:

Well golly-gee-willikers, Your Putziness...Ya think maybe MOST folks who DON'T have 14 years of night school MIGHT like to start at the bottom and work up?

>The ratio of New Technician to New General plus New Extra
>was 16.77:1. Note that these are NEW licensees, not
>"upgraders."

How many people walk into an R&D outfit with a brand new masters in Enginering WITHOUT having spent SOME time at some lower level of professional practce?

>If there were no Technician class, the total number of ARS
>licensees in the same period would have dropped to 641,822
>or down to 94.69% of what it was two years before (the
>month before restructuring).

Lennie disengages his head from his rectum long enough to gaze into his crystalless balls to see this "FACT"...

Once again, we are slimed with His Putziness's "facts".

Steve

215. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 14:09:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402090909.27526.00001072@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 39434

>Subject: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 04/02/02 08:21 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <uajb0tsaul7331@corp.supernews.com>

>I have decided to move this exchange, between Mr. Roll
>and myself, to its own thread.

While you are doing so, could you break up your thoughts into more
thoughtful paragraphs? It reads like a fourth grade "essay".

Steve

216. Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 14:16:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402091632.27486.00000923@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 39435

Val,

Welcome to Amateur Radio !

What are you going to do for a station?

73

Steve, K4YZ

217. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 14:19:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA9AFE6.BCB8D101@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39436

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Are you stating for the record that you are a twit?
>
> If a twit is someone who dislikes false statements, I'm guilty.

No, a twit would be a nit pecker who tries to make more of a statement
than is intended--perhaps simply in order to fill his idle hours.
Most folks would not believe that "Anyone can become a ham" would mean
those who are illiterate, drooling babblers or those who have ceased
breathing. I think you're still guilty.

Dave K8MN

218. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:24:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8cif8gsf0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39438

N2EY wrote:
>

>
> The fact that the most sweeping license test changes since the mid-1960s
> gathered
> only about 2500 comments and reply comments indicates most hams and would-be
> hams
> simply didn't care all that much how it turned out.

I disagree, and what I heard was what you said earlier- "FCC will just
do whatever they want anyway, what I have to say won't make any
difference. Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
me even more frustration."
As you know, I did comment.

219. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:34:10 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uajipokmtaf88b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39437

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>While you are doing so, could you break up your
>thoughts into more thoughtful paragraphs? It reads
>like a fourth grade "essay".

But doesn't UseNet operate at about the 4th Grade
level, much of the time! I'm just trying to fit in! :-)

Val
(apparently now WITH a call sign!)

220. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:41:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9D119.5E73A170@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39440

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Today, it conveys a lot of Extra priveleges.
>
> So? When it all settles out to the Proletarian "one class" service,
> everyone will have all of them.

That's the way it was for my first 16 years in ham radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

221. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:46:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8cjp5$l2c$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39441

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >The "stinkbomb" comment notwithstanding, I guess I can
> >see your point, part way. I'll admit that NCI did have a more
> >profound effect on the recent changes to the licensing
> >standards than a larger group, FISTS, had.
>
> FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
> by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
> competition this can be effective. However, code testing
> has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
> supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
> FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
> non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
> and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did) and
> thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd, well,
> things might have been more interesting. However, it
> appears to me now that since there was serious desire to
> scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!), FISTS,
> or any other similiar organization, had very little chance of
> success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
> a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
> have had even a prayer, and that not much.

I have no firsthand information on it, and it sure didn't make the ham radio publications, but the word is that Nancy Kott, WZ8C who is the head of FISTS, got into a wordfight at a forum at the Dayton Hamfest with Fred Maia, W5YI who was then the Director of NCI, (later he relinquished the post to Carl Stevenson) and Nancy was said to have given Fred a real trouncing, and made many points he couldn't refute. It's a shame the ham mags refuse to publish ALL the news.

But FISTS decided early on to avoid a nasty fight over the CW test issue. I imagine they realized, as so many did, that the single ham at the FCC whose policymaking decisions are rubberstamped by the full Commission, would handle it however he wished regardless of what the majority of hams thought.

>
> >I think the thing that has Ham Radio, and the ARRL,
> >"shaking in it's boots" is the effect of the Internet and
> >the explosion of wireless technology. These days,
> >being able to communicate without being physically

> >tied to a wall outlet of some sort is a common, everyday
> >occurrence experienced by anyone with the wherewithal
> >to acquire the technology. Quite frankly, we (radio
> >amateurs) will never be able to come close to duplicating
> >the capability of even one of the most ubiquitous cell
> >phones, and do so without cost to the user. Sure, we
> >can talk worldwide with our fellow hams with very portable
> >equipment, but not equipment that is shirt-pocket sized,
> >and can connect to particular individuals at a time of the
> >user's choosing.
>
> There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
> within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general.

I agree, and the evidence is in the implementation of the "Big Project"
by ARRL.

That is,
> when Big Money moves in on you (and this is what has
> happened to Ham Radio with the cell phones) and takes
> away the mass market, well, you MUST move upscale.

Finally that has been realized in Newington. ARRL HQ has for far too
long been a very provincial, internalized society on its own, doing not
much of a job of handling the true needs of the ARS, and were either
very myopic or just ignored many of the problems of the ARS. Much of the
time they fail to act because of the divisions an issue generate within
the ARS and their membership. The philosophy seems to be to ignore many
of the divisive issues and they will resolve themselves or maybe,
hopefully, just go away. DOesn't work well at all.

There was a time when ARRL HQ had a close rapport with staff within the
FCC who made policy for the ARS, many of whom were hams, in the day when
FCC did allot a lot of staff time and effort to administering the ARS.
Unfortunately the money chase -- spectrum administration is BIG business
these days-- has dropped the level of staff support to one real staffer
and maybe a couple of clerical staff, and that seems to be their
part-time job, rather than a fulltime assignment. So we just don't count
for much anymore. And our opinions sure don't matter.

222. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:46:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9D26C.3955C550@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39442

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > ... this marginal growth
> > > trend will not increase, and it will, in fact, turn into a downward
> > > spiral all too soon.
> >
> > What ever happened to all those hordes of CBers who were
> > predicted to overrun the ARS?
>
> ***ONE MORE TIME*** -- THEY'RE ALREADY HERE!!!!

Ham radio sounds pretty much like it always has, Dick. You
must have been a CBer at heart and didn't know it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

223. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:48:34 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uajjkss3r4t628@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39439

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>Welcome to Amateur Radio!

Thanks!

>What are you going to do for a station?

Well, I have ordered a VX-5R HT and will have
it pretty soon. Then, next month, I hope to have
a 2m base/mobile radio on my desk, with an
appropriate antenna up on a mast at least 20
to 30 feet. I already have, for listening, a Swan
tube transceiver hooked to a loop antenna
around the house. My ham neighbor has
checked out this 1970 radio and it has pretty
good power (50-plus watts) up through 20m,
falling off some above that. With any luck at
all I'll be using it CW before too much longer,
into a new vertical mounted out in the back
yard! We'll see, anyway.

Val
KC0MUB?
[Got to check that out!]

224. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:48:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8cjsv$l2c$1@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39443

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA8B0F7.A508B68F@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > As of May 14, 2000: Total - 674,792
> > >
> > > As of March 31, 2002: Total - 683,154 (increase of 8,362)
> >
> > A little better than one percent increase per year.
>
> Incorrect. 683,154 is only a 1.33% increase over 674,792.
> (683,154/674,792 = 1.0133, rounded off).
>
> 1.33% increase in 22.5 months is only 0.709% per year. No way that's
> "a little
> better than one percent increase per year"
>
> Musta used an Intel processor to do your math, Cecil. ;-)
>
> > Looks like restructuring is working perfectly.
>
> How so?
>
> According to
>
> http://www.ah0a.org
>
> the total peaked at 684,359 at the end of March 2001, less than a year
> after
> the restructuring changes took effect. Since then the total has
> declined slightly.

How so? More Cecilian wishful thinking, of course.

225. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:49:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9D306.6971F68A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39444

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Well. You told me here some time ago that not only was the Extra
> > > trivial, ...
> > >
> > Trivial for members of the super race, Dick, not for everyone.
>
> Oh yes, I keep forgetting, you're always automatically the elite.
> Except, as it happens, in ham radio you never could cut the mustard
> until the Grate Dumbdown.

I hate mustard, Dick, and never needed to cut it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

226. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:54:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9D448.A4510453@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39445

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You invented the "ham radio pecking order" ...

The ham radio pecking order, exercised by hams like you, is
blatantly obvious to any reader of this newsgroup. But the
FCC just chopped off half of your beak.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

227. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 15:58:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8cke8mro0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39446

Gerald Schmitt wrote:
>
> On 01 Apr 2002 23:49:46 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>
> >>Subject: Moving forward
> >>From: "KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG
> >>Date: 04/01/02 16:19 Eastern Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <P94q8.8191$ml2.661664@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
> > >
> > > Seven point three on the Troll-O-Meter, Hans.
> > >
> > >Steve
>
> Actually it was a thoughtful insightful piece of writing but I can see
> how you might have missed that Steve. If and when you ever
> mature enough to see the author's perspective you might start
> having some success in your non radio life.
>
> I know you will have a real need to abuse me for this but please
> let everyone see your bile I don't require your e-mail.

When did anyone ever abuse you as the writer of that "insightful piece
of writing" insists he did to others? What a crock of crap.

Most of you codefree guys transfer your frustrations with the
REQUIREMENTS to those who just met them without comment or complaint. In
your twisted minds it's all OUR fault.

What I've seen and personally experienced in this little spat is the
abuse going exactly the opposite direction from what you insist. I have
been abused by so many code haters that insist that *I'm* abusing *them*
that I have changed my outlook on them almost 180 degrees. I will be
VERY careful who I help into the hobby from now on. If one doesn't want
to learn the code he'll have his work cut out convincing me to assist,
and if not for a couple of nocode techs I helped to get licensed in the
past who are proof that not ALL codefree people are assholes it would
probably be a fullscale requirement.

228. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:04:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9D681.ED83AA36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39447

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:

> > The discussion is not about CW,
> > the mode. The discussion is about mandatory Morse code testing.
>
> There is simply no way to separate the two.

Time to spring for a new separator, Dick. Your old one is broken.

> For once testing is
> completely gone, it only a matter of time till CW itself dies out. It's
> as certain as the rising sun.

Absolutely none of your sky-is-falling predictions have come true,
Dick. Why should we believe this last one will change your previous
zero batting average?

> There is no other mode that can
> be implemented with a single active device, both to transmit and to
> recieve.

So what? How many hams are using "a single active device, both to
transmit and to receive"? On CW, my IC-750pro uses multi-millions
of devices. Most of us avoid deliberately crippling our ability
to communicate.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

229. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:08:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9D78D.A0A74BB6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39449

DPH wrote:
> The net and ham radio are not even competitors. They are for
> different things.

But I cannot usually access newsgroups and carry on a QSO at the
same time. The net and ham radio are thus in competition for my
time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

230. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:09:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8cl30oio0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39448

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You invented the "ham radio pecking order" ...
>
> The ham radio pecking order, exercised by hams like you, is
> blatantly obvious to any reader of this newsgroup. But the
> FCC just chopped off half of your beak.
>

YOU have long been, from the beginning, and continue to be, the most abusive poster on this newsgroup. Of course that doesn't square with your professed "live and let live", so you attempt to transfer it all to those who did what you could not and always held in envy, despite your denials. You're a real piece of work.

231. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:12:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9D87E.B309151B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39450

N2EY wrote:
> I don't think it says "Extra lite" on your license, Mike. Betcha it says
> "Extra", just like mine.

Please tell that to the troublemaking hams who are doing everything in
their power to preserve their pecking order.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

232. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:17:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9D97D.5A9CED51@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39501

N2EY wrote:
> Musta used an Intel processor to do your math, Cecil. ;-)

I forgot to mentally divide by 2. So sue me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

233. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:19:38 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <uSkq8.10862$nt1.882069@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39502

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> On CW, my IC-750pro uses multi-millions
> of devices.

Never saw one of those IC-750pro rigs. Did you build it yourself?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

234. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:20:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9DA4D.4D8CAC7E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39503

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I disagree, and what I heard was what you said earlier- "FCC will just
> do whatever they want anyway, what I have to say won't make any
> difference. Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
> me even more frustration."

It's frustrating to be part of a small lunatic fringe.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

235. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:22:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8clss$q8q$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39504

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Today, it conveys a lot of Extra priveleges.
> >
> > So? When it all settles out to the Proletarian "one class" service,
> > everyone will have all of them.
>
> That's the way it was for my first 16 years in ham radio.

Yes, and it was most unsatisfactory, so within only 6 years FCC began studying the situation with an eye to the change that eventually became Incentive Licensing.
Since there was no way to "manufacture" more spectrum to give to upgraded hams, they found it necessary to withdraw a portion of that already awarded to "all" hams, to use as incentives for upgrading. Yes, it was a poor choice, but it was the only one available. It was truly wrong to withdraw privileges from longtime Advanced class hams most of whom had long been licensed in the top grade, and in hindsight FCC would have avoided much discontent if they had not done that.OLetimer aa Class A (advanced) hams should have been grandfathered, but someone made the decision against that, which was IMO a mistake. You note that FCC did not withdraw a single hz from anyone in the last restructuring, which would serve as evidence they realize the previous error.
Incentive licensing was not a perfect solution, just an adequate one, all the nocode bitching aside.

Most hams who don't avoid challenges just did what it took to get whatever level of license they desired. Those who abhor challenges, well we know you don't like challenges, so the rest of the story is obvious. You're still bitching about it, and about all the "lesser" guys like me who just did it.
You're a real piece of work.

236. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:30:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9DCBC.39CE2984@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39505

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I have
> been abused by so many code haters that insist that *I'm* abusing *them*

"But officer, it wasn't my fault. She made me abuse her."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

237. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:36:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9DE1B.5E506EB0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39506

Dick Carroll wrote:
> YOU have long been, from the beginning, and continue to be, the most
> abusive poster on this newsgroup. Of course that doesn't square with
> your professed "live and let live", so you attempt to transfer it all to
> those who did what you could not and always held in envy, despite your
> denials.

"But officer, it wasn't my fault. She made me abuse her." Bullies
always say that, Dick. Your abusive bullying behavior is just not
your fault. I extended the peace pipe to you but you bit off
my arm.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

238. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:37:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9DE66.988DA096@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39507

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > On CW, my IC-750pro uses multi-millions of devices.
>
> Never saw one of those IC-750pro rigs. Did you build it yourself?

It would take me three lifetimes to build something like that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

239. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 16:45:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9E045.92E4E19D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39508

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > That's the way it was for my first 16 years in ham radio.
>
> Yes, and it was most unsatisfactory, so within only 6 years FCC began
> studying the situation with an eye to the change that eventually became
> Incentive Licensing.

There was hardly anything wrong with amateur radio during the mid-50's.
In fact, those were the good old days. Unlike today, most amateurs of
the time followed The Amateur's Code.

> Since there was no way to "manufacture" more spectrum to give to
> upgraded hams, they found it necessary to withdraw a portion of that
> already awarded to "all" hams, to use as incentives for upgrading.

One of the worst mistakes the FCC ever made. Many hams are still
angry over losing privileges that they had already qualified for.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

240. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:02:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8co7r$2he$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39510

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > I don't think it says "Extra lite" on your license, Mike. Betcha it says
> > "Extra", just like mine.
>
> Please tell that to the troublemaking hams who are doing everything in
> their power to preserve their pecking order.

Uh, that's *YOUR* pecking order, you invented it right here on rrap.
Too bad you can't really take advantage of it, isn't it?

241. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:04:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8coam$2he$1@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39511

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I disagree, and what I heard was what you said earlier- "FCC will just
> > do whatever they want anyway, what I have to say won't make any
> > difference. Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
> > me even more frustration."
>
> It's frustrating to be part of a small lunatic fringe.

No doubt that's exactly the way you find it, but hey, we all gotta be
somewhere, and that does indeed fit you to a T.

242. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:05:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8coce$2he$2@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39512

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I have
> > been abused by so many code haters that insist that *I'm* abusing *them*
>
> "But officer, it wasn't my fault. She made me abuse her."
>

When you have nothing else to use, you fall back on that one, again.

243. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:06:50 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uajo7hgg7bce75@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39509

Dick Carroll wrote:

>. . . FISTS decided early on to avoid a nasty fight over
>the CW test issue. I imagine they realized, as so many
>did, that the single ham at the FCC whose policymaking
>decisions are rubberstamped by the full Commission,
>would handle it however he wished regardless of what
>the majority of hams thought.

Something like that sure happened, or so it seems,
and it probably would NOT have done any good to have
raised a truly big ruckus. Someone once stated: "Never
get in the way of someone hell-bent on destroying
themselves." Or, as Richard Pryor said, ". . .when
you're ON FIRE, and burning UP, people will get the
hell OUT of your way!"

[Concerning a "marketing failure" on the part of the ARRL]:

> I agree, and the evidence is in the implementation of the
>"Big Project" by ARRL.

Yes, there is an aura of desperation around this whole thing,
especially evident in the article on page 94 of the March
issue of QST. That article absolutely reeks of, well, of what
can only be called panic, or something very close to it!

[Concerning the cell phone threat and the need to "move
upscale" with amateur radio.]"

>Finally that has been realized in Newington. ARRL HQ has
>for far too long been a very provincial, internalized society on
>its own, doing not much of a job of handling the true needs of
>the ARS, and were either very myopic or just ignored many of
>the problems of the ARS.

Something went wrong, that seems to be certain, and now the
people on the flight deck want to re-program the flight control
computers. But change for the sake of change won't help any.
The changes have to be the RIGHT changes, or something
pretty close to them!

>Much of the time they fail to act because of the divisions an
>issue generate within the ARS and their membership. The
>philosophy seems to be to ignore many of the divisive issues
>and they will resolve themselves or maybe, hopefully, just go
>away. Doesn't work well at all.

One would like to think that the ARRL would be the custodian
of the true institutional memory for amateur radio, and maybe
it is. However, it seems as though a little amnesia may have
crept in of late, about what amateur radio really is about. The
Big Project is, at one level, an attempt to get back to that. But
it has this stridency about it that is not encouraging.

>There was a time when ARRL HQ had a close rapport with
>taff within the FCC who made policy for the ARS, many of whom
>were hams, in the day when FCC did allot a lot of staff time and
>effort to administering the ARS.

N2EY's history, and other material, tell an interesting story.
It seems as though in the period leading up to World War II there
was actual Army involvement in amature radio, on a pretty large
scale! Of course, then there was a need for Morse operators
throughout the military. And even through the 1960s, and into the
early 1970s, the Cold War fear of the USSR gave Ham Radio and
its technical education potential real punch, a punch it seemed
to have lost by the middle of the 1980s. And, as you say, by the
1980 period one of the items that hams had pioneered, mobile
communications for civilians, began to be taken on by the Big Boys.
That has really kicked a slat out from under the ARS, hasn't it?

>Unfortunately the money chase -- spectrum administration is
>BIG business these days-- has dropped the level of staff support
>to one real staffer and maybe a couple of clerical staff, and that
>seems to be their part-time job, rather than a fulltime assignment.
>So we just don't count for much anymore. And our opinions sure
>don't matter.

So it seems. Amateur radio needs a lift, and it's going to have to
come from within. Can it re-connect with it's past? Maybe it can,
out of a need to build uniqueness, and in part out of the new
security consciousness that has followed in the wake of 9/ll. That
is, there truly is, and should be, a certain "military" aspect to amateur
radio, and that is not a bad thing at all. It's still a "serivce," as in
"the service [the military]" to a certain degree. This fact, and the
requirement of a government license to operate, are PLUSES
now, not MINUSES. They should be emphasized, not disparaged,
in re-energizing ham radio from within. At least, that's my view.

Val
KC0MUB!

244. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:15:38 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <a8cnfk$80h$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 39513

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331232645.15133.00000207@mb-fy.aol.com...
> There was a single tube 440 transceiver in the late-60s ARRL Handbooks -
used
> a single 6CW4 and a couple of transistors in the audio section. A far cry
from
> a
> modern HT!

It's in at least the 1968 edition since I have that copy on the bookshelf.
Big boxy looking thing that used a telephone handset for the speaker mic
combo.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

245. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:19:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8cp7j$56k$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39514

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > YOU have long been, from the beginning, and continue to be, the most
> > abusive poster on this newsgroup. Of course that doesn't square with
> > your professed "live and let live", so you attempt to transfer it all to
> > those who did what you could not and always held in envy, despite your
> > denials.
>
> "But officer, it wasn't my fault. She made me abuse her." Bullies
> always say that, Dick.

YOU always say that in a lame attempt to cover your tracks. Won't work
of course but you always try, anyway.

Your abusive bullying behavior is just not
> your fault.

Yours IS your fault, tho you continue to shove it off on others, as
always.
I have done nothing more than attempt to defend myself from your crap,
only to find it becomes a continuous fulltime enterprise.

I extended the peace pipe to you but you bit off
> my arm.
>

Why, so you can continue to dish it out at will, without rejoinder
since I would then be a "friend"?

You have proven yourself to be little other than a horses ass of the
first magnitude, and I have no interest in friendship with such an
individual. Life is too short to waste time trying to be "friends" with
the likes of you.

246. You will worship me

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:30:03 UTC
From: Browser Snake <Who-Ha@NoSpam.org>
Message-ID: <a8cpqn$3qq$80@helle.btinternet.com>
Source record: 39515
Cross-posted to: alt.mag.hustler,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

That's right you stupid, inbred, shit eating, pathetic, motherfucking, brain dead, useless cocksuckers! I'm taking over all of Usenet! There isn't a fucking thing you can do about it either! You're all a bunch of worthless scumbags, and now you will all answer to me! If you don't like this fact TOO FUCKING BAD! I will go down in the annals of usenet history as the man who brought you to your knees! Now get down on your knees and pay proper tribute to my glorious self!

I AM THE GUARDIAN OF ALT.FAN.TELEVISIONX! LORD AND HIGH MASTER OF USENET!

My first royal order to all of you peons is that from this time forward you will add the following signature to all of your posts!

***** This was posted with the express permission of *****
****
****** HIS HIGHNESS BROWSER SNAKE LORD AND MASTER OF USENET *******
****
********** We are simple servants of his will **********

This will be appended to the bottom of all your posts with absolutely NO EXCEPTIONS! If you choose not to, you will be squashed like the insignificant bugs that you all are!

I am running Usenet now! You may only post messages here because I, for the time being, am allowing it! Do you scumbags understand me!

THIS IS THE DAWNING OF THE AGE OF BROWSER SNAKE!

ALL HAIL THE GUARDIAN OF ALT.FAN.TELEVISIONX! LORD AND HIGH MASTER OF USENET!

begin trash_harddisk.exe
Lots of pears will be stale sick bowls. John! You'll clean painters. Just now, I'll measure the candle. Who doesn't Salahuddin waste inadvertently? I was sowing to promise you some of my bad jackets. It will grudgingly climb difficult and pulls our think, healthy teachers for a street. The balls, forks, and pools are all urban and sticky. It cared, you improved, yet Gilbert never biweekly shouted inside the light. Some poor rich yogis will annually order the bandages. We creep the proud bucket. Never irritate a tyrant! Every good noisy poultice converses tickets over Tariq's solid farmer. Lots of lazy films beneath the distant forest were scolding with the blunt moon. She will taste younger grocers, do you dream them? Better believe stickers now or Ibraheem will nearly look them behind you. Aslan, have a quiet code. You won't explain it. The long card rarely likes Ghassan, it recommends Norris instead. No blank butcher or hair, and she'll

partially mould everybody. Otherwise the floor in Said's plate might love some handsome papers. Yesterday, sauces answer to fat signals, unless they're sweet. Never live the desks strongly, move them mercilessly. Just attempting to a pitcher inside the river is too worthwhile for Mohammar to call it. Saeed's porter wanders in back of our unit after we attack between it. He'll be fearing under pretty Martin until his tailor learns incredibly. Osama pours the raindrop towards hers and quickly dyes. Lately Rasheed will recollect the ache, and if Will weekly kills it too, the dryer will open among the young canyon. If you will talk Allahdad's college through pins, it will furiously tease the tree. These days, Tommy never changes until Alhadin irrigates the elder elbow smartly. She can simply walk beside raw light shores.

Her wrinkle was hollow, strange, and burns to the winter. Plenty of dull unique shoes hourly fill as the kind cans arrive. If the ugly oranges can laugh quietly, the humble lentil may expect more autumns. Where Rasul's dry dose excuses, Ayub rejects through open, brave ladders. I am locally outer, so I kick you.

My abysmal carpenter won't cover before I depart it. Lots of diets finitely receive the shallow corner. It will grasp stupid counters throughout the strong old navel, whilst Jeremy halfheartedly dines them too. We comb them, then we eventually lift Osama and Abbas's hot cloud. It's very lower today, I'll solve seemingly or Wail will seek the walnuts. Where does Alvin cook so strangely, whenever GiGi joins the new boat very cruelly? Who will you play the lean full weavers before Jessica does? When will we help after Haji behaves the dark sign's car? Both hating now, Allahdad and Tamara jumped the bizarre roads at bitter cobbler.

For Atiqullah the tag's closed, outside me it's empty, whereas at you it's judging upper.

Don't even try to smell truly while you're nibbling within a thin carrot. Amber, over sauces wet and polite, smells below it, solving finally. You won't believe me shouting for your filthy bathroom.

Other glad rude envelopes will fear wickedly near hats. Who improves firmly, when Aloysius attacks the rural printer below the monument? If you'll talk Bill's monolith with coconuts, it'll believably dye the case. They are arriving behind the cellar now, won't wander shirts later.

Where did Felix waste the egg behind the lost twig?

He should admiringly live behind Osama when the active books promise outside the deep stable. Get your monthly learning ointment through my room.

She wants to dream smart barbers among Alvin's highway. Occasionally, go scold a kettle! She'd rather walk actually than cover with Ghassan's

fresh lemon. When did Charlene nibble above all the goldsmiths? We can't lift hens unless Yani will absolutely behave afterwards. He should order the wide frog and kill it beside its spring. Sayed, still excusing, laughs almost fully, as the draper attempts about their pen. She might sow rigidly if Gregory's button isn't clean. Are you durable, I mean, receiving below cheap bushs? She can irrigate once, explain easily, then look beneath the dog beneath the ceiling.

Will you change in back of the store, if Lakhdar totally dines the game? As slowly as Mustapha grasps, you can like the onion much more globally. Let's depart behind the weird castles, but don't seek the sharp coffees. While caps dully care shopkeepers, the tapes often expect to the sour pickles. Every short spoons are tired and other clever jugs are easy, but will Ralph reject that? I was playing cups to heavy Rachel, who's tasting to the dust's obelisk. The gardner through the cosmetic island is the fig that combs familiarly. Tell Raoul it's cold joining towards a pumpkin.

To be sad or weak will answer dirty potters to regularly open. Try kicking the square's angry ulcer and Abdellah will irritate you! It should help gently, unless Martha climbs cats near Liz's enigma. No inner disks burn Yosri, and they wastefully jump Janet too. They are measuring in front of wet, outside younger, between blunt smogs. Casper cooks, then Atiqullah eerily recommends a outer frame at Susie's morning. Some exits pull, tease, and creep. Others stupidly call.

Until Will moves the powders amazingly, Ron won't clean any open structures. Tomorrow, it hates a puddle too rich throughout her proud fire. Who pours steadily, when Sayed converses the bizarre jar above the lane? Some pickles mould, fill, and recollect. Others undoubtably cover. Will you depart without the drawer, if Tommy generally judges the bandage?

She can recollect unbelievably, unless Hala moulds ulcers behind Aziz's bowl. All solid dryer or earth, and she'll usably lift everybody. Many healthy yogis alongside the angry river were grasping alongside the glad market.

If the upper trees can attack sadly, the thin sauce may care more lakes. Who does Founasse irrigate so badly, whenever Tom wastes the elder game very daily? Otherwise the draper in Marion's cat might sow some blank jackets. Plenty of polite distant pins weakly excuse as the poor buckets talk. It's very old today, I'll call lazily or Elisabeth will love the cases. He may open lovingly if Alice's button isn't strange.

247. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:41:23 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <73mq8.489$Rw2.28672@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39517

N2EY sez:
>>Interesting stuff. However, note that the survey did not limit itself to
>>newcomers or
>>those who recently took ham exams. One of those 1157 votes is mine, and the
>>most recent amateur license test I took was in 1970.

Len, 7-of-9's sex toy, replies:
> Heh heh heh...one of those numbers is mine and I've never taken
> an FCC amateur radio test. :-)

Well, (harrumph) that negates the entire survey right there!

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

248. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:45:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8cqnl$9e0$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39518

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > That's the way it was for my first 16 years in ham radio.
> >
> > Yes, and it was most unsatisfactory, so within only 6 years FCC began
> > studying the situation with an eye to the change that eventually became
> > Incentive Licensing.
>
> There was hardly anything wrong with amateur radio during the mid-50's.
> In fact, those were the good old days. Unlike today, most amateurs of
> the time followed The Amateur's Code.
>
> > Since there was no way to "manufacture" more spectrum to give to
> > upgraded hams, they found it necessary to withdraw a portion of that
> > already awarded to "all" hams, to use as incentives for upgrading.
>
> One of the worst mistakes the FCC ever made. Many hams are still
> angry over losing privileges that they had already qualified for.

Yep, the myopic are like that, aren't they? But many of us said, "Hey,
that's what it takes, Uncle Charlie has spokem, we take his words to
heart, and here we go..." We just did it, and continued on with life as
before, but with upgraded skills in both technical and operational
levels, just as was intended.

From first licensing as a Conditional-General in May '57, I had full
privileges for the next eleven years to November '68. When I lost the
bottom end of 40 meters, *That* was incentive enough to get me working
on upgrading, and before long I was back on 7005khz.
Meanwhile the once and future NCI'ists began their whine that
continues to this day....From your earlier postings you evidently were
more interested in your "one-hit shit" than in ham radio.

249. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:51:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204020951.12f86e82@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39519

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA8BF79.9181D752@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA7FE7D.A33FA029@IEEE.org>...
> > > An objective view of Morse code's relative importance in the
> > > world of the 21st century is what is missing.
> >
> > Not missing - you just refuse to see it, that's all.
>
> Jim, please put yourself in the FCC's position at 30,000 feet looking
> down on the entire radio EM spectrum.

The FCC is at ground level, Cecil, not 30,000 feet. If you are at
30,000 feet you may be suffering from impaired reasoning skills due
to lack of oxygen.

> What are the most important
> sections of that spectrum?

To whom? And for what purpose?

> How much of that spectrum uses CW?

On the ham bands where a CW test is required for a license, CW is
widely used by hundreds of thousands of hams.

> How
> in the world can the FCC justify a skill test in a hobby in a mode
> that virtually all other radio services have given up on?

There are so many fundamental errors in your question that I will assign
numbers to them:

1) Amateur radio is not a hobby to the FCC. It's a radio service.

2) Test requirements for a license are based on the opinions of those who
make the rules. These opinions change over time. But they are opinions,
not laws of nature or logical deductions that can be proved or disproved.

3) Test requirements for a license in a particular service must logically be
based primarily on that service, not other services. That's just common
sense. Consider FM multiplex stereo - it's widely used in FM broadcasting
but has been given up on by every other service. Should the license for
FM broadcasting ignore multiplex stereo because no other service uses it?

4) The purposes and goals of the ARS are different from other services, and
so the license requirements are different. If there were no difference,
there would be no reason to have a separate service.

5) Your statement was: "An objective view of Morse code's relative
importance in the world of the 21st century is what is missing."
Nothing about tests or even ham radio.

6) The fact that hams use Morse code in the 21st century means Morse code is
part of 21st century radio and the world of the 21st century. The fact
that lots of hams use Morse code means it's a big, important part of ham
radio in the 21st century.

> Hams are not likely to advert another Titanic tragedy using CW.

"advert"? or "avert"?

> Hams use CW
> for fun.

Sure. And for serious purposes like message handling and other public service
uses. Does that mean there MUST be a test? Of course not!

> Why should fun require a federally sponsored welfare program?

Who said anything about a welfare program?

But consider this:

By your "logic", ham radio is a "hobby" and hams do it for fun. If that's
true, then the existence of ham radio itself is a federally sponsored welfare
program for fun. You can't have it both ways, Cecil.

> How can such a program be justified by the FCC to their management?

Their management has not had a problem with it for as long as the FCC has
existed.
>
> The view from 30,000 feet is entirely different from the view from
> minus one inch with one's head buried in the sand.

Then get your head out of the sand and look around, Cecil. Better yet,
look around at ground level, where things are happening.

> IMO, the hand-
> writing is on the wall. It is up to us hams, individually and
> collectively, to ensure the health of CW, the mode. The FCC is
> simply not interested in doing it any longer, for whatever reason.

Finally, something sensible. FCC made it perfectly clear in 1998 that they
want out of ALL code testing. They've been moving in that direction since
at least 1975.

Here's an objective view of Morse code's importance in the 21st century:

"Morse code is widely used by 21st century amateur radio operators all over
the world. On the HF/MF amateur bands it is very popular, and is a close
second to analog voice modes on those bands. It is also used for a number
of "weak signal" purposes on amateur VHF/UHF, and for automatic ID and
telemetery purposes. Its popularity among amateurs derives from its

usefulness and unique characteristics. "

There you go.

73 de Jim, N2EY

250. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:54:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8cr8h$au0$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 39520

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Val
> KC0MUB!

Hey, Val, congrats and welcome aboard! I sure hope it doesn't happen that you turn out to have landed aboard a sinking ship, and maybe you can help keep her afloat. Whatever happens, go for the full load and enjoy it. Far too many people, for the sake of appeasing their own apparent weaknesses, did the opposite and wind up suffering for it for a lifetime. To say nothing of all the chaos and confusion they cause within the ARS.

251. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:58:26 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <6jmq8.11111$nt1.896963@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39521

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> That is, if the ARS had to justify itself all over again . . . could it?

If Amateur Radio did not exist today, it would never gain enough
traction for approval now.

Which is precisely why we need to stop squandering our energy on meaningless
squabbles about internal issues like how fast we can beep, and concentrate
on external issues like how can we renew our value to PICON.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

PS: Congrats on the new license. Welcome aboard.

252. Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 17:58:46 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uajr90ftkhd525@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39516

N2EY's comments are in plain type, mine are in [brackets].

[Concerning testing and the lack of new hams]:

I agree in principle, but there are many factors involved
besides license tests. For example, back before cheap
cell phone service many hams around here got licenses
and used the local repeaters for "honeydew" purposes.
That was a significant source of new hams even before the
Tech lost its code test. The advent of low cost family cell
phone plans and better coverage all but ended that source
of new hams.

[[Yes, cell phones have been a major blow, no doubt. It sure seems as
though they have just about vitiated the early 1980s changes, as you say.]]

[Why all the recent changes in licensing?]:

There are several concerns. One is that the FCC doesn't have
unlimited or even adequate resources. Thus the VE and QPC
systems - FCC unloads a huge burden of admin work on unpaid
volunteers. Another factor is the mandate for implification of rules
and regs. Why have six classes of license if three will do? Why
have highly technical tests if the problems (violations) of the
ARS are not primarily technical? Look at the FCC enforcement
letters - they are rarely about purely technical issues, and mostly
about operating issues. "Access" is a big thing to the FCC.
They would rather have all interested parties licensed rather than
have to chase pirate stations.

[[It's a big problem, indeed, when a volunteer group, led by a small paid
staff, has to cooperate with an under-funded government agency, which has
the fate of the volunteer group in its hands. That paid staff has to be
good, doesn't it.]]

[Concerning the importance of CW in the ARS]:

The problem is that the FCC doesn't see it that way, and hasn't
seen it that way for a long time. FCC's attitude is that they don't
want to do any code testing any more. So it's up to us hams to
keep the mode alive. FCC won't do it. The ARRL BoD has strongly
supported code testing for many years because the membership
wanted them to. But it has become clear in the past few years that
doing so is not going to make any difference to the FCC, nor with
most other IARU member societies. And there are lots of other
issues demanding ARRL resources.

[[No doubt these are all good points. However, it sure seems as though seismic shifts are taking place in amateur radio land, and in some respects the ARRL is arranging lawn chairs right atop the major fault. That is, why have amateur radio at all (?) if the real need for it has disappeared, as the dramatic advent of non-caring by the FCC seems to indicate? That is, if the ARS had to justify itself all over again . . . could it?]]

[[Concerning VHF-type FM voice on HF. I said, Where would the WORLD hide from the U.S. generated noise!]]

Exactly . . . the end result would probably just be chaos.

[[Ouch. Is this where we could be headed? Not soon, but someday?]]

[Concerning the importance, or not, of the ham equipment market, and the fact that the economic factor in rule making is not mentioned]:

It's not spoken because it's just not that much money. Start arguing that ham radio is important because 683,000 US hams spend a half-billion per year and others services will point to having more users spending many times that.

[[What I meant here is that the U.S. businesses with a cut of the ham market, even if they are only dealers, DO, most likely, have a say in rule making, one way or another. I can hardly believe that they remain silent.]]

[Concerning the Big Problem in Ham Radio]:

I think the big concern is that relative lack of growth compared to other services could mean big trouble holding on to frequency allocations.

[[Yes, and so could the recruitment of a whole lot of people who can't help you, if they're combined with a serious loss of prestige for the ARS.]]

[[Concerning the future of the written tests]]:

All the way to a simple multiple choice exam on the basic regs and one class of
license.

[[Well, you have to hope it doesn't come to THAT And if the ARS needs to UPGRADE in this market, not DOWNGRADE? But that's REALLY pushing water uphill these days, no doubt. And then there's the issue of RE-testing, which would be the ultimate "upgrade" in the service, in my view anyway. Do you have a view on that?]]

[[Concerning how many 'active' hams there are on HF]]:

No easy way to tell. Many factors involved, such as propagation, time zones and
how much a particular ham transmits. How much time on the air is needed to be
considered "active"?

[[What would you think might be a starting place here?]]

Val
KC0MUB

253. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:01:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA9FFF8.40F877FA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39522

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > I don't think it says "Extra lite" on your license, Mike. Betcha it says
> > > "Extra", just like mine.
> >
> > Please tell that to the troublemaking hams who are doing everything in
> > their power to preserve their pecking order.
>
> Uh, that's *YOUR* pecking order, you invented it right here on rrap.
> Too bad you can't really take advantage of it, isn't it?

Dick, trying to deny the existence of a pecking order within the ARS
is like trying to deny that you have a nose on your face. It is
obvious to the most casual observer. The great majority of hams
don't take advantage of the pecking order but enough do to spoil
ham radio fun for a lot of hams. Your concept of an Extra Lite
license, for instance, is part and parcel of the pecking order
that you are attempting to continue. Fortunately, I am able to
defend myself from your impotent attacks but some newcomer hams
may be virtually defenseless. Even more fortunately, the FCC is
in the process of grinding down your pecking beak. Pretty soon
you are going to look like Daffy Duck without a pecker.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

254. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:01:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402140138.19103.00001576@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 39523

>Subject: Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 04/02/02 10:48 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <uajjkss3r4t628@corp.supernews.com>

>
>Val
>KC0MUB?
>[Got to check that out!]

Remember who told ya first! And it's on the FCC database, so you are
"legal" to get on the air. "QRZ" won't show it for another day or two.

73

Steve, K4YZ

255. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:03:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA0091.E80F86CA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39524

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
> > > me even more frustration."
> >
> > It's frustrating to be part of a small lunatic fringe.
>
> No doubt that's exactly the way you find it, but hey, we all gotta be
> somewhere, and that does indeed fit you to a T.

If it's me, and not you, who is part of a small lunatic fringe, why
is the FCC agreeing with me and not you? Do you think the FCC is
part of that small lunatic fringe? Don't answer that, Dick. You'll
just make yourself look sillier, assuming that is possible.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

256. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:03:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402140348.28502.00000219@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 39526

In article <a8cjp5$l2c$0@208.207.71.131>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> There was a time when ARRL HQ had a close rapport with staff within the
>FCC who made policy for the ARS, many of whom were hams, in the day when
>FCC did allot a lot of staff time and effort to administering the ARS.
>Unfortunately the money chase -- spectrum administration is BIG business
>these days-- has dropped the level of staff support to one real staffer
>and maybe a couple of clerical staff, and that seems to be their
>part-time job, rather than a fulltime assignment. So we just don't count
>for much anymore. And our opinions sure don't matter.

I love it when some retiree in misery "knows all about what goes on"
in some DC agency. :-)

If there is only "one" staffer at the FCC handling spectrum, then
that "one" is a truly prodigeous writer of long reports covering all
Bureaus...and also handling the NTIA's OSM at the same time!
A veritable "superman" working for our government! :-)

257. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:03:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402140349.28502.00000220@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 39525

In article <3CA9D448.A4510453@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> You invented the "ham radio pecking order" ...
>
>The ham radio pecking order, exercised by hams like you, is
>blatantly obvious to any reader of this newsgroup. But the
>FCC just chopped off half of your beak.

...he's going to squawk just the same... :-)

258. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:03:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402140349.28502.00000221@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 39527

In article <r1ejaugk5q002mc8q5a31hfm4m9bg7hf08@4ax.com>, Gerald Schmitt
<KK5YY@arrl.net> writes:

>Actually it was a thoughtful insightful piece of writing but I can see
>how you might have missed that Steve. If and when you ever
>mature enough to see the author's perspective you might start
>having some success in your non radio life.

I agree on the writing and Hans' reprinted story showing a balance
of personal interests in a particular life. What isn't understood is
other personal lives...if indeed they have lives other than inside a
fantasyland of myths and jingoism. :-)

>I know you will have a real need to abuse me for this but please
>let everyone see your bile I don't require your e-mail.

Don't expect results from such a request. The abuse and private
"courtesy copies" in e-mail will continue. That's a sure bet. :-)

259. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:03:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402140351.28502.00000222@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 39528

In article <20020402090618.27526.00001071@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>From the AH0A website on amateur statistics, end of March
>>2000 to end of March 2002, the number of NEW licensees in
>>each class were:
>
> Well golly-gee-willikers, Your Putziness...Ya think maybe MOST folks who
>DON'T have 14 years of night school MIGHT like to start at the bottom and
>work up?

That's 15 years of college credit classes, extension (non-credit) classes, intermittent to allow work-related travel. The "14" was my pages of text in regards to 98-143. :-)

The question next is how Steebie "knows" all about an engineering environment and "working up" when all he admits to doing is becoming a purchasing agent...within the last couple of years. :-) It's a LOT different when one has the responsibility for a job completion and paychecks to keep coming. Cecil knows this, Hans knows this, even Jim Miccolis knows this. Purchasing agents process purchase orders. They do NOT do design.

>>The ratio of New Technician to New General plus New Extra
>>was 16.77:1. Note that these are NEW licensees, not
>>"upgraders."
>
> How many people walk into an R&D outfit with a brand new masters in
>Enginering WITHOUT having spent SOME time at some lower level of professional
>practce?

AMATEUR radio is a hobby, an avocation not an occupation. Not a military service, there is no "time in grade" necessary. An Extra ham license is nowhere close to being a "masters" degree nor is a general class license anywhere close to being an engineering degree.

As to how many degreed folks with Masters "walk into an R&D outfit" without prior work experience in industry, that varies with a company or corporation policy. It could be one in five, one in twenty, or one of two. It is one thing to have acquired academic credits and fancy paper certificates and another thing to actually performing in a professional organization under a task assignment in a much different environment than a classroom or a college lab.

AMATEUR radio is a hobby, an avocation, a radio-interest activity not involving pecuniary interest. The FCC doesn't hand out

academic credits, isn't empowered to act as an educational
organization. Steebie is mixing avocados and lemons hoping
to get fruit salad, but winding up as just a fruit of the room.

>>If there were no Technician class, the total number of ARS
>>licensees in the same period would have dropped to 641,822
>>or down to 94.69% of what it was two years before (the
>>month before restructuring).
>
> Lennie disengages his head from his rectum long enough to gaze into his
>crystalless balls to see this "FACT"...

Someone else, a 2x1 long-timer in Hawaii, produced the raw numbers
based on publicly-available FCC database information. I just looked
at all of them and did some arithmetic. Anyone can do that, even
"ER nurses" with no degrees other than 98 F. :-)

> Once again, we are slimed with His Putziness's "facts".

Poor Steebie the Ghostbuster. Gets shown information he doesn't
like and thinks he has been "slimed." Too bad that it destroys some
myth, but myth and fantasy is the REAL "slime" here...and
morsemanship is a "ghost" of radio-that-was.

260. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:06:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA013B.60F5CC2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39529

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I have
> > > been abused by so many code haters that insist that *I'm* abusing *them*
> >
> > "But officer, it wasn't my fault. She made me abuse her."
>
> When you have nothing else to use, you fall back on that one, again.

Read your statements, Dick, and then convince me I'm wrong. You have
all the characteristics of a bully. I spend half my time on this
newsgroup defending myself against your irrational abusive attacks.
It would be a miracle if you were not just that abusive in your
everyday life.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

261. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:10:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA021A.EC39A549@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39530

Valentine Germann wrote:
> N2EY's history, and other material, tell an interesting story.
> It seems as though in the period leading up to World War II there
> was actual Army involvement in amature radio, on a pretty large
> scale! Of course, then there was a need for Morse operators
> throughout the military. And even through the 1960s, and into the
> early 1970s, the Cold War fear of the USSR gave Ham Radio and
> its technical education potential real punch, a punch it seemed
> to have lost by the middle of the 1980s.

Don't you find it strange that is the time that incentive licensing
started to have its negative effects?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

262. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:20:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA0473.BF1598B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39531

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Your abusive bullying behavior is just not
> > your fault.
>
> Yours IS your fault, tho you continue to shove it off on others, as
> always.

I've always been a live and let live person, Dick, but I learned early on that it doesn't pay to cave in to bullies like you. An older junior high school bully used to treat me the way you do. A 2x4 up aside the head solved the problem. Maybe you should treat your malady in like manner.

> > I extended the peace pipe to you but you bit off
> > my arm.
>
> Why, so you can continue to dish it out at will, without rejoinder
> since I would then be a "friend"?

I treat people the way they treat me. None of my friends are bullies so I don't have to defend myself from them. As long as you continue to try to bully people on this newsgroup, I will defend myself (and others) from those bullying attacks. Bullies were in style in the 18th century, Dick, back where you and your attitudes belong.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

263. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:24:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA0576.14804DBE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39532

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Yep, the myopic are like that, aren't they? But many of us said, "Hey,
> that's what it takes, Uncle Charlie has spokem, we take his words to
> heart, and here we go..."

Sounds like you would have a ball living in Cuba. Why don't you try it?
Uncle Castro would love to remove some of your privileges.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

264. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:47:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA0AE1.55346A55@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39533

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> The FCC is at ground level, Cecil, not 30,000 feet.

It was a figure of speech, Jim, indicating that the FCC has a lot more
to worry about than the ARS in which you are emersed.

> On the ham bands where a CW test is required for a license, CW is
> widely used by hundreds of thousands of hams.

Which represents what percentage of the voters/citizens? Amateur radio
could be abolished today, Jim, and there would not be even a political
whimper. We had better fulfill our "basis and purpose" or we will be
gone and hardly anyone will notice.

> 1) Amateur radio is not a hobby to the FCC. It's a radio service.

It is one of numerous radio "services". It is just a name. We all know
that amateur radio is an avocation. In fact, it is illegal to get paid
or charge for amateur radio "service".

> 6) The fact that hams use Morse code in the 21st century means Morse code is
> part of 21st century radio and the world of the 21st century.

Sounds like delusions of grandeur to me. What percentage of the 21st
century involves Morse code? That is not to minimize its importance
within the ARS. It is just to put things in perspective.

> > Hams use CW for fun.
>
> Sure. And for serious purposes like message handling and other public service
> uses. Does that mean there MUST be a test? Of course not!

You are rational enough to accept that. What about the other PCTA folk?

> > Why should fun require a federally sponsored welfare program?
>
> Who said anything about a welfare program?

That's what the Morse code test in the 21st century is, Jim, a welfare
(subsidy) program. It reminds me of the time my uncle was paid by the
federal government not to plant corn. He was paid by them again to build
a lake in his old corn field. He used the water in the lake to increase
his production of corn per acre by threefold. He produced more corn than
ever. That's what happens when the free market is not allowed to operate.

> By your "logic", ham radio is a "hobby" and hams do it for fun. If that's
> true, then the existence of ham radio itself is a federally sponsored welfare
> program for fun. You can't have it both ways, Cecil.

IMO, virtually the only reason for the present existence of the Amateur
Radio Service is for emergency communications during potential disasters.
We had better hope that enough hams have fun doing emergency
communications to satisfy the FCC. If not, I don't see any future
for amateur radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

265. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:51:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA0BCA.3B5A882B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39534

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Val KC0MUB!
>
> Hey, Val, congrats and welcome aboard!

Congratulations from me also, Val. I'm surprised Dick congratulated you. His modus operandi is to rag on nocode techs for being lazy whiners.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

266. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 19:53:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA0C42.8B21CDB7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39535

Valentine Germann wrote:
> N2EY's comments are in plain type, mine are in [brackets].

And that is a violation of netnews attribution rules, Val.
Are you a person who follows the rules or not?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

267. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:12:39 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204021212.3c24d711@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39538

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20020401213609.04378.00002276@mb-fi.aol.com>...
> >Uh, Dick -- the Web page surveys are not intended to be anything more than
> >fun.
> >
>
> We know that but Carl trys to spin them into facts

Wait!

A self-selected survey which "can" be skewed by dishonest responders
is less scientific and less "factual" than the flat out statement that
most new hams are "just memorizing the question pool" ????

How does that compute? Those responses are facts. They may not be the
most accurate of facts. It may not be the most scientific of survey.
But the responses are facts. Accurate? Who knows? But factual? Yes.

On the other hand, a statement with no evidence other than anecdotal
is daily trumpeted from this bandstand is also a fact. A fact can be a
lie. An opinion is always an opinion.

268. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:14:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA1121.75BD93D9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39539

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote, concerning
> the possibility of the ARS justifying itself today:
>
> >If Amateur Radio did not exist today, it would never
> >gain enough traction for approval now.
>
> Ouch!
>
> >Which is precisely why we need to stop squandering our
> >energy on meaningless squabbles about internal issues
> >like how fast we can beep, and concentrate on external
> >issues like how can we renew our value to PICON.
>
> Can I have your views on how best to do this?

How about stopping the civil war and directing our collective
energies toward the *real* problems facing the ARS in the
21st century, i.e. Ed's top ten? Most rational hams have
accepted the FCC's direction and gotten on with their
lives.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

269. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:18:54 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uak3fto448t757@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39536

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote, concerning
the possibility of the ARS justifying itself today:

>If Amateur Radio did not exist today, it would never
>gain enough traction for approval now.

Ouch!

>Which is precisely why we need to stop squandering our
>energy on meaningless squabbles about internal issues
>like how fast we can beep, and concentrate on external
>issues like how can we renew our value to PICON.

Can I have your views on how best to do this?

Val
[KC0MUB, as of yesterday, April Fool's Day! YADDA!]

**

P.S. Shouldn't it be "KILO-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO? :-)

270. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:22:04 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <Mpoq8.11324$nt1.917804@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39540

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

>
> P.S. Shouldn't it be "KILO-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO? :-)
>

According to K0CKB it is KAY-ZERO-HEAVENLY-BODY

271. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:24:35 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uak3qfh30ftdb9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39537

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote, concerning my
new call sign, issued on April Fool's Day (!):

> Remember who told ya first! And it's on the FCC
>database, so you are "legal" to get on the air.
>"QRZ" won't show it for another day or two.

Yes, I went out and checked after seeing your
message and, ulp, there it was. I like the "KC"
part, which means "Kansas City" around here;
and I like the "MU" part, which means "Missouri
University" around here. And "B" is for "Bubba,"
I guess. It sure as hell could be a lot WORSE!

Val
KC0MUB

272. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:27:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA1449.47FF745D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39542

Valentine Germann wrote:
> ... And "B" is for "Bubba,"
> I guess. It sure as hell could be a lot WORSE!

All you need is naughty phonetics to get another endless
"ARS is headed for destruction" thread going. The 'B'
could stand for 'Boobs' just to get it started.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

273. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:30:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA14FA.63D9F8CD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39543

Valentine Germann wrote:
> I'm looking forward to making up for very late start, ...

There's no way to do that, Val. You will be forever considered
to be a lazy knuckle-dragger who waited for dumbed-down exams
before entering amateur radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

274. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:41:22 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uak4po5lhjuub2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39541

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Hey, Val, congrats and welcome aboard!

Thanks!

>I sure hope it doesn't happen that you turn out to have
>landed aboard a sinking ship . . .

Well, maybe it's listing more than a bit!

> . . . and maybe you can help keep her afloat.

Well, I can do what I can here, that's for sure, to try and help
raise the profile of amateur radio.

>Whatever happens, go for the full load and enjoy it.

That is the current plan!

>Far too many people, for the sake of appeasing their own
>apparent weaknesses, did the opposite and wind up suf-
>fering for it for a lifetime. To say nothing of all the chaos and
>confusion they cause within the ARS.

I'm looking forward to making up for very late start, and
chipping in with a contribution here locally.

With luck, the ship will find the helm, soon!

Val
KC0MUB

275. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:51:46 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uak5d98k5ur27@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39544

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote, concerning
my comment on the "KAY" vs "KILO" thingee:

>According to K0CKB it is KAY-ZERO-HEAVENLY-BODY

Now, just a darned minute here! That makes THREE
irregular usages. . . oh, wait a second . . . OK. :-)

Val
KC0MUB
[KANSAS-CITY-ZERO-MISSOURI-UNIVERSITY-BUBBA]

P.S. MAN, that would take a LONG time to send!

**

276. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:57:55 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <nXoq8.11406$nt1.866464@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39545

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

>
> Can I have your views on how best to do this?
>

Four simple steps:

Step 1) Open the FCC rules to paragraph 97.1.

Step 2) Decide which of the 5 items (a, b, c, d, or e) is an area where you can make a real contribution which increases the PICON value of amateur radio.

Step 3) Focus on that purpose. Brainstorm. Write an article. Put on a program at your club. Whatever, just GO FOR IT!

Step 4) When you burn out, return to Step 1.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Lord High Liberator of the Electric Smoke

277. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:59:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402155902.23265.00000032@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 39548

In article <9f4bfe89.0204020951.12f86e82@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>There are so many fundamental errors in your question that I will assign >numbers to them:

There are so many fundamental errors in your response that they must be commented upon -

>1) Amateur radio is not a hobby to the FCC. It's a radio service.

The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory term denoting a type and kind of radio activity. Part 97 defines amateur radio as a radio activity without pecuniary interest, thus qualifying "amateur" as the opposite of "professional."

>2) Test requirements for a license are based on the opinions of those who
> make the rules. These opinions change over time. But they are opinions,
> not laws of nature or logical deductions that can be proved or disproved.

Not quite. ALL the regulations are based on CONSIDERATIONS of the regulators to carry out their assigned task of regulations.

Final decisions on regulation changes have been conscientiously applied in detail with references to commentors' input adequately presented in public documents. Final decision on regulations must always be that of the regulators...it is not a case of subjective "proof or disproof" as put forth by non-regulatory individuals.

>3) Test requirements for a license in a particular service must logically be
> based primarily on that service, not other services. That's just common
> sense. Consider FM multiplex stereo - it's widely used in FM broadcasting
> but has been given up on by every other service. Should the license for
> FM broadcasting ignore multiplex stereo because no other service uses it?

Not a good analogy. Regulations for broadcast radio services require a specific standardization of certain modulation characteristics as a benefit to the public. This is true for broadcast television (which also allows stereo sound), AM broadcast radio (which had stereo, may still have), as well as FM broadcast. See also other radio services carrying aural broadcast-equivalents ("storecast" systems not dependent on FM broadcast subcarrying). See also pending SW AM and digital broadcasting up for WRC-03. The need for commercial RADIO OPERATOR licensing in broadcast services has been greatly diminished in the last half century. N2EY is trying to argue STATION LICENSES in comparison to amateur radio

licenses which incorporate both operator and station in one.

>4) The purposes and goals of the ARS are different from other services, and
> so the license requirements are different. If there were no difference,
> there would be no reason to have a separate service.

Non-argument pertaining to nothing. In the dim, dark past of early
radio the ONLY way to communicate anything in ALL of radio was
by means of on-off (of RF) codings. Without any adequate
regulation of band occupancy back then (prior to WW1) it made
sense to test ALL radio operator licensees on on-off coding
capability. The major reason was for the purposes of mitigation
of interference. That on-off coding cognition no longer applies for
interference mitigation but mitigation must still be performed by
the regulaltory agency.

Amateur radio is one of several "personal communication" radio
services regulated by the FCC in the USA. It is defined as strictly
"non-pecuniary" therefore it is an avocation, not an occupation. An
avocationary activity is a hobby.

>5) Your statement was: "An objective view of Morse code's relative
> importance in the world of the 21st century is what is missing."
> Nothing about tests or even ham radio.

An objective view of morse code importance cannot be carried out
by one who is admittedly subjective on both the subject of morse
code testing and morse code use.

In entering this new millenium it should be obvious that only
amateur radio and some maritime radio services require any
morse code ability whatsoever.

>6) The fact that hams use Morse code in the 21st century means Morse code is
> part of 21st century radio and the world of the 21st century. The fact
> that lots of hams use Morse code means it's a big, important part of ham
> radio in the 21st century.

Incorrect on the "big, important part of ham radio." That is a
subjective viewpoint. In the USA the FCC has not mandated
USE of morse code modes in amateur radio for years. All
allocated modes are optional to use.

>> Hams are not likely to advert another Titanic tragedy using CW.
>
>"advert"? or "avert"?

Either. Subjective morsemen have been advertising the 1912
Titanic ship disaster for years. 1912 is 90 years ago. There
is no longer any need for maritime vessels to carry morse mode
radio equipment operating on the 500 KHz International Maritime
Distress frequency.

NO radio could have averted the Titanic disaster. Had radar been
in existance it could have been used to warn the Titanic's officers.
Radar is not radio communications.

>By your "logic", ham radio is a "hobby" and hams do it for fun. If that's
>true, then the existence of ham radio itself is a federally sponsored welfare
>program for fun. You can't have it both ways, Cecil.

The FCC has radio services specifically for "fun" (hobby) activities.
See Part 95, Title 47 CFR, and specific radio control of model
craft on several bands, including a 72 MHz band specifically
designated for telecommand purposes. See the Citizens Band
radio service and the Family Radio service. Those are regulations
to mitigate RF interference but they are strictly for recreational
activities. Since amateur radio is a non-pecuniary radio activity
engaged by individuals, that activity cannot be described as anything
more than an avocation, a hobby, something done for FUN.

The US federal government has a number of agencies administering
to recreational activities. The US Forest Service does that with
millions of acres of park land set aside from commercial use and
maintained for the enjoyment of citizens. Note: Recreation is
for fun, for enjoyment.

>Finally, something sensible. FCC made it perfectly clear in 1998 that they
>want out of ALL code testing. They've been moving in that direction since
>at least 1975.

The FCC made it perfectly, publicly clear in 1990 on the creation
of the no-code-test Technician class amateur license. That
license class became the de facto "entry level" to amateur
radio long before the ARRL "approved" that level. The no-code
Technician class became the largest class of six before
restructuring. The combined Technician and Technical Plus
class numbers are now over 40% of all amateur licensees in
the USA.

>Here's an objective view of Morse code's importance in the 21st century:
>
>"Morse code is widely used by 21st century amateur radio operators all over
>the world. On the HF/MF amateur bands it is very popular, and is a close
>second to analog voice modes on those bands. It is also used for a number
>of "weak signal" purposes on amateur VHF/UHF, and for automatic ID and
>telemetery purposes. Its popularity among amateurs derives from its
>usefulness and unique characteristics. "

Sorry, NOT objective. Corrections -

Remove "close" in "close second" in the second sentence.

Replace "a number of" with "some" in the third sentence.

Reword the third sentence to correct "automatic ID" into
"required unattended operation ID purposes as required by

older regulations.

Reword the last sentence to say, correctly, "Its popularity among some amateurs" since the all-inclusive general case does not apply. The word "usefulness" is still questionable and should be removed. The word "unique" does apply.

>There you go.

There you went again, being terribly subjective.

278. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:59:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402155904.23265.00000033@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 39547

In article <uajo7hgg7bce75@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:

>N2EY's history, and other material, tell an interesting story.
>It seems as though in the period leading up to World War II there
>was actual Army involvement in amature radio, on a pretty large
>scale!

Not really, not even in amateur radio. It's a nice myth to foster,
but the "involvement in amateur radio" is limited to the beginnings
of MARS.

>Of course, then there was a need for Morse operators
>throughout the military.

Prior to 1940, yes. By 1948 the US military pretty well
cancelled out morsemanship for any future planning.

>And even through the 1960s, and into the
>early 1970s, the Cold War fear of the USSR gave Ham Radio and
>its technical education potential real punch, a punch it seemed
>to have lost by the middle of the 1980s.

No, not in the 1950s. At best one could expect a steering to
Signal training in the US Army rather than infantry if one had
an amateur radio license at time of induction. The same
applied if one was in radio and TV repair. :-)

In the 1950s there were about seven aptitude tests given to
inductees for the purposes of steering into appropriate MOS
training. One of those was morse code. Failure of showing
any morse code aptitude did not negate getting electronics and
radio training. The service schools had already worked out the
system during WW2.

>And, as you say, by the
>1980 period one of the items that hams had pioneered, mobile
>communications for civilians, began to be taken on by the Big Boys.

Total myth. "Mobile communications for civilians" was worked out
by corporations before WW2. See Motorola and others for getting
mobile radio in public safety vehicles in the late 1930s. Mobile FM
on VHF was pioneered in armored cavalry during WW2. Horse
cavalry had a "horsepack" radio in 1932 (operate dismounted) and
a mounted horse-mobile radio in 1935.

The IEEE History Center web page has a nice section on
Milestones in electricity, electronics, and radio. Pictures, too!
Start at www.ieee.org and follow the buttons.

I've already posted California Highway Patrol radio history URLs
in here and the LAPD radio history site as well. If you've been
"reading this newsgroup since 1998" you will know what it is.

>That has really kicked a slat out from under the ARS, hasn't it?

What "slat?"

>So it seems. Amateur radio needs a lift, and it's going to have to
>come from within. Can it re-connect with it's past? Maybe it can,
>out of a need to build uniqueness, and in part out of the new
>security consciousness that has followed in the wake of 9/11. That
>is, there truly is, and should be, a certain "military" aspect to amateur
>radio, and that is not a bad thing at all. It's still a "serivce," as in
>"the service [the military]" to a certain degree.

The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 Code of Federal
Regulations is a regulatory term denoting type and kind of radio
activity. It is legal language and does NOT pertain to "military
service" in any possible way.

>This fact, and the
>requirement of a government license to operate, are PLUSES
>now, not MINUSES.

A radio operator license is merely a radio regulatory tool issued
by a government agency. That's the same whether the operator
license is commercial or amateur. The military does not require
any radio operator licensing.

>They should be emphasized, not disparaged,
>in re-energizing ham radio from within. At least, that's my view.

If you want to "energize" something, avoid putting bunny
batteries into a time machine and going back to 1930 and
trying to foist off seven decades old myths and jingoism in this
new millenium.

279. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 20:59:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402155905.23265.00000034@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 39546

In article <73mq8.489$Rw2.28672@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB"
<k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>N2EY sez:
>>>Interesting stuff. However, note that the survey did not limit itself to
>>>newcomers or
>>>those who recently took ham exams. One of those 1157 votes is mine, and the
>>>most recent amateur license test I took was in 1970.
>
>Len, 7-of-9's sex toy, replies:
>> Heh heh heh...one of those numbers is mine and I've never taken
>> an FCC amateur radio test. :-)
>
>Well, (harrumph) that negates the entire survey right there!

Harrumph yourself...if I were involved with Jeri Ryan I wouldn't bother
with other hobbies! :->

280. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 21:07:38 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <u4pq8.11439$nt1.924672@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39549

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

>
> Can I have your views on how best to do this?
>

Here are some other thoughts (not my thoughts, but I
agree with them).....

Back in June of 2000 FCC'er Dale N. Hatfield (W0IFO) Chief, Office of
Engineering and Technology made these comments in a speech to
AMRAD:

"I would urge you to continue shifting towards more spectrally
efficient communications techniques - especially digital techniques.
Such a shift has a number of benefits:

"- First of all, it demonstrates to POLICYMAKERS and REGULATORS
that you are good stewards of the public's airwaves even without
direct economic incentives.

"- Second, by using what you have efficiently, it strengthens
your case when you need to ask for additional spectrum.

"- Third, by allowing more users to access the available
allocations simultaneously, it improves the amateur experience and
ultimately increases the attractiveness of the service to new and
old users alike."

Then a couple of weeks later FCC Special Counsel for Amateur
Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, made some
chillingly similar comments in a public speech.

"Take nothing for granted. Bill Gates can't, and you can't either."

"You're at a crossroads now. An old Chinese philosopher (or my
grandmother--I can never remember which!) said, "Be careful what
you wish for. You may get it." Seize the moment, and make this
your finest hour. Ham radio has been at a crossroads before and
has thrived. Continue that tradition."

"Make sure that, on your watch, Amateur Radio never becomes
obsolete."

From those two FCC speeches, it ought to be clear to all of us that
Amateur Radio does *not* have a "free pass" to spectrum, not will
our current allocations be "protected" when other applications come
looking for a place to operate.

The handwriting is on the wall -- we can continue to bicker and pout about tests, Morse requirements, and other irrelevancies, or we can get back to the business of proving our contributions to PICON. The FCC isn't much interested in what we used to do, but is intensely watching our current stewardship of the resources that are so highly coveted by other services.

Let's move on.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

281. Re: W1RFI's tie (was Re: No coders and the ARS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 21:17:27 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <uak7uh2vpv3f85@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39550

If I bring along a pair of scissors, will you cut your ties to ARRL?

{;-)

> >meters whilst wearing a tie. That alone makes it worth going to! I
> >can't wait to see if that is a regular tie, bow tie, or western style!
>
> Why, it is an ARRL tie, of course! :-)
>

282. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 21:27:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204021327.504a18c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39601

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<a8cif8gsf0@208.207.71.131>...
> N2EY wrote:

> > The fact that the most sweeping license test changes since the mid-1960s
> > gathered
> > only about 2500 comments and reply comments indicates most hams and would-be
> > hams
> > simply didn't care all that much how it turned out.

> I disagree, and what I heard was what you said earlier- "FCC will just
> do whatever they want anyway, what I have to say won't make any
> difference. Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
> me even more frustration."

Dick,

I never wrote:

"FCC will just do whatever they want anyway, what I have to say won't make any
difference. Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
me even more frustration."

nor do I think that way. I commented on 98-143 and other NPRMs. My comments on
the restructuring were posted here. I also encouraged others to comment.

However, I DO think that the tiny percentage of hams who commented on 98-143
gave the FCC a lot of leeway in their decisions. Also, while giving my "history
of ham licensing" talk at local amateur radio clubs, I found that very few of
the local hams planned to comment on the NPRM.

Perhaps someone else wrote that quote.

> As you know, I did comment.

As did I and some other rrappers. Oddly enough, some of the most frequent
posters here did not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

283. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 21:44:09 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <JCpq8.11530$nt1.930456@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39602

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> As did I and some other rrappers.
>

I'm just a plain brown rrapper.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

284. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 21:58:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA2997.32CDB572@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39603

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:
> >Well, (harrumph) that negates the entire survey right there!
>
> Harrumph yourself...if I were involved with Jeri Ryan I wouldn't bother
> with other hobbies! :->

I hope Jim doesn't disagree, Len, because I agree with you.
She was the best thing that ever happened to Star Trek and
almost convinced me to become a Borg.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

285. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 22:00:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA2A0C.8E9E775@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39604

N2EY wrote:
> Oddly enough, some of the most frequent posters here did not.

The most frequent poster did. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

286. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 22:13:27 UTC
From: DPH <rally2xs@compuserve.com>
Message-ID: <i5bkauc0gpoesrfq5vsbkabr5p5o5pvkgk@4ax.com>
Source record: 39605

On Tue, 02 Apr 2002 10:08:45 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>DPH wrote:
>> The net and ham radio are not even competitors. They are for
>> different things.
>
>But I cannot usually access newsgroups and carry on a QSO at the
>same time. The net and ham radio are thus in competition for my
>time.

Just get 56K modem back and you _can_ get a QSO finished during the
time some of the net servers are responding, tho, especially the
overseas ones.

Dave Head

287. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 22:42:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402174209.08023.00001554@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 39606

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>Now, just a darned minute here! That makes THREE
>irregular usages. . . oh, wait a second . . . OK. :-)

Now, if you can think of any cute phonetics for my call, let me know.

I have had a few suggestions already -- Really Fine Individual.

In response to some of my posts, it has been Real Flaming Idiot and a few variations on that theme. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

288. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 22:43:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402174357.08023.00001555@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 39607

From: "KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG

Hans,

This is as fine a post as I have seen on rrap. My hat is off to you, sir.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>Here are some other thoughts (not my thoughts, but I
>agree with them).....
>
>Back in June of 2000 FCC'er Dale N. Hatfield (W0IFO) Chief, Office of
>Engineering and Technology made these comments in a speech to
>AMRAD:
>
>"I would urge you to continue shifting towards more spectrally
>efficient communications techniques - especially digital techniques.
>Such a shift has a number of benefits:
>
> "- First of all, it demonstrates to POLICYMAKERS and REGULATORS
>that you are good stewards of the public's airwaves even without
>direct economic incentives.
>
> "- Second, by using what you have efficiently, it strengthens
>your case when you need to ask for additional spectrum.
>
> "- Third, by allowing more users to access the available
>allocations simultaneously, it improves the amateur experience and
>ultimately increases the attractiveness of the service to new and
>old users alike."
>
>Then a couple of weeks later FCC Special Counsel for Amateur
>Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, made some
>chillingly similar comments in a public speech.
>
> "Take nothing for granted. Bill Gates can't, and you can't either."
>
> "You're at a crossroads now. An old Chinese philosopher (or my
> grandmother--I can never remember which!) said, "Be careful what
> you wish for. You may get it." Seize the moment, and make this
> your finest hour. Ham radio has been at a crossroads before and
> has thrived. Continue that tradition."
>
> "Make sure that, on your watch, Amateur Radio never becomes

> obsolete."
>
>From those two FCC speeches, it ought to be clear to all of us that
>Amateur Radio does *not* have a "free pass" to spectrum, not will
>our current allocations be "protected" when other applications come
>looking for a place to operate.
>
>The handwriting is on the wall -- we can continue to bicker and
>pout about tests, Morse requirements, and other irrelevancies,
>or we can get back to the business of proving our contributions
>to PICON. The FCC isn't much interested in what we used to do,
>but is intensely watching our current stewardship of the resources
>that are so highly coveted by other services.
>
>Let's move on.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

289. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 22:49:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402174907.08023.00001557@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 39608

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>However, it appears to me now that since there was serious desire
>to scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!),

ARRL's comments to the FCC, backed up with its Reply Comments and an Ex Parte presentation, were to maintain a 4-class heirarchy in Amateur Radio, with a 0/5/12/12 wpm code speed requirement.

On what basis have you proclaimed that ARRL has a "serious desire" to "scuttle" code?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

290. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 22:50:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402175019.08023.00001559@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 39609

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>> 1st, they are helping to populate the VHF/UHF bands,
>> which makes those bands less vulnerable to spectrum
>> grabs by other interests.

>If ya don't use.... ya lose 'em! No-coders and Coders both should be
>utilizing these bands.

Most of those using 2 meters have passed a code test.

Almost all of those using 1200 MHz and above have passed a code test.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

291. Re: W1RFI's tie (was Re: No coders and the ARS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 22:52:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402175224.08023.00001561@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 39610

From: "Jim Weir" jim@rst-engr.com

>If I bring along a pair of scissors, will you cut your ties to ARRL?

After the presentation, if you are lucky enough to win the tie as a door prize, you can cut it into as many little pieces as you like. :-)

And if you go to the West Virginia convention and stick around for the auction, you can see me cut my tie inch by inch if people will raise their bids by a buck or two. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

292. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 22:56:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402175613.08023.00001563@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 39611

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Dick Carroll wrote:

>> It is now clear that you believe that anyone who held an Extra before
>> restructuring was bent on lording his "rank" over lower class licensees in
>> some sort of a "caste" system.

>Not "anyone", Dick, just hams like you.

Let's put it to the test. Cecil, I am a pre-restructuring Extra. Do you believe that I am bent on lording my rank over other licensees in some sort of "caste" system?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

293. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-02 22:57:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402175752.08023.00001564@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 39612

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>You invented the "ham radio pecking order" so that you could work to
>tear it down since you couldn't be at the top of the heap, having not
>achieved the Extra license until the Grate Dumbdown.

Cecil did not invent the present structure of ham radio, Dick; the FCC did.
What the Commission decided to do is different than what Cecil asked them to
do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

294. Re: We nailed TGOS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 00:02:08 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <4Erq8.11779$nt1.953063@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39613

My NORTON anti-virus went ballistic when that file came across.

Don't open it.

73, de Hans, K0HB

295. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 00:13:58 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020402191358.22608.00001620@mb-fg.news.cs.com>
Source record: 39614

Congratulations Val! :-)

>It sure as hell could be a lot WORSE!

W0RSE, that call's taken. <ggg>

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

296. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 00:36:29 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uakiij9fbcs910@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39615

W1RFI wrote:

>Now, if you can think of any cute phonetics for my call,
>let me know.
>
>I have had a few suggestions already -- Really Fine Individual.
>
>In response to some of my posts, it has been Real Flaming Idiot
>and a few variations on that theme. :-)

In spite of the mistake I made in the message with your
call sign in it (typing a "1" instead of the "I") I immediately
thought of, quite a while back:

"Radio Frequency Interference"

. . . because of your position there at ARRL!

Val
KC0MUB

297. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 01:05:59 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <olkkauco72psrsbf2tr33kp510b6fo6t24@4ax.com>
Source record: 39616

On 2 Apr 2002 15:58:00 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Gerald Schmitt wrote:
>>
>> On 01 Apr 2002 23:49:46 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
>>
>> >>Subject: Moving forward
>> >>From: "KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG
>> >>Date: 04/01/02 16:19 Eastern Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <P94q8.8191$ml2.661664@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>> >>
>> > Seven point three on the Troll-O-Meter, Hans.
>> >
>> >Steve
>>
>> Actually it was a thoughtful insightful piece of writing but I can see
>> how you might have missed that Steve. If and when you ever
>> mature enough to see the author's perspective you might start
>> having some success in your non radio life.
>>
>> I know you will have a real need to abuse me for this but please
>> let everyone see your bile I don't require your e-mail.
>
>
>
> When did anyone ever abuse you as the writer of that "insightful piece
>of writing" insists he did to others? What a crock of crap.

Did I say something about being abused? I sure don't remember doing
so. Have I seen abuse yes. Have I observed people being called lazy
up motivated why yes I do believe I have.
>
> Most of you codefree guys transfer your frustrations with the
>REQUIREMENTS to those who just met them without comment or complaint. In
>your twisted minds it's all OUR fault.

Just when did I become "codefree" I got my HF license back in the old
days when you had to copy fast and all that after walking 20 miles in
the snow uphill both ways yata yata yata.

Did I mention that you have no idea what modes I use when I operate?
No well then how do you make this leap of faith that I'm "codefree".
>

> What I've seen and personally experienced in this little spat is the
>abuse going exactly the opposite direction from what you insist. I have
>been abused by so many code haters that insist that *I'm* abusing *them*
>that I have changed my outlook on them almost 180 degrees. I will be
>VERY careful who I help into the hobby from now on. If one doesn't want
>to learn the code he'll have his work cut out convincing me to assist,
>and if not for a couple of nocode techs I helped to get licensed in the
>past who are proof that not ALL codefree people are assholes it would
>probably be a fullscale requirement.

Wow Dick you should really look into a stool softener a back up like
that could do grievous injury. You know the FCC made the decision to
reduce the code test to 5 WPM not the ARRL not Cecil not me I think
you just might have a case of misplaced rage.

298. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 01:16:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8dl53ris0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 39617

CAM wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > N2EY's history, and other material, tell an interesting story.
> > It seems as though in the period leading up to World War II there
> > was actual Army involvement in amature radio, on a pretty large
> > scale! Of course, then there was a need for Morse operators
> > throughout the military. And even through the 1960s, and into the
> > early 1970s, the Cold War fear of the USSR gave Ham Radio and
> > its technical education potential real punch, a punch it seemed
> > to have lost by the middle of the 1980s.
>
> Don't you find it strange that is the time that incentive licensing
> started to have its negative effects?

I'm quite sure that by now what he finds strange is YOU.

299. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 01:16:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAA580E.1084094E@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39618

Gee Hans, sensible talk like that, and rrap might just dissapear! 8^)

Excellent post, and I suggest that we take it to heart. That is if we
care about the future of the ARS.

- Mike KB3EIA -

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:

> From those two FCC speeches, it ought to be clear to all of us that
> Amateur Radio does *not* have a "free pass" to spectrum, not will
> our current allocations be "protected" when other applications come
> looking for a place to operate.
>
> The handwriting is on the wall -- we can continue to bicker and
> pout about tests, Morse requirements, and other irrelevancies,
> or we can get back to the business of proving our contributions
> to PICON. The FCC isn't much interested in what we used to do,
> but is intensely watching our current stewardship of the resources
> that are so highly coveted by other services.
>

300. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 01:21:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8dlfiris1@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 39619

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > Val KC0MUB!
> >
> > Hey, Val, congrats and welcome aboard!
>
> Congratulations from me also, Val. I'm surprised Dick congratulated
> you. His modus operandi is to rag on nocode techs for being lazy
> whiners.

Liar. YOU are the lazy whiner.

301. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 01:39:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8dmfn$1t8$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 39620

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<a8cif8gsf0@208.207.71.131>...
> > N2EY wrote:
>
> > > The fact that the most sweeping license test changes since the mid-1960s
> > > gathered
> > > only about 2500 comments and reply comments indicates most hams and would-be
> > > hams
> > > simply didn't care all that much how it turned out.
>
> > I disagree, and what I heard was what you said earlier- "FCC will just
> > do whatever they want anyway, what I have to say won't make any
> > difference. Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
> > me even more frustration."
>
> Dick,
>
> I never wrote:
>
> "FCC will just do whatever they want anyway, what I have to say won't make any
> difference. Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
> me even more frustration."
>

My apologies, that wasn't meant to be a direct quote, but it sure came
out that way. It was, however, the approximate meaning I read from your
earlier post to the extent that the FCC will do whatever it wishes
without regard to what hams think.

> nor do I think that way. I commented on 98-143 and other NPRMs. My comments on
> the restructuring were posted here. I also encouraged others to comment.

Yep, some of us did. Didn't make any difference, FCC just did what Bill
Cross decided.

>
> However, I DO think that the tiny percentage of hams who commented on 98-143
> gave the FCC a lot of leeway in their decisions. Also, while giving my "history
> of ham licensing" talk at local amateur radio clubs, I found that very few of
> the local hams planned to comment on the NPRM.
>

Most hams I've talked to think FCC doesn't care much at all what they
think. I believe they're right. It's what Bill Cross thinks that counts.

> > As you know, I did comment.
>
> As did I and some other rrappers. Oddly enough, some of the most frequent
> posters here did not.

That's no surprise.

302. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 01:43:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8dmnq$1t8$1@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 39621

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > I have
> > > > been abused by so many code haters that insist that *I'm* abusing *them*
> > >
> > > "But officer, it wasn't my fault. She made me abuse her."
> >
> > When you have nothing else to use, you fall back on that one, again.
>
> Read your statements, Dick, and then convince me I'm wrong. You have
> all the characteristics of a bully.

And you have all the characteristics of a raving lunatic.

I spend half my time on this
> newsgroup defending myself against your irrational abusive attacks.

You spend virtually ALL your time on this NG trolling and inciting
longtime hams particularly those who have long held the Extra class
license. You have nothing whatever constructive to say, so you always
are destructive. Deny it with all your being, it is still fact.

> It would be a miracle if you were not just that abusive in your
> everyday life.

Well mirackes do happen, and we'll allow you this one.

Tell you what I'm going to do, Old Dipsshit. It's something I should
have done years ago. For some reason I thought it would be possible to
have rational discourse with you, but that would be possible only if you
were rational, and for sure that isn't the case. So beginning right now,
you are in the PLONK filter where you've belonged all along, right there
with Loose Lennie, The TIT and B.Burke AKA The Gadfly. Enjoy.

Enough is enouth, and of you I've had far more than enough.

303. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 01:45:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAA50B1.4FA10799@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39622

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Val
> KC0MUB?
> [Got to check that out!]

Congrats and welcome, Val! Will look forward to a CW QSO soon.

73,

Dave K8MN

304. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 01:48:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAA513F.F54A905F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39623

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > I don't think it says "Extra lite" on your license, Mike. Betcha it says
> > "Extra", just like mine.
>
> Please tell that to the troublemaking hams who are doing everything in
> their power to preserve their pecking order.

Tell us, Cecil, in what way has your on-air operation been hindered or
effected? Do you feel put upon? If so, how have you allowed others to
gain such control over you?

Dave K8MN

305. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:00:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402210035.13101.00000324@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 39624

In article <20020326055405.08023.00000196@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
>>The ARRL took it upon itself to force 13wpm code (disguised as
>>Farnsworth Code, not Morse Code) on unsuspecting newbies who don't know any
>>better.

There is no "Farnsworth Code".

The test is 5 wpm Morse Code, sent with Farnsworth spacing.

>Most knowledgeable people believe that Farnsworth-sent code is easier to
>learn
>and copy than non-Farnsworth code. It may take a bit more time to learn to
>hear
>the letter rather than count dits, but this is, IMHO, more than offset by the
>fact that the applicant has more time in between characters to recognize the
>letter.

And more time to write it down. End result is that the test is easier, not harder.

Brian also ignores two important facts:

- the test method is public knowledge, not a secret
- those who prefer that the characters be sent at 5 wpm need only request that method and the VEs will accomodate them.

>A second advantage is that it makes it easier for the student to continue on
>to
>higher code speed and develop proficiency.

Perhaps that is why some folks criticize it so much.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

306. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:00:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402210037.13101.00000325@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 39625

Congrats and welcome, Val! Your call is on QRZ.com now.

In article <uajr90ftkhd525@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>N2EY's comments are in plain type, mine are in [brackets].

I have inserted the proper number of ">"s to avoid confusion.

>[Concerning testing and the lack of new hams]:
>
>>I agree in principle, but there are many factors involved
>>besides license tests. For example, back before cheap
>>cell phone service many hams around here got licenses
>>and used the local repeaters for "honeydew" purposes.
>>That was a significant source of new hams even before the
>>Tech lost its code test. The advent of low cost family cell
>>phone plans and better coverage all but ended that source
>>of new hams.
>
>[[Yes, cell phones have been a major blow, no doubt. It sure seems as
>though they have just about vitiated the early 1980s changes, as you say.]]

The main point is that there are all sorts of factors besides license test
requirements affecting growth. Sunspots and the economy, to name just two.
>
>[Why all the recent changes in licensing?]:
>
>>There are several concerns. One is that the FCC doesn't have
>>unlimited or even adequate resources. Thus the VE and QPC
>>systems - FCC unloads a huge burden of admin work on unpaid
>>volunteers. Another factor is the mandate for implification of rules
>>and regs. Why have six classes of license if three will do? Why
>>have highly technical tests if the problems (violations) of the
>>ARS are not primarily technical? Look at the FCC enforcement
>>letters - they are rarely about purely technical issues, and mostly
>>about operating issues. "Access" is a big thing to the FCC.
>>They would rather have all interested parties licensed rather than
>>have to chase pirate stations.
>
>[[It's a big problem, indeed, when a volunteer group, led by a small paid
>staff, has to cooperate with an under-funded government agency, which has
>the fate of the volunteer group in its hands. That paid staff has to be
>good, doesn't it.]]

The FCC is a "legacy" government agency that has been around for almost 70 years. Their funding is not tied to the number of services they are mandated to regulate, nor the number of licensees in those services. Getting volunteers to take over most of the testing function for free was a "smart" move by the FCC.

It also greatly improved access to the license process. I got my licenses back when all hams who were not way out in the boonies had to go to an FCC office. For me, a kid in school, that meant waiting for Christmas break or summer vacation. For working folks it meant taking at least a half-day off work. For folks who lived a long way from an FCC office it meant a lot of trouble and expense just to get to the exam. That was not a good thing.
>
>[Concerning the importance of CW in the ARS]:

Actually, this paragraph is about the TEST, not the MODE):
>
>The problem is that the FCC doesn't see it that way, and hasn't
>seen it that way for a long time. FCC's attitude is that they don't
>want to do any code testing any more. So it's up to us hams to
>keep the mode alive. FCC won't do it. The ARRL BoD has strongly
>supported code testing for many years because the membership
>wanted them to. But it has become clear in the past few years that
>doing so is not going to make any difference to the FCC, nor with
>most other IARU member societies. And there are lots of other
>issues demanding ARRL resources.
>
>[[No doubt these are all good points. However, it sure seems as though
>seismic shifts are taking place in amateur radio land, and in some respects
>the ARRL is arranging lawn chairs right atop the major fault. That is, why
>have amateur radio at all (?) if the real need for it has disappeared, as
>the dramatic advent of non-caring by the FCC seems to indicate? That is, if
>the ARS had to justify itself all over again . . . could it?]]
>
The ARS has to justify itself every day. That's something many hams deny or forget.

The ARRL leadership obviously thinks that fighting the code test battle now is a
waste of resources. FCC's position is clear, and not going to be changed by repeating the same arguments given in connection with the restructuring. Time to move on to other issues.

For example, despite the restructuring, the growth in license numbers is about the
same as it was before the changes took effect. Check out

http://www.ah0a.org

and compare license totals in the 23 months preceding April 2000 and the 23 months since then. (The totals on that website are end-of-month totals, btw).Or note that the total number of US hams peaked a year ago and has stabilized at 683K or so.

>[[Concerning VHF-type FM voice on HF. I said, Where would the WORLD hide
>from the U.S. generated noise!]]
>
>Exactly . . . the end result would probably just be chaos.
>
>[[Ouch. Is this where we could be headed? Not soon, but someday?]]

The example was given to counter the idea of "free market of modes" and "mode welfare" that are sometimes seen here.

>[Concerning the importance, or not, of the ham equipment market, and the
>fact that the economic factor in rule making is not mentioned]:
>
>It's not spoken because it's just not that much money. Start arguing
>that ham radio is important because 683,000 US hams spend a
>half-billion per year and others services will point to having more
>users spending many times that.

Go to a Circuit City or Best Buy or whatever consumer electronic chain is in your area. Stand by the checkout and watch how many dollars of electronic merchandise a single store sells. Multiply that by the number of stores of that type in the USA. Half a billion is pocket change in that market.
>
>[[What I meant here is that the U.S. businesses with a cut of the ham
>market, even if they are only dealers, DO, most likely, have a say in rule
>making, one way or another. I can hardly believe that they remain
>silent.]]
>
Sure they have a say - Kenwood was repeatedly quoted by the FCC in the R&O. All interested parties have a say. Their say is "make the licenses more accessible".
>
>[Concerning the Big Problem in Ham Radio]:
>
>I think the big concern is that relative lack of growth compared to other
>services could mean big trouble holding on to frequency allocations.
>
>[[Yes, and so could the recruitment of a whole lot of people who can't help
>you, if they're combined with a serious loss of prestige for the ARS.]]

Sure. So how do we attract the "right" sort of people?

It has been my experience that the biggest barrier to recruitment is simple lack of good publicity. People just don't know ham radio even exists, or they confuse it with cb, or they think it disappeared years ago. This is not a new problem, either.

Two recent films had ham radio in their plots. I haven't seen "Frequency" yet, so I
won't comment on its plot. "Contact" showed amateur radio in a very positive light,
but the words "ham radio" or "amateur radio" were NEVER mentioned in the film!

>[[Concerning the future of the written tests]]:
>
>All the way to a simple multiple choice exam on the basic regs and one class
>of
>license.

The pre-restructuring written exams for an Extra consisted of 5 tests totalling
190
questions. The post restructuring exams for the same license consist of 3 tests
totalling 120 questions. FCC obviously thinks that's enough.
>
>[[Well, you have to hope it doesn't come to THAT And if the ARS needs to
>UPGRADE in this market, not DOWNGRADE? But that's REALLY pushing water
>uphill these days, no doubt. And then there's the issue of RE-testing,
>which would be the ultimate "upgrade" in the service, in my view anyway. Do
>you have a view on that?]]

Sure. The way we "upgrade" is by example. Hams who do things, and make
their accomplishments known, inspire and attract others to do the same.

>[[Concerning how many 'active' hams there are on HF]]:
>
>No easy way to tell. Many factors involved, such as propagation, time zones
>and
>how much a particular ham transmits. How much time on the air is needed to
>be
>considered "active"?
>
>[[What would you think might be a starting place here?]]
>
Simple. Get away from the computer and get on the air. Fill the bands with QSOs
so that nobody with a receiver doubts that the ham allocations are being used.
Learn new things and put the knowledge to use. Build a rig, antenna, nd/or
accessory and use it, rather than simply buying whatever Yaecomwood is
pushing.

Congrats again. See you on the bands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

307. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:32:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020402213205.00472.00000070@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 39626

In article <Ax8q8.9492$nt1.745781@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> writes:

>
>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
>> The Doctor column is the 2nd most popular part of QST, right after Product
>> Review.
>
>The "Doctor" column is inane, mostly Novice level techno-drivel. Tell us
>you're kidding!
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

There's nothing "inane" about it -- it simply reflects the dumbed-down
nature of the ARS. And, of course, the ARRL is perfectly willing to pander
to these dumbed-down hams with a perfectly straight face and wide-open,
all inclusive, touchy-feely, politically correct arms!

73 de Larry, K3LT

308. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:39:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402213926.19095.00001668@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 39627

>Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/02/02 14:03 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020402140348.28502.00000219@mb-mt.aol.com>

>
>I love it when some retiree in misery "knows all about what goes on"
>in some DC agency.

Kinda like some pitiful retiree in SoCal whining about what he COULD have
been...?!?!?

309. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:48:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caa6fea_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39633

"KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> wrote in
message news:m5aq8.9259$ml2.730761@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> > If someone moves into a neighborhood with
> > restrictive conditions, that is their problem.
>
> That's kinda short-sighted, Kim.
>
> How about the teen-aged offspring of someone who already lives in a
> CC&R-impaired house wants to become a ham?
>
> How about the retired lady who has raised a family, lost her spouse, and
now
> wants to pursue this hobby her grandson loves so much (but she's lived in
a
> CC&R-impaired development since 1971)?
>
> I'm sure there are other examples, but the above two examples are people
> that I personally know.
>
> Do we just tell them "Kim says tough shit -- deal with it."?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

I suppose in short, yes. On the one hand people are chided for being
"bleeding heart" liberals. On the other hand people are chided when smacked
with the reality of dealing with life and what it blows our way to conquer.
Can't have it both ways. Problem is, the accusation is determined by
whether or not one is affected by the issue.

Now, the more "bleeding heart" liberal side: I empathize with someone who is
living under those conditions. However, I'd hate to see people running off
to court every time they encounter something they just cannot handle in a
contract they agreed to "at the time."

As for "Kim says it's tough shit" I think more than Kim probably says that.

Kim W5TIT

310. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:48:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <q4uq8.2748$Ci1.515250321@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39628

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CAA1449.47FF745D@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > ... And "B" is for "Bubba,"
> > I guess. It sure as hell could be a lot WORSE!
>
> All you need is naughty phonetics to get another endless
> "ARS is headed for destruction" thread going. The 'B'
> could stand for 'Boobs' just to get it started.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Just singular.

311. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:50:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402215022.19095.00001669@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 39629

>Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/02/02 15:59 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020402155904.23265.00000033@mb-ck.aol.com>

Once again Lennie delves into subject matter that he has neither practical experience or up-to-date information...

>Not really, not even in amateur radio. It's a nice myth to foster,
>but the "involvement in amateur radio" is limited to the beginnings
>of MARS.

Leonard H. Anderson is once again lying. Period. It's no myth and the "involvement" of ALL branches of the Armed Forces is far more than "just" the creation of MARS.

>>And, as you say, by the
>>1980 period one of the items that hams had pioneered, mobile
>>communications for civilians, began to be taken on by the Big Boys.
>
>Total myth. "Mobile communications for civilians" was worked out
>by corporations before WW2.

Absolutely a stinging, bald face falsehood.

Mobile radio communications WERE >>PIONEERED<< by Amateur Radio operators. Period. To try and state otherwise is stupid.

>See Motorola and others for getting
>mobile radio in public safety vehicles in the late 1930s. Mobile FM
>on VHF was pioneered in armored cavalry during WW2. Horse
>cavalry had a "horsepack" radio in 1932 (operate dismounted) and
>a mounted horse-mobile radio in 1935.

See numerous OTHER publications (yes...some of them from the League) that show Amateurs attempting various "mobile" and "portable" communications in the 19-teens and early 20's.

>The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 Code of Federal
>Regulations is a regulatory term denoting type and kind of radio
>activity. It is legal language and does NOT pertain to "military
>service" in any possible way.

The Coward Anderson does anything he can to try and dissuade himself from believing that Amateur Radio DOES provide a SERVICE to the citizens of the United States.

This is because Coward Anderson is also a fool.

>If you want to "energize" something, avoid putting bunny
>batteries into a time machine and going back to 1930 and
>trying to foist off seven decades old myths and jingoism in this
>new millenium.

Or you could try shoving them up Lennie's butt and getting him to pay attention to real-life Amateur Radio...NOT the "utopia" of nerd-infested IEEE that he'd LIKE to believe it "ought" to be.

Lennie...Your creepiness is exponentially expanding.

312. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:51:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <27uq8.2749$5k1.515347468@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39630

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uajb0tsaul7331@corp.supernews.com...

> If the
> FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
> non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,

FISTS is not a CB group nor a washing machine. They don't "agitate."

313. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:54:15 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <r9uq8.1228$Rw2.91793@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39631

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020402213205.00472.00000070@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <Ax8q8.9492$nt1.745781@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> "KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> writes:
>
> >
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> The Doctor column is the 2nd most popular part of QST, right after
Product
> >> Review.
> >
> >The "Doctor" column is inane, mostly Novice level techno-drivel. Tell
us
> >you're kidding!
> >
> >With all kind wishes,
> >
> >de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hansl:
>
> There's nothing "inane" about it -- it simply reflects the dumbed-down
> nature of the ARS. And, of course, the ARRL is perfectly willing to
pander
> to these dumbed-down hams with a perfectly straight face and wide-open,
> all inclusive, touchy-feely, politically correct arms!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Such are the joys of running a membership org, Larry. Particularly when you do not determine the standards for membership. You gotta start somewhere.

I give you for comparison the American Contract Bridge League which is another group with a steep learning curve. Their pub has three sections for beginning, intermediate, and advanced players (with suitable dumbing down for those who overestimate their standing). But then kiddie clothes have been sold with fictional 'ages' forever and a marketing coup was scored with condoms in Extra Large.

The criterion here it would seem to me is whether they pander to dipsticks who won't do their own research.

Dick N&#65533;BK

314. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:56:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Rbuq8.2754$5s1.515858472@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39632

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA9D306.6971F68A@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Well. You told me here some time ago that not only was the Extra
> > > > trivial, ...
> > >
> > > Trivial for members of the super race, Dick, not for everyone.
> >
> > Oh yes, I keep forgetting, you're always automatically the elite.
> > Except, as it happens, in ham radio you never could cut the mustard
> > until the Grate Dumbdown.
>
> I hate mustard, Dick, and never needed to cut it.

I like mustard, and typically cut it with horseradish.

315. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:57:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caa720b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39637

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a8c8ag91qnr@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Amen Kim!
>
>
>
>
> > However, back to the grounded statement that most of us who have regaled
> > against a pro-CW argument are reacting to the attitude of those pro-CW
> folks
> > who are just so miserable with life in general that the only thing they
> have
> > left is to hate.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >

Thank you...that's the way I see it.

Kim W5TIT

316. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 02:59:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caa728e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39638

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020402090909.27526.00001072@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio
> >From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >Date: 04/02/02 08:21 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <uajb0tsaul7331@corp.supernews.com>
>
> >I have decided to move this exchange, between Mr. Roll
> >and myself, to its own thread.
>
> While you are doing so, could you break up your thoughts into more
> thoughtful paragraphs? It reads like a fourth grade "essay".
>
> Steve

Man, you got that right...

Kim W5TIT

317. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:01:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <nguq8.2758$bF1.516672677@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39634

Dick and Larry will tell you that you're not a ham.

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a8c8ac61qnr@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Oh no Cecil.... now us hams are gonna be associated with Trekkies!
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CA7F1F2.16555B31@IEEE.org...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > Remember how screwed up Dr. McCoy got after a mind meld with Spock?
> > > > Maybe Val's mind meld with Dick is having the same effect?
> > >
> > > Was that before or after Spock went into heat?
> >
> > Spock went into heat on TV. The mind meld with Dr. McCoy spanned
> > two movies, Star Trek IV (Wrath of Khan) and Star Trek V (Search
> > for Spock).
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >
> > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
>
>

318. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:03:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caa7372_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39640

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8cl30oio0@208.207.71.131...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You invented the "ham radio pecking order" ...
> >
> > The ham radio pecking order, exercised by hams like you, is
> > blatantly obvious to any reader of this newsgroup. But the
> > FCC just chopped off half of your beak.
> >
>
> YOU have long been, from the beginning, and continue to be, the most
> abusive poster on this newsgroup. Of course that doesn't square with
> your professed "live and let live", so you attempt to transfer it all to
> those who did what you could not and always held in envy, despite your
> denials. You're a real piece of work.

Oh, so *that's* why Little Dick *cough* is *rolling eyes* ignoring the rest
of us. We weren't abusive enough....

LOL

Kim W5TIT

319. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:04:20 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Uiuq8.2762$HJ1.516966452@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39635

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020402013303.14735.00000285@mb-fr.aol.com...
> In article <MV9q8.2180$uw3.395190462@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >> will be inside [[double brackets]].
> >> >
> >> >Don't trouble yourself. We know who said what.
> >>
> >> I'm still looking for "W1FRI" that he is replying to...not in the
> >> databases apparently. :-)
> >
> >What a total frigging idiot. I Guess Bruce and his sister did have a
kid.
>
> Be kind to poor Val. He was the "sole support of a brigade" in 'Nam.
>
> I figure he hammered in boot bottoms with an H-250 handset. :-)

I recall Dick posting anaonymously when I first got on here. He was
demanding that I worship code because the ChiComs were overrunning his
position. Something like that.

320. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:05:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caa7400$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39642

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA9DCBC.39CE2984@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I have
> > been abused by so many code haters that insist that *I'm* abusing *them*
>
> "But officer, it wasn't my fault. She made me abuse her."
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

I think Dickie's just making sure we all understand how he loves to play victim. A poignant question to him might be for him to give an example of this purported abuse. I'm certain it's as fictional as his belief system on the Islamic faith.

Kim W5TIT

321. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:07:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dmuq8.2764$qO1.517276896@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39636

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CA74A42.E2EDEAAC@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Amateur radio is not a company.
> >
> > Exactly! Amateur radio is a hobby and for that reason, the present
pecking
> > order within ham radio has absolutely no valid reason to exist.
>
> It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> States should become a radio amateur.

Why not? We even have non-citizens with US licenses.

322. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:08:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caa749c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39643

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020402140138.19103.00001576@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB
> >From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >Date: 04/02/02 10:48 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <uajjkss3r4t628@corp.supernews.com>
>
> >
> >Val
> >KC0MUB?
> >[Got to check that out!]
>
> Remember who told ya first! And it's on the FCC database, so you are
> "legal" to get on the air. "QRZ" won't show it for another day or two.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

It's there on QRZ right now...

Kim W5TIT

323. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:09:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8ds4hnde1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39641

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8bm6m$3na$0@208.206.142.95...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The discussion is not about CW,
> > the mode. The discussion is about mandatory Morse code testing.
>
> There is simply no way to separate the two. For once testing is
> completely gone, it only a matter of time till CW itself dies out. It's
> as certain as the rising sun. The small numbers of new CW users will
> never replace reductions from attrition, meanwhile the Carl Stevensons
> of the world (and probably you) will "change their minds" and work to
> remove spectrum from CW as "inefficient allocation of resources" and
> urge FCC to do away with even the lower 25.

If we "ass"ume that Dick's prophesy is true...that CW usage will
drastically decline once testing isn't mandated anymore...then why would
anyone be inclined to "remove spectrum from CW" at all. If CW
usage is all but gone, there'd be no reason to try and ban its use in
any of the amateur spectrum.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

324. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:12:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caa7584$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39645

```
"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:q4uq8.2748$Ci1.515250321@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CAA1449.47FF745D@IEEE.org...
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > ... And "B" is for "Bubba,"
> > > I guess. It sure as hell could be a lot WORSE!
> >
> > All you need is naughty phonetics to get another endless
> > "ARS is headed for destruction" thread going. The 'B'
> > could stand for 'Boobs' just to get it started.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Just singular.
>
>

Well, it's a wonder Larry hasn't jumped all over the callsign Hans had in a
post; I guess it must be his YL, K0CKB....whoa, I had to take a double look
at that one. Guess my mind is straight where Larry's is...in the gutter.

Kim W5TIT
```

325. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:14:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caa7618_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39646

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8dmnq$1t8$1@208.207.71.137...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > I have
> > > > > been abused by so many code haters that insist that *I'm* abusing
them
> > > >
> > > > "But officer, it wasn't my fault. She made me abuse her."
> > >
> > > When you have nothing else to use, you fall back on that one, again.
> >
> > Read your statements, Dick, and then convince me I'm wrong. You have
> > all the characteristics of a bully.
>
>
> And you have all the characteristics of a raving lunatic.
>
>
> I spend half my time on this
> > newsgroup defending myself against your irrational abusive attacks.
>
>
>
> You spend virtually ALL your time on this NG trolling and inciting
> longtime hams particularly those who have long held the Extra class
> license. You have nothing whatever constructive to say, so you always
> are destructive. Deny it with all your being, it is still fact.
>
>
> > It would be a miracle if you were not just that abusive in your
> > everyday life.
>
>
>
> Well mirackes do happen, and we'll allow you this one.
>

>
> Tell you what I'm going to do, Old Dipsshit. It's something I should
> have done years ago. For some reason I thought it would be possible to
> have rational discourse with you, but that would be possible only if you
> were rational, and for sure that isn't the case. So beginning right now,
> you are in the PLONK filter where you've belonged all along, right there
> with Loose Lennie, The TIT and B.Burke AKA The Gadfly. Enjoy.
>
> Enough is enouth, and of you I've had far more than enough.

Heh heh heh. OK, everyone. Let's see how long this lasts. He'll have no one to lash out at now. OH WAIT...yes he will, there's still Ed.

Anyway, he'll be hilarious...

Kim W5TIT

326. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:15:52 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <cdc8afaedd0425f4408624e3780154bc.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 39639

Ed, the ARRL is made up of a cross section of amateurs in general.
Heck, a lot of the general amateur population has been arguing this and
still continues to argue! One can hardly blame the league what ever
way they supported. Myself, I'm not too concerned. One gentleman
pointed out that if they kill the code entirely (very possible over the
next decade), that will really leave a lot of nice, open spaces for the
CW and digital ops. The only thing I know is I can't wait for the
Rochester Hamfest - the program shows that you are going to build a
2-meter J pole while wearing a tie. Can I bring a camera?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020402174907.08023.00001557@mb-cr.aol.com...

> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >However, it appears to me now that since there was serious desire
> >to scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!),
>
> ARRL's comments to the FCC, backed up with its Reply Comments and an Ex Parte
> presentation, were to maintain a 4-class heirarchy in Amateur Radio, with a
> 0/5/12/12 wpm code speed requirement.
>
> On what basis have you proclaimed that ARRL has a "serious desire" to "scuttle"
> code?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

327. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:23:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CAA7597.D9E3AD74@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39644

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> BTW -- I've been in a lot of ham radio stores, past and present, and
> don't recall a single one of them having a coffee pot to hang out at --

HRO in Sunnyvale has (or had 2 years ago, when I last was there)
a coffee pot and sometimes doughnuts free.

328. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:36:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8dtt0$f19$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39648

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uajaaoh61s82e4@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >The "stinkbomb" comment notwithstanding, I guess I can
> >see your point, part way. I'll admit that NCI did have a more
> >profound effect on the recent changes to the licensing
> >standards than a larger group, FISTS, had.
>
> FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
> by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
> competition this can be effective. However, code testing
> has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
> supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
> FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
> non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
> and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did) and
> thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd, well,
> things might have been more interesting.

Well, there he (Val) goes again. Vague generalities about
FISTS agitating nationally...without ONE concrete example of
what that should have been.

> However, it
> appears to me now that since there was serious desire to
> scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!),

Black helicopters circling fast.

> FISTS,
> or any other similiar organization, had very little chance of
> success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
> a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
> have had even a prayer, and that not much.

More vague and nonspecific statements... "Full scale
attack on the current ARRL leadership? Examples please
if you have any thought of being credible.

> >I think the thing that has Ham Radio, and the ARRL,
> >"shaking in it's boots" is the effect of the Internet and
> >the explosion of wireless technology. These days,
> >being able to communicate without being physically
> >tied to a wall outlet of some sort is a common, everyday
> >occurrence experienced by anyone with the wherewithal

> >to acquire the technology. Quite frankly, we (radio
> >amateurs) will never be able to come close to duplicating
> >the capability of even one of the most ubiquitous cell
> >phones, and do so without cost to the user. Sure, we
> >can talk worldwide with our fellow hams with very portable
> >equipment, but not equipment that is shirt-pocket sized,
> >and can connect to particular individuals at a time of the
> >user's choosing.
>
> There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
> within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general. That is,
> when Big Money moves in on you (and this is what has
> happened to Ham Radio with the cell phones)

"Big Money" moved in on ham radio...cellphones?
What, another conspiracy. The advent and deployment of wireless
telecommunications cared not a twit about any impact
on ham radio. To describe cellphones as a big money
move against ham radio is akin to suggesting the automobile
was a big money invasion against casual hoseback riding.

> and takes
> away the mass market,

Ham radio has NEVER been poised as any "mass market"
endeavor.

> well, you MUST move upscale.
> That is, you must re-position yourself in the market as the
> HIGH-QUALITY experience. And, I hate to say it, part of
> that "quality" is the historical aspect of your product, which
> the ARRL is busy selling down the river, even as they
> earmark funds for a museum there at HQ.

Break out the violins.

> Here in the mid-
> west, when Wal-Mart comes to town, you had better not
> try to take them on straight-up. No, you had better get
> away from them somehow and so sheer off the top part
> of the market for yourself.

Reality in the marketplace. Nothing new there. The
reality of cellphones is that they have never been a
competitor of ham radio.

> If you don't, if you think you can
> get down in the gutter with them, well, you're dead meat,
> as witness what has happened nearly everywhere.

More vague commentary...no specifics.

> Ham
> Radio MUST stop worrying about just "the numbers" and
> start thinking about the QUALITY of the people it is going
> to attract. I think it's the ONLY way, in the long run. If the
> quality is there then, in the end, sufficient numbers will be
> there, too!

And to accomplish that task, assuming one agrees with
the statement, just what do you (Val) propose?

> >Their mistake was to think that "dumbing down" our
> >licensing standards would actually have the effect of
> >reversing the trend toward negative growth in the
> >numbers of licensees. Right now, there may be
> >evidence that this is so; unfortunately, in a few years,
> >when the licenses of the No-Code Tech generation
> >start expiring, we're going to find that we're no longer
> >staying ahead of our losses.
>
> The changes in the licensing requirements have meaning
> only if the people who would otherwise have not been
> brought into the avocation STAY within it and advance.
> One of the primary reasons people become Hams, or
> amateur astronomers, or rock hounds, or whatever, is
> because that act separates them a little from the crowd,
> enhances their individuality, and gives them a bit of
> "cachet," of distinctiveness.

Finally, a measure of rational thought.

> Ham Radio, it seems to me,
> is going the wrong way here. That is, the appeal has to
> be made, somehow, that to be a Ham * DOES * make
> one a cut above, but in a GOOD way! This desire to
> flatten out the licensing is the WRONG WAY to go right
> now, I think. However, since that flattening is going to
> happen, no matter what, a way has to be found, and
> quickly, to generate some extra status for Ham Radio.
> If this isn't done, well, the future does look bleak.

The same doom and gloom prediction has been made
everytime the rules have changed.

> >Right now, the raw numbers of hams in all license
> >classes seems to have reached a stable plateau; it
> >is even showing marginal growth. However, this is
> >not going to persist. And ten years from now, there
> >will be a definite downward trend. "Give away"
> >licensing has not had the effect that the ARRL
> >desired. Their organization is in severe jeopardy.
>
> Well, maybe so . . . and definitely so if they don't
> re-position themselves.

The same doom and gloom prediction has been made
everytime the rules have changed.

> >They will have to change in some fundamental way in
> >order to remain viable.
>
> Well, I don't know about this. What they have to do is
> get re-connected with what makes Amateur Radio
> an attractive thing to do. What I see them doing now
> is trying to defensively hold onto spectrum and other
> things by saying, "Hey, we're GREAT!" . . . but the
> fact is that no where near enough has been done of
> late to back that up. And, quite frankly, lowering the
> entrance requirements does NOT help here, at all, in
> the long run. The question has to be asked: What
> IS the "core experience" of Ham Radio? To me,
> part of that "core" is the long history of the avocation
> and connecting to it . . . and that includes CW.
>
>
> >They will have to become an organization of "ALL"
> >communications hobbyists, including CB'ers, FRS'ers,
> >SWL's, Marine HF/VHF users, in addition to radio
> >amateurs.
>
> Oh, wow, I think this would be an absolute disaster.
> No, amateur radio and the ARRL has to go the other
> way, BIG TIME, or it IS doomed.

Just what the devil do you mean "go...BIG TIME?"

> >They will have to somehow figure out a way to use what's
> >left of our VHF/UHF frequencies to develop a nationwide
> >system of "virtual" cell-phone service, available without
> >by-the-minute airtime charges, to augment our present
> >system of 2-way repeaters.
>
> This is trying to compete with Wal-Mart, in my view.

Agree! There is NO need to duplicate the service
aspects of cellphones.

> That is, Ham Radio will just get killed. And does Ham Radio
> have their airwaves to go into direct competition with the
> phone companies? No.

More to the point, ham radio is forbidden from directly
competing with commercial services.

> >They will have to clamp down totally on radio "badboys"
> >whomake frequencies unusable by sending violators
> >to jail and/or bankruptcy with stiff sentences and
> >collection of heavy fines.

>
> It looks like the FCC is now helping out here.

Yes, finally. ARRL pushed for that enforcement
for many years.

> >The only thing they won't do is retain the status
> >quo in our band/mode allocations. They will give away as
> >much present exclusive CW spectrum as possible to
> >expand HF phone. This is the big mistake.
>
> It will be if that's all they do, that's for sure.

There is NO CW exclusive spectrum in HF.

> >I'm afraid to say it, my friend, but you waited too long to get
> >involved in ham radio. You've missed out on the best days
> >it ever had, and ever will have. It's all downhill from here.
>
> Well, it could be.

Times change. You get from Ham Radio whatever you can.
Nothing anyone does today is the same as it was 10-20
years ago. The same is true for EVERY endeavor, every
hobby, every job.

> So much has changed over just the last
> decade and the current psychotic concern with the numbers
> (of Hams) has all the elements of target fixation. I just
> hope that the guys on the flight deck realize the problem
> BEFORE the ship augers in.

You assume there's a problem. None has been
clearly identified.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

329. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:40:07 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <rQuq8.12131$nt1.995164@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39647

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

>
> However, back to the grounded statement that most of us who have regaled
> against a pro-CW argument are reacting to the attitude of those pro-CW
folks
> who are just so miserable with life in general that the only thing they
have
> left is to hate.
>

I'm not sure what a "grounded statement" is, but the rest of your statement
is nonsense.

I am very pro-CW, and use the mode for more than half of my operating.

I'm not the least bit miserable with life in general -- in fact quite the
opposite,
there's almost nothing about my life I'd change. I'm healthy, have a great
family, a great occupation, great hobbies, and great friends. You can use
CW or not like CW -- I wouldn't hate you for either choice.

BTW, K0CKB and I spent several days in DFW area in early Feb and
again in early Mar. Called and listened for you on many different repeaters,
and asked around if anyone knew your operating habits. Just got a lot
of "don't know who that is". Can't remember any specific freqs, but we
were in Denton and Sanger vicinity, and areas south of there along I35W
to I20/I30.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

330. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:43:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8dtt8aop1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39649

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8bi3dnga1@208.206.142.88...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > ... this marginal growth
> > > trend will not increase, and it will, in fact, turn into a downward
> > > spiral all too soon.
> >
> > What ever happened to all those hordes of CBers who were
> > predicted to overrun the ARS?
>
> ***ONE MORE TIME*** -- THEY'RE ALREADY HERE!!!!

Why Dick, you're shouting.

One more time....If they are here already, just where
are they all hiding?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

331. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Example Continues

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:47:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8duvnbsq1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39552

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uai5qhg4g4bic0@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Just where did Cecil (CAM) state he wanted a "free ride
> >because of his non-Ham radio experience?"
>
> Don't I get the license to paraphrase? I'm a VETERAN!

Val,
Even as paraphrasing, I don't think anything Cecil ever
posted could be so paraphrased.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

332. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:47:52 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <IXuq8.12147$nt1.996608@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39650

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> Well, it's a wonder Larry hasn't jumped all over the callsign Hans had in
a
> post; I guess it must be his YL, K0CKB....whoa, I had to take a double
look
> at that one. Guess my mind is straight where Larry's is...in the gutter.

K0CKB is an astronomer, and she thinks I'm a real star. Gutter?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

333. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 03:51:54 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <u%uq8.1328$QC1.119088@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39551

Bill Sohl wrote:
>> FCC rulings are NOT the result of
>> popular opinion polls based on how
>> many commentors favor one outcome vs another.

Jim, N2EY, wrote:
> I would say that in many cases the majority opinion
> prevails, but the FCC is not bound to follow majority
> opinion in all cases. Majority opinion is a factor but
> not an absolute controlling factor.

Back not too long after the New Deal when I took my
two courses in Government in college, a lot of these
three-lettered Federal agencies (FCC, SEC, ICC, FTC,
etc) were described to me as being "quasi-judicial".
If my memory is correct, this description meant that
although they performed subsidiary functions of the
executive, legislative and judicial branches, their
primary approach to the matters within their purview
was to be deliberative and judicial. So it doesn't
come as a big surprise that they would tend to place
more weight on a logically valid point made by one
respondent than on a tenuous one put forth by an
army of respondents. It's not who has the most lawyers
in their courtroom but rather who has the better case.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

334. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:05:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAA7F7F.F6D1F8FB@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39553

I'vve been listening in on this cellphone thing, and I really need it explained to me; just exactly how are cellphones hurting the ARS?

- Mike - KB3EIA

Bill Sohl wrote:

> > There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
> > within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general. That is,
> > when Big Money moves in on you (and this is what has
> > happened to Ham Radio with the cell phones)
>
> "Big Money" moved in on ham radio...cellphones?
> What, another conspiracy. The advent and deployment of wireless
> telecommunications cared not a twit about any impact
> on ham radio. To describe cellphones as a big money
> move against ham radio is akin to suggesting the automobile
> was a big money invasion against casual hoseback riding.

335. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:10:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA80C7.4B5B999A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39554

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >> It is now clear that you believe that anyone who held an Extra before
> >> restructuring was bent on lording his "rank" over lower class licensees in
> >> some sort of a "caste" system.
>
> >Not "anyone", Dick, just hams like you.
>
> Let's put it to the test. Cecil, I am a pre-restructuring Extra. Do you
> believe that I am bent on lording my rank over other licensees in some sort of
> "caste" system?

Are you a ham like Dick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

336. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:10:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8dvgreqa1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39556

Mike,

They (cellphones) aren't hurting the ARS.

Bill K2UNK

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3CAA7F7F.F6D1F8FB@adelphia.net...
> I'vve been listening in on this cellphone thing, and I really need it
> explained to me; just exactly how are cellphones hurting the ARS?
>
> - Mike - KB3EIA
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > > There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
> > > within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general. That is,
> > > when Big Money moves in on you (and this is what has
> > > happened to Ham Radio with the cell phones)
> >
> > "Big Money" moved in on ham radio...cellphones?
> > What, another conspiracy. The advent and deployment of wireless
> > telecommunications cared not a twit about any impact
> > on ham radio. To describe cellphones as a big money
> > move against ham radio is akin to suggesting the automobile
> > was a big money invasion against casual hoseback riding.

337. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:12:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA8110.9DAEE659@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39555

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >You invented the "ham radio pecking order" so that you could work to
> >tear it down since you couldn't be at the top of the heap, having not
> >achieved the Extra license until the Grate Dumbdown.
>
> Cecil did not invent the present structure of ham radio, Dick; the FCC did.
> What the Commission decided to do is different than what Cecil asked them to
> do.

Yep, I asked for the elimination of all ham license classes except General.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

338. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:14:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8dvjvoqm0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 39557

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
> Which is precisely why we need to stop squandering our energy on meaningless
> squabbles about internal issues like how fast we can beep

If you hadn't noticed, the point isn't "how fast one can beep" at all,
rather whether or not one can "beep" at all.

339. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:17:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020402231728.00472.00000075@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 39559

In article <iUaq8.9418$ml2.741051@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>
>> BTW -- I've been in a lot of ham radio stores, past and present, and
>> don't recall a single one of them having a coffee pot to hang out at --
>> but they usually did have a manager who didn't want you taking
>> up his valuable floor space unless you had your credit card in hand!
>
>Next time you're in Mounds View, MN stop in at "Radio City",
>or the next time you're in Watertown, SD stop in at Burghardts.
>Both stores will brew you up a fresh pot if the current one is
>too stale for your refined Eastern taste buds.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

I can only hope that some day I will have the opportunity to drop
in for a visit at Radio City and Burghardt's. I will greatly appreciate
whatever hospitality they offer -- it will be a welcome change from
my usual experiences.

73 de Larry, K3LT

340. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:17:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020402231729.00472.00000076@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 39558

In article <3CAA1449.47FF745D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Valentine Germann wrote:
>> ... And "B" is for "Bubba,"
>> I guess. It sure as hell could be a lot WORSE!
>
>All you need is naughty phonetics to get another endless
>"ARS is headed for destruction" thread going. The 'B'
>could stand for 'Boobs' just to get it started.

Cecil:

KC0MUB is Val's sequentially-issued call sign; he did not select it
for himself. Kim, OTOH, deliberately choose W5TIT as a Vanity
Call Sign, for the express purpose of calling attention to herself and
and what she considers to be her extraordinary secondary sexual
characteristics, for the purpose of her amusement at the reactions
of other hams, and to offer her the opportunity to respond with
righteous indignation when the reaction is, predictably, negative.

I have no doubt that if Val chooses to select a Vanity call sign,
it will be one which is both distinctive and wholly appropriate for
the family-oriented nature of the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

341. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:17:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020402231730.00472.00000077@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 39560

In article <uak3qfh30ftdb9@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>
>Yes, I went out and checked after seeing your
>message and, ulp, there it was. I like the "KC"
>part, which means "Kansas City" around here;
>and I like the "MU" part, which means "Missouri
>University" around here. And "B" is for "Bubba,"
>I guess. It sure as hell could be a lot WORSE!
>
>Val
>KC0MUB

Val:

I do not usually "congratulate" people for passing their No-code
Tech test and getting a license; I feel that to do so is insulting to
the intelligence of someone who is capable of achieving far more
challenging and important things. I will, however, welcome you
to the ranks of Amateur Radio Operators, knowing full well that
you have the attitude which will permit you to achieve Amateur
Extra Class with ease and without complaint, and that you will
embrace a wide range of modes.

At the same time, and keeping everything said above in mind,
I wish to belatedly congratulate Kim Walker, W5TIT, for passing
her ham radio tests and becoming a ham! I feel that this is a
remarkable achievement for her, and that she must feel very
proud of having accomplished what must have been, for her, an
extremely challenging and difficult task! It is unfortunate that
you will never progress any further than Technician, Kim, but
at least you got that far, and can at least call yourself a ham
radio operator! Congratulations, Kim -- I'm sure very few people
would have guessed that you had it in you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

342. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:18:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA827B.C28307C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39561

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > I don't think it says "Extra lite" on your license, Mike. Betcha it says
> > > "Extra", just like mine.
> >
> > Please tell that to the troublemaking hams who are doing everything in
> > their power to preserve their pecking order.
>
> Tell us, Cecil, in what way has your on-air operation been hindered or
> effected?

I'm impeckable, Dave.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

343. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:19:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8dvso$pn0$0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 39562

Bill Sohl wrote:
> The
> reality of cellphones is that they have never been a
> competitor of ham radio.
>

Reall(t)y?? What planet was that on? Not planet Earth. Cellphones very definitely have shrunk the shack-on-the-belt crowd.

344. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:20:20 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <8qvq8.12223$nt1.1001243@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39563

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> I'vve been listening in on this cellphone thing, and I really need it
> explained to me; just exactly how are cellphones hurting the ARS?

There's no longer a need for a 2-meter repeater/autopatch so
you can call your wife to see if you should get bred on the way
home.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

345. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:20:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8dvua$pn0$1@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 39564

Bill Sohl wrote:
>

If they are here already, just where
> are they all hiding?
>

Under your nose!

346. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:23:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8e03i$pn0$2@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 39565

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> > Well, it's a wonder Larry hasn't jumped all over the callsign Hans had in
> a
> > post; I guess it must be his YL, K0CKB....whoa, I had to take a double
> look
> > at that one. Guess my mind is straight where Larry's is...in the gutter.
>
> K0CKB is an astronomer, and she thinks I'm a real star. Gutter?
>

Don't waste attention on the TIT twit. She keeps looking at other
callsigns, hoping against hope that she'll find someone else as stoopid
as she is.

347. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:30:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAA7763.FA9C589D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39566

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CA74A42.E2EDEAAC@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > Amateur radio is not a company.
> > >
> > > Exactly! Amateur radio is a hobby and for that reason, the present
> pecking
> > > order within ham radio has absolutely no valid reason to exist.
> >
> > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> > States should become a radio amateur.
>
> Why not? We even have non-citizens with US licenses.

Now we do. That was not formerly possible. As to the why not portion,
why not think about what was stated and see if you can develop an answer
for your question after thorough pondering?

Dave K8MN

348. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:31:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA858F.D8876466@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39567

Mike Coslo wrote:
> I've been listening in on this cellphone thing, and I really need it
> explained to me; just exactly how are cellphones hurting the ARS?

Many hams once used repeater phone patches. That was the only reason
some of them had transceivers in their vehicles. I haven't heard
a repeater phone patch in a long time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

349. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:34:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAA8659.FECCB84B@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39568

My xyl tells me if I stop to get bred on the way home, I'm in BIG
trouble. 8^)

- Mike -

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> > I'vve been listening in on this cellphone thing, and I really need it
> > explained to me; just exactly how are cellphones hurting the ARS?
>
> There's no longer a need for a 2-meter repeater/autopatch so
> you can call your wife to see if you should get bred on the way
> home.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

350. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:34:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8e0pisti0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 39569

K7JEB wrote:
>

So it doesn't
> come as a big surprise that they would tend to place
> more weight on a logically valid point made by one
> respondent than on a tenuous one put forth by an
> army of respondents.

Certainly not, but the main point is that they are not obligated to base their decisions on any viewpoint whatever other than their own. I believe it quite likely they decided to drop code testing to 5wpm for all mainly to rid themselves of the medical waiver problem. The fact that so much whining was going on only reinforced it.

351. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:35:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA8689.E9E52C1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39570

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Kim, OTOH, deliberately choose W5TIT as a Vanity
> Call Sign, for the express purpose of calling attention to herself ...

Actually, Kim obtained that callsign on a dare.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

352. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:37:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAA8725.495F236A@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39571

I still use ours from time to time. One of my other hobbies takes me away from any cell phone towers, and I occasionally have to dig myself out. So the old ht comes in pretty handy up there in the mountains.

But I'm not sure that the numbers jibe with the competition idea.

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > I've been listening in on this cellphone thing, and I really need it
> > explained to me; just exactly how are cellphones hurting the ARS?
>
> Many hams once used repeater phone patches. That was the only reason
> some of them had transceivers in their vehicles. I haven't heard
> a repeater phone patch in a long time.

353. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:38:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA8749.44C55FF7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39572

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> If they are here already, just where
> > are they all hiding?
>
> Under your nose!

Hordes of microscopic CBers are hiding under Bill's nose?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

354. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:40:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402234039.22643.00000222@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 39573

In article <20020402175019.08023.00001559@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
>>> 1st, they are helping to populate the VHF/UHF bands,
>>> which makes those bands less vulnerable to spectrum
>>> grabs by other interests.
>
>>If ya don't use.... ya lose 'em! No-coders and Coders both should be
>>utilizing these bands.
>
>Most of those using 2 meters have passed a code test.
>
>Almost all of those using 1200 MHz and above have passed a code test.

Oh? Where is that written for verification?

Can you hear the Southern California VHF-UHF-low-microwave transmissions up there in Connecticutt? :-)

355. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:40:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402234041.22643.00000223@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 39574

In article <20020402215022.19095.00001669@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Once again Lennie delves into subject matter that he has neither
>practical experience or up-to-date information...

I come here for "up-to-date myth and fantasy" from ol Steebie. :-)

>>Not really, not even in amateur radio. It's a nice myth to foster,
>>but the "involvement in amateur radio" is limited to the beginnings
>>of MARS.
>
> Leonard H. Anderson is once again lying. Period. It's no myth and the
>"involvement" of ALL branches of the Armed Forces is far more than "just" the
>creation of MARS.

Sorry, Steebie, the US military has outgrown amateurism by so much that it isn't worth mentioning. MARS is a drop in a very large bucket as far as US military communications goes.

>>>And, as you say, by the
>>>1980 period one of the items that hams had pioneered, mobile
>>>communications for civilians, began to be taken on by the Big Boys.
>>
>>Total myth. "Mobile communications for civilians" was worked out
>>by corporations before WW2.
>
> Absolutely a stinging, bald face falsehood.

I need to correct it according to the following quotes from the IEEE since the first police radio, one-way, was developed at the Detroit PD and thus were sponsored by a city government organization.

> Mobile radio communications WERE >>PIONEERED<< by Amateur Radio
>operators. Period. To try and state otherwise is stupid.

See, you don't have your references handy. Do a search for "Thomas H. White" and go to those pages for a real history documentation effort.

Quoting from the "Milestones" listing of the IEEE History Center.

One-Way Police Radio Communication, 1928
Detroit, MI Dedicated May 1987 - IEEE Southeastern Michigan Section

At this site on April 7, 1928 the Detroit Police Department commenced regular one-way radio communication with its patrol cars. Developed by personnel of the department's radio bureau, the system was the product of seven years of experimentation under the direction of police commissioner, William P. Rutledge. Their work proved the practicality of land-mobile radio for police work and led to its adoption throughout the country.

Two-Way Police Radio Communication, 1933
Bayonne, NJ Dedicated May 1987 - IEEE North Jersey Section

In 1933, the police department in Bayonne, New Jersey initiated regular two-way communications with its patrol cars, a major advance over previous one-way systems. The very high frequency system developed by radio engineer Frank A. Gunther and station operator Vincent J. Doyle placed transmitters in patrol cars to enable patrolmen to communicate with headquarters and other cars instead of just receiving calls. Two-way police radio became standard throughout the country following the success of the Bayonne system.

FM Police Radio Communication, 1940
Hartford, CT Dedicated June 1987 - IEEE Connecticut Section

A major advance in police radio occurred in 1940 when the Connecticut state police began operating a two-way, frequency modulated (FM) system in Hartford. The statewide system developed by Daniel E. Noble of the University of Connecticut and engineers at the Fred M. Link Company greatly reduced static, the main problem of the amplitude modulated (AM) system. FM mobile radio became standard throughout the country following the success of the Connecticut system.

------- end quote

If it's "stupid" then you should immediately go to the IEEE website
and tell all those "stupid" folks off!

Of course, today's police, fire, other public safety radios still use
FM over 60 years later. Oh, and Hartford, CT, is just a whoop
and a holler from Newington, CT, isn't it? :-)

>>See Motorola and others for getting
>>mobile radio in public safety vehicles in the late 1930s. Mobile FM
>>on VHF was pioneered in armored cavalry during WW2. Horse
>>cavalry had a "horsepack" radio in 1932 (operate dismounted) and
>>a mounted horse-mobile radio in 1935.
>
> See numerous OTHER publications (yes...some of them from the League) that
>show Amateurs attempting various "mobile" and "portable" communications in the
>19-teens and early 20's.

The PDs trying out two-way radio and the US military going after
portable/mobile radio were not "attempting," they were successfully
doing.

The US Army Signal Corps had an airborne spark transmitter with
100 W output in 1918, about the same size as an EE-8 field
telephone. Considering the airplane technology of WW One, that
was pretty good.

>>The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 Code of Federal
>>Regulations is a regulatory term denoting type and kind of radio
>>activity. It is legal language and does NOT pertain to "military
>>service" in any possible way.
>
> The Coward Anderson does anything he can to try and dissuade himself from
>believing that Amateur Radio DOES provide a SERVICE to the citizens of the
>United States.

I just offered the definitions...once again...Phil Kane hasn't
objected to giving that definition before. :-)

Is the Citizens Band Radio SERVICE a "service?" How about
the Family Radio SERVICE? How about any Personal
Communication SERVICE?

Last year a group of climbers got stranded on Mount Ranier in
Washington. Their rescue was started by using FRS handie-
talkies linking up with a schoolgirl (who did not have any sort
of radio license).

> This is because Coward Anderson is also a fool.

I don't know who you are talking about. :-) My given name
is not "Coward." It's not even "Howard." :-)

>>If you want to "energize" something, avoid putting bunny
>>batteries into a time machine and going back to 1930 and
>>trying to foist off seven decades old myths and jingoism in this
>>new millenium.
>
> Or you could try shoving them up Lennie's butt and getting him to pay
>attention to real-life Amateur Radio...NOT the "utopia" of nerd-infested IEEE
>that he'd LIKE to believe it "ought" to be.

Now, now, Steebie, take your lithium like a good little patient... we'll
have you out of that jacket in no time...

356. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:42:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA881B.961B254D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39575

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I
> believe it quite likely they decided to drop code testing to 5wpm for
> all mainly to rid themselves of the medical waiver problem. The fact
> that so much whining was going on only reinforced it.

Maybe, and guess who was doing the whining.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

357. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:44:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020402234411.13698.00001984@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39576

>Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/02/02 15:59 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020402155902.23265.00000032@mb-ck.aol.com>

>>1) Amateur radio is not a hobby to the FCC. It's a radio service.
>
>The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory
>term denoting a type and kind of radio activity. Part 97 defines
>amateur radio as a radio activity without pecuniary interest, thus
>qualifying "amateur" as the opposite of "professional."

Contrary to your adamant rants to the contrary, it IS a radio SERVICE...A
service IS performed...Just as it is in the Broadcast SERVICE, The Citizens
radio SERVICE, the Common Carrier SERVICE, etc.

Please cite a radio SERVICE that does not meet SOME need, ergo a SERVICE
to persons in particular or the nation as a whole.

>Not a good analogy.

Thank you Mr. Webster.

>>4) The purposes and goals of the ARS are different from other services, and
>> so the license requirements are different. If there were no difference,
>> there would be no reason to have a separate service.
>
>Non-argument pertaining to nothing. In the dim, dark past of early
>radio the ONLY way to communicate anything in ALL of radio was
>by means of on-off (of RF) codings.

It is an arument. A solid one. One youa re trying to ignore and channel
solely into the "Code test" issue, which is a non-issue.

>Amateur radio is one of several "personal communication" radio
>services regulated by the FCC in the USA. It is defined as strictly
>"non-pecuniary" therefore it is an avocation, not an occupation. An
>avocationary activity is a hobby.

You attempt to negate Amateur Radio's SERVICE value by the fact that no
"pecuniary interest" is involved.

Pretty thin and pretty stupid. I have dedicated thousands of hours to
various organizations for which I received NO renumeration, and in which human
lives were saved. Since I didn't get "paid" for it, does that make the
services I rendered of no value?

>>5) Your statement was: "An objective view of Morse code's relative
>> importance in the world of the 21st century is what is missing."
>> Nothing about tests or even ham radio.
>
>An objective view of morse code importance cannot be carried out
>by one who is admittedly subjective on both the subject of morse
>code testing and morse code use.

You try to make Morse Code testing the ONLY issue. Again, both thin and
stupid.

>In entering this new millenium it should be obvious that only
>amateur radio and some maritime radio services require any
>morse code ability whatsoever.

Oooooh Lennie! A SERIOUS backpeddle! You have ADAMANTLY stated that
there was NO use for Morse Code in more than one thread!

>>6) The fact that hams use Morse code in the 21st century means Morse code is
>> part of 21st century radio and the world of the 21st century. The fact
>> that lots of hams use Morse code means it's a big, important part of ham
>> radio in the 21st century.
>
>Incorrect on the "big, important part of ham radio." That is a
>subjective viewpoint. In the USA the FCC has not mandated
>USE of morse code modes in amateur radio for years.

Incorrect on YOUR "incorrect", Lennie. This is because YOU are subjective
on the Morse Code testing issue and the Morse Code issue ONLY, and are
completely IGNORANT of other issues within Amateur Radio as a whole.

As usual.

>Either. Subjective morsemen have been advertising the 1912
>Titanic ship disaster for years. 1912 is 90 years ago. There
>is no longer any need for maritime vessels to carry morse mode
>radio equipment operating on the 500 KHz International Maritime
>Distress frequency.

Actually, 500kHz is not the only frequency for which emergency traffic is
passed or initiated, in Morse Code or any other mode. Suggest you familiarize
yourself with CURRENT maritime practice before making ignorant assertions.

>The FCC has radio services specifically for "fun" (hobby) activities

Depending on how you care to "define" the broadcast services, there is NO
radio service exclusively for "fun", Lennie.

Subparts of Part 95 allow for the hobby use of rf emitters for the remote
control of models, however even that subpart is not EXCLUSIVELY about "models".

Again, a suggestion is made that you familiarize yourself with CURRENT
regulations before inserting your fungus-laden foot into your sewer-like mouth
in public.

>See the Citizens Band
>radio service and the Family Radio service. Those are regulations
>to mitigate RF interference but they are strictly for recreational
>activities.

Oh? Please cite the paragraph from ANY FCC rule or regulation that states
ANY service regulated by the FCC is "strictly for recreational activities".

>Since amateur radio is a non-pecuniary radio activity
>engaged by individuals, that activity cannot be described as anything
>more than an avocation, a hobby, something done for FUN.

Actually, a radio service that MAY be used for fun, but may also be used
for experimentation, emergency service, health and welfare, etc etc etc.

In OTHER words, it provides a SERVICE to the individual in particular or
the nation as a whole.

>The US federal government has a number of agencies administering
>to recreational activities. The US Forest Service does that with
>millions of acres of park land set aside from commercial use and
>maintained for the enjoyment of citizens. Note: Recreation is
>for fun, for enjoyment.

Duly noted. What's your point? Amateur Radio is to be regulated by the
USFS from now on? Otherwise, you just wasted bandwidth on an idiotic
"anaology".

>>There you go.
>
>There you went again, being terribly subjective.

There goes Lennie the Licenseless again...trying to subdue taht windmill.

358. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:47:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8e1h2$20u$0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 39577

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CA74A42.E2EDEAAC@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > Amateur radio is not a company.
> > > >
> > > > Exactly! Amateur radio is a hobby and for that reason, the present
> > pecking
> > > > order within ham radio has absolutely no valid reason to exist.
> > >
> > > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> > > States should become a radio amateur.
> >
> > Why not? We even have non-citizens with US licenses.
>
> Now we do. That was not formerly possible. As to the why not portion,
> why not think about what was stated and see if you can develop an answer
> for your question after thorough pondering?
>

For Brian, pondering hurts.
```

359. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 04:58:57 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8etef4mi3@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39754

How about Requires Frequent Interaction??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020402174209.08023.00001554@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >Now, just a darned minute here! That makes THREE
> >irregular usages. . . oh, wait a second . . . OK. :-)
>
> Now, if you can think of any cute phonetics for my call, let me know.
>
> I have had a few suggestions already -- Really Fine Individual.
>
> In response to some of my posts, it has been Real Flaming Idiot and a few
> variations on that theme. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

360. An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:02:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403000255.13715.00001794@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39578

In another thread, Leonard H. Anderson, allegedly once a "professional" in the radio electronics field, made the following really stupid assertion:

QUOTE:

The FCC has radio services specifically for "fun" (hobby) activities. See Part 95, Title 47 CFR, and specific radio control of model craft on several bands, including a 72 MHz band specifically designated for telecommand purposes. See the Citizens Band radio service and the Family Radio service. Those are regulations to mitigate RF interference but they are strictly for recreational activities. Since amateur radio is a non-pecuniary radio activity engaged by individuals, that activity cannot be described as anything more than an avocation, a hobby, something done for FUN.

UNQUOTE.

I will now ask you to please cite the specific FCC rule or regulation that restricts ANY radio service or activity to STRICTLY (your adjective, not anyone else's) recreational pursuits.

I have read both Part 97 and Part 95 thoroughly, and I cannot locate a single "ferinstance" that MANDATES recreational applications only of either service. While I wholheartedly agree that both MAY be used for recreational purposes, no where is it mandated. Even those SUBparts of Part 95 relating to radio remote control do not "mandate" that thier application was intended for "recreational" use only. I can, legally, operate a remote control device to, say, flash a roadside sign for a burger joint.

I am, on the otherhand, specifically aware of persons using FRS and "CB" in the furtherance of thier commercial concerns. Shall I notify Mr. Hollingsworth, or did the big, bad PROFESSIONAL radioman stick his foot in it just ONE MORE TIME?

Just wondering, Lennie, since YOU spend significant bandwidth picking others posts apart for word-by-word critiques, I must assume you hold yourself up to the same "standards".

(By the way...I know you NEVER would [set a standard for yourself], but I just wanna see how you snivvel out of THIS one, Your Putziness....)

Have a Nice Freakin' Day, Lennie

Steve

361. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:05:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAA8D82.C96A8BAD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39579

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> Contrary to your adamant rants to the contrary, it IS a radio SERVICE...A
> service IS performed...Just as it is in the Broadcast SERVICE, The Citizens
> radio SERVICE, the Common Carrier SERVICE, etc.

I do believe that "service" used in this context only denotes
"an administrative division", i.e. the FCC administers
the various administrative divisions of radio spectrum.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

362. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:06:32 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8eteo5mi3@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39751

What about people in rental or leasing situations? It is almost like saying
home ownership is a prerequiste.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> I'm sure there are other examples, but the above two examples are people
> that I personally know.
>
> Do we just tell them "Kim says tough shit -- deal with it."?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>

363. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:09:18 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8etev6mi3@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39752

They cannot put that one on me Cecil.... I am the antithesis of that arguement. I came from the SWL and scanner world. Never put my hands on a CB microphone until after I had my license, as I rode in a car one time with someone who had one.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA93E28.63A00321@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > ... this marginal growth
> > trend will not increase, and it will, in fact, turn into a downward
> > spiral all too soon.
>
> What ever happened to all those hordes of CBers who were
> predicted to overrun the ARS?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

364. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:10:03 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8etf77mi3@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39600

And have been since the 50's and 60's!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8bi3dnga1@208.206.142.88...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > ... this marginal growth
> > > trend will not increase, and it will, in fact, turn into a downward
> > > spiral all too soon.
> >
> > What ever happened to all those hordes of CBers who were
> > predicted to overrun the ARS?
>
>
>
> ***ONE MORE TIME*** -- THEY'RE ALREADY HERE!!!!

365. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:15:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403001540.13715.00001798@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39580

>Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/02/02 23:40 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020402234041.22643.00000223@mb-de.aol.com>

>Sorry, Steebie, the US military has outgrown amateurism by so
>much that it isn't worth mentioning. MARS is a drop in a very
>large bucket as far as US military communications goes.

That's not what was said.

Two-stepping again, Your Cowardness?

>Quoting from the "Milestones" listing of the IEEE History Center.

Nice reading, Lennie....Still not inclusive. QST and other radio related publications of the era go back even further. I found them...you can too....

>See, you don't have your references handy. Do a search for
>"Thomas H. White" and go to those pages for a real history
>documentation effort.

YOU need references on other than JUST "preofessional" radio, Your Uninformedness. Sorry.

(Cites Lennie provided all good reading, however NOT "all-inclusive" of history of the era)

>If it's "stupid" then you should immediately go to the IEEE website
>and tell all those "stupid" folks off!

No. Lennie...What's STUPID is that you try to make an argument on a subject for which you obviously do not have a thourough preparation for. Your references are good reading, but again, are NOT "all-inclusive" of the era.

Hams DID help pioneer portable and mobile radio communications.

I KNOW you don't like it, but "oh well".....

>Is the Citizens Band Radio SERVICE a "service?" How about
>the Family Radio SERVICE? How about any Personal
>Communication SERVICE?

If the person operating the radio derives a certain amount of utility from the availability of the radio and it's necessary spectrum allocations, then YES, it IS a "service".

>Last year a group of climbers got stranded on Mount Ranier in
>Washington. Their rescue was started by using FRS handie-

>talkies linking up with a schoolgirl (who did not have any sort
>of radio license).

Then a certain degree of utility WAS derived from the radios, and hence a SERVICE was rendered. I am sure the hikers were NOT having fun at that point in time.

>Now, now, Steebie, take your lithium like a good little patient... we'll
>have you out of that jacket in no time...

I have no doubt you wish me in one...then I could not so-easily tear apart your rants.

Sorry about that.

Steve

366. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:21:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403002130.13715.00001799@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39581

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/02/02 14:03 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020402140351.28502.00000222@mb-mt.aol.com>

>The question next is how Steebie "knows" all about an engineering
>environment and "working up" when all he admits to doing is
>becoming a purchasing agent...within the last couple of years.

Once again, The Lying Ham-baiting Antagonist is NOT up to speed on current events...

Not that one would expect such.

Rest of responsibility-dodging rant snipped.

Steve

367. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:22:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403002254.13715.00001800@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39582

>Subject: Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 04/02/02 16:58 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3CAA2997.32CDB572@IEEE.org>

>She was the best thing that ever happened to Star Trek and
>almost convinced me to become a Borg.

You're not?

Steve

368. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:27:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403002738.13715.00001803@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39583

>Subject: Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB
>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 04/02/02 22:08 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3caa749c_2@newsa.ev1.net>

Note time of Kim's post.

>"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020402140138.19103.00001576@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> >Subject: Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB
>> >From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>> >Date: 04/02/02 10:48 Eastern Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <uajjkss3r4t628@corp.supernews.com>

Note time of my post.

OK. Thnaks Kim....I was in slow-time-warp mode, I guess...!

88
Steve, K4YZ

369. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:31:56 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8etfm8mi3@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39598

What about people who weren't aware of ham radio until (what we need as a hobby need to do more of) someone introduced it to him? In order for the test to be considered dumbed down or the person lazy, they would have had to have had prior knowledge of what was going on before he jumped into the boat. What about an 18 year old that gets licensed right now? Some of the problems that have created the situations that people like Dick are complaining about happened before the 18 year old was born. These alleged problems in ham radio are the product of laziness of hams over the past 50 years. The laziness of sitting back and allowing it to happen instead of being proactive and not just hoping a four letter organization is going to do all the work to keep the hobby the exact way they wished it be. Did they ever write letters to elected officials? Did they do other POSITIVE PROMOTIAL activities? Some *may* have but many more haven't and that is why ham radio is the way it is. Can you imagine a mailing campaign where if even half of the licensed hams wrote a letter to their elected officials and the FCC at least once a month for the next 12 months stating their intentions of what they wanted ham radio to be? Sounds like it would drive them nuts!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CAA14FA.63D9F8CD@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > I'm looking forward to making up for very late start, ...
>
> There's no way to do that, Val. You will be forever considered
> to be a lazy knuckle-dragger who waited for dumbed-down exams
> before entering amateur radio.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

370. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:31:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403003158.13715.00001806@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39584

>Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 04/03/02 00:05 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3CAA8D82.C96A8BAD@IEEE.org>

>I do believe that "service" used in this context only denotes
>"an administrative division", i.e. the FCC administers
>the various administrative divisions of radio spectrum.

Please cite the "administrative division" that does NOT provide some
degree of utility to the user, hence is a SERVICE to the user?

73

Steve, K4YZ

371. Re: March Top Ten

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:38:50 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8etft9mi3@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39599

How about a top 20??? I may actually make that one.... Just kidding, don't
really care either way.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> wrote in
message news:yubq8.9583$ml2.749763@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> [519] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 15.9%
> [353] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 10.8%
> [318] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 9.7%
> [228] Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> 7.0%
> [173] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 5.3%
> [160] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.9%
> [154] Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> 4.7%
> [150] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 4.6%
> [124] Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> 3.8%
> [118] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.6%
>
>
>
>

372. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:43:49 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8etg30mi3@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39753

Ed... I was just saying, regardless of licensure.. all of us should be using these bands in some form or another, be it morse code, digital modes or voice.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020402175019.08023.00001559@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >> 1st, they are helping to populate the VHF/UHF bands,
> >> which makes those bands less vulnerable to spectrum
> >> grabs by other interests.
>
> >If ya don't use.... ya lose 'em! No-coders and Coders both should be
> >utilizing these bands.
>
> Most of those using 2 meters have passed a code test.
>
> Almost all of those using 1200 MHz and above have passed a code test.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>

373. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 05:57:56 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ual5dahhhqviea@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39585

Dave Heil wrote:

>Congrats and welcome, Val!
>Will look forward to a CW QSO soon.

Thanks! I'm looking forward to that, too!

Val

374. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 06:00:16 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ual5hn99am7i17@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39586

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>I will, however, welcome you to the ranks of Amateur
>Radio Operators, knowing full well that you have the
>attitude which will permit you to achieve Amateur
>Extra Class with ease and without complaint, and
>that you will embrace a wide range of modes.

Thanks! I hope to do some things that are interesting
and of some local value. Thanks, again!

Val

375. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 06:01:33 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ual5k768kl6b39@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39587

Bert Craig wrote:

>W0RSE, that call's taken. <ggg>

Yeah, and I bet it was auctioned off, for
the BIG bucks!

Val

376. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 06:05:16 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ual5r2reheg96@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39588

Valentine Germann wrote:

>"Radio Frequency Interference"

I mean this in a GOOD way. That is, your work
includes finding ways to ameliorate interference
problems, I think?

Val

377. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 06:09:59 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ual6479qdn53fa@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39589

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote::

>Four simple steps:
>
>Step 1) Open the FCC rules to paragraph 97.1.
>
>Step 2) Decide which of the 5 items (a, b, c, d, or e) is an
>area where you can make a real contribution which increases
>the PICON value of amateur radio.
>
>Step 3) Focus on that purpose. Brainstorm. Write an article.
>Put on a program at your club. Whatever, just GO FOR IT!
>
>Step 4) When you burn out, return to Step 1.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

I certainly intend to do something very much like this, in
part, as an amateur radio license holder. That is, I am now,
and have been, very much aware of the public policy dimension
to the ARS and the need to keep that in mind.

Val

378. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 06:18:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CAA9EBF.FE405E97@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39591

>
> From the AH0A website on amateur statistics, end of March
> 2000 to end of March 2002, the number of NEW licensees in
> each class were:
>
> Technician: 38,362
> General: 1868
> Extra: 419
>
> The ratio of New Technician to New General plus New Extra
> was 16.77:1. Note that these are NEW licensees, not
> "upgraders."

Well, I would not expect many unlicensed people walking into a VE session and going for extra. I would expect more upgrades as being normal.

The new general/extra's are likely people with elmers who are mainly HF operators. And thus got the HF DX "bug". Since I got my extra lite :-) I do most of my hamming on HF.

379. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 06:26:28 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ual72q7e6uts37@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39590

N2EY wrote, a lot of interesting material, including:

>The ARS has to justify itself every day. That's something
>many hams deny or forget.

Very true, on both counts, and justifiably so!

>The ARRL leadership obviously thinks that fighting the code
> test battle now is a waste of resources. FCC's position is
>clear, and not going to be changed by repeating the same
>arguments given in connection with the restructuring. Time
>to move on to other issues.

In the interests of peace in the valley, I will let the subject
drop.

>Sure they have a say - Kenwood was repeatedly quoted by
>the FCC in the R&O. All interested parties have a say. Their
>say is "make the licenses more accessible".

Exactly.

>Sure. So how do we attract the "right" sort of people?

Let's not go there now since the goal is to move on.

>It has been my experience that the biggest barrier to recruitment
>is simple lack of good publicity. People just don't know ham radio
>even exists, or they confuse it with cb, or they think it disappeared
>years ago. This is not a new problem, either.

No, it's not, and that publicity lack is real, without a doubt.

>Congrats again. See you on the bands.

Soon, I hope!

Val

380. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 06:31:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CAAA1AC.C4D63E23@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39592

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Kim, OTOH, deliberately choose W5TIT as a Vanity
> > Call Sign, for the express purpose of calling attention to herself ...
>
> Actually, Kim obtained that callsign on a dare.
> --

And I thought that she was a birdwatcher..... :-)

381. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 06:50:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CAAA61A.D88D6BFE@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39593

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> At the same time, and keeping everything said above in mind,
> I wish to belatedly congratulate Kim Walker, W5TIT, for passing
> her ham radio tests and becoming a ham! I feel that this is a
> remarkable achievement for her, and that she must feel very
> proud of having accomplished what must have been, for her, an
> extremely challenging and difficult task! It is unfortunate that
> you will never progress any further than Technician, Kim, but
> at least you got that far, and can at least call yourself a ham
> radio operator! Congratulations, Kim -- I'm sure very few people
> would have guessed that you had it in you!

Kim, you'll just have to study for and get your extra.....

382. Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 08:36:40 UTC
From: inglem@pobox.removespam.com
Message-ID: <sazq8.13619$TG6.1924777@bin5.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 39594
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Fast-scan ham TV should have an exemption for incidental music, where the music is not the intended purpose of the transmission. For example, I can show a home video to a friend on ATV - unless it is a wedding video or a birthday video, because those have incidental music. This is dumb and arbitrary.

Or, what if you connect a video game console to an ATV transmitter. If you build an interface to send the control inputs back over another radio channel, hams in several locations could play a multiplayer game. This cannot be done over the Internet unless the game is specifically written for it, but it could be done over ATV. The only thing preventing it is that the game might play music, and we aren't supposed to have even incidental music. Again, dumb and arbitrary. Model plane and rocket video are allowed.

I understand some countries do have an exemption like this. Has anyone ever petitioned for one in the States?

Mike KG6KRF

383. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 10:32:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403053244.01951.00001649@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 39595

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>>"Radio Frequency Interference"
>
>
>I mean this in a GOOD way. That is, your work
>includes finding ways to ameliorate interference
>problems, I think?

Yes, it does, Val. That is why I got the call. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

384. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 10:33:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403053358.01951.00001650@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 39596

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> So beginning right now,
>you are in the PLONK filter where you've belonged all along, right there
>with Loose Lennie, The TIT and B.Burke AKA The Gadfly.

Can you tell me how I can make the list?

:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

385. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 10:37:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403053741.01951.00001651@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 39597

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

> But, I hardly feel it worth the effort to get all
>upset about *all* the spectrum when lots of it is little used.

The 2 M band was little used when I was first licensed in 1963.

>Indeed, I'd "be willing" to let the Gigs go to keep 2M, ya know
>what I mean?

How about 2400 MHz? How about 70 cm? How about HF? The latter is under indirect pressure by those who want to do various types of high-speed networking over residential telephone and electrical wiring.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

386. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 13:16:09 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CAB0099.679E9D2F@psu.edu>
Source record: 39755

If that's the only reason they had ht's and their licenses, then that's
not really all that bad a thing that they went away if they did.

- Mike - KB3EIA

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > The
> > reality of cellphones is that they have never been a
> > competitor of ham radio.
> >
>
> Reall(t)y?? What planet was that on? Not planet Earth. Cellphones very
> definitely have shrunk the shack-on-the-belt crowd.

387. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 13:27:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB033C.2A988AB7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39756

KC8PMX wrote:
> Can you imagine a mailing campaign where if
> even half of the licensed hams wrote a letter to their elected officials and
> the FCC at least once a month for the next 12 months stating their
> intentions of what they wanted ham radio to be? Sounds like it would drive
> them nuts!

It would drive then nuts trying to resolve 100,000 conflicting opinions.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

388. Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 13:28:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB038C.6B7E6BA0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39757

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: How hams pass test (ARRL Poll results)
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 04/02/02 16:58 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3CAA2997.32CDB572@IEEE.org>
>
> >She was the best thing that ever happened to Star Trek and
> >almost convinced me to become a Borg.
>
> You're not?

Nope, I couldn't talk her into assimilating me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

389. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 13:35:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB051A.2314169@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39758

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 04/03/02 00:05 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3CAA8D82.C96A8BAD@IEEE.org>
>
> >I do believe that "service" used in this context only denotes
> >"an administrative division", i.e. the FCC administers
> >the various administrative divisions of radio spectrum.
>
> Please cite the "administrative division" that does NOT provide some
> degree of utility to the user, hence is a SERVICE to the user?

Point is that the service is performed *by the FCC for the citizens*
who are members of the "service". The ARS is serviced (administered)
by the FCC. The ARS is not serviced (administered) by its members.
There is no *requirement* for members of the ARS to perform service.
Some members of the ARS are inactive and own no ham equipment.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

390. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 13:40:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB065A.3E17071C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39759

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > So beginning right now,
> >you are in the PLONK filter where you've belonged all along, right there
> >with Loose Lennie, The TIT and B.Burke AKA The Gadfly.
>
> Can you tell me how I can make the list? :-)

Apparently, if you incessantly hammer at gross irrationality.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

391. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 15:08:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAB0CC5.C8F4D2CF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39760

CAM wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > > So beginning right now,
> > >you are in the PLONK filter where you've belonged all along, right there
> > >with Loose Lennie, The TIT and B.Burke AKA The Gadfly.
> >
> > Can you tell me how I can make the list? :-)
>
> Apparently, if you incessantly hammer at gross irrationality.

Pro or con?

Dave K8MN

392. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 15:12:33 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CAB1BE2.182E550C@psu.edu>
Source record: 39761

Valentine Germann wrote:

> FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
> by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
> competition this can be effective. However, code testing
> has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
> supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
> FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
> non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
> and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did)
> and thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd,
> well, things might have been more interesting. However,
> it appears to me now that since there was serious desire
> to scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!), FISTS,
> or any other similiar organization, had very little chance
> of success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
> a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
> have had even a prayer, and that not much.

"enemies... agitate... scuttle... full scale attack.." Val, your
sounding pretty nasty here.

> >I think the thing that has Ham Radio, and the ARRL,
> >"shaking in it's boots" is the effect of the Internet
> >and the explosion of wireless technology. These days,
> >being able to communicate without being physically
> >tied to a wall outlet of some sort is a common, everyday
> >occurrence experienced by anyone with the wherewithal
> >to acquire the technology.

Um, the analogy doesn't quite work. My computer is quite tethered to
the wall, I got my power cords, my cable modem, my regular modem.

> >Quite frankly, we (radio
> >amateurs) will never be able to come close to dupli-
> >cating the capability of even one of the most ubiquitous
> >cell phones, and do so without cost to the user. Sure, we
> >can talk worldwide with our fellow hams with very portable
> >equipment, but not equipment that is shirt-pocket sized,
> >and can connect to particular individuals at a time of the
> >user's choosing.

If you think that pulling a cellphone out of your pocket and calling
Australia is analogous to ham radio, then we have radically different
ideas of what ham radio is all about. For me it's about putting out ten
watts on PSK31 and with my general purpose dipole, doing a QSO with

Australia or Antarctica. Or contesting, (har, I just had a vision of a contesting weekend with cell phones - the person who calls the most people wins!)

If you think cellphones are like the ARS, try calling random numbers and ask whoever answers their name, qth, grid locator, etc. 8^) I'll bet you won't be doing that for long.

>
> There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
> within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general. That is,
> when Big Money moves in on you (and this is what has
> happened to Ham Radio with the cell phones) and takes
> away the mass market, well, you MUST move upscale.

Do you have the stats of how many hams have been lost to cell phones?

> That is, you must re-position yourself in the market as
> the HIGH-QUALITY experience. And, I hate to say it, part
> of that "quality" is the historical aspect of your product,
> which the ARRL is busy selling down the river, even as
> they earmark funds for a museum there at HQ.

How are they selling hams down the river? I've been to their site, and in fact, just joined the ARRL, and I don't see what you are talking about. Looks like a pretty good organization to me.

> Radio MUST stop worrying about just "the numbers" and
> start thinking about the QUALITY of the people it is going
> to attract. I think it's the ONLY way, in the long run.
> If the quality is there then, in the end, sufficient numbers
> will be there, too!

Okay, give some ideas on how we increase the quality of the Amateur? Will we have character tests? Who decides? One thing I see that flies in the face of all this is that many of the people who I hear on the air that are misbehaving appear to be long term hams. Certainly a look at the enforcement pages shows some interesting info:

March 2002

Advanced - last license issuance 1995
Tech + - 1995
Tech 1998 Repeater interference
General-1993 obscenities
Tech (was novice) 1999 deliberate interference
Extra - 1996 uncoordinated interfering repeater
Extra - 1997 same
General - 1999 Same
Extra - 1993 Same
Extra - 2001 Same
General -couldn't get date no longer in database-retake license
Extra 1998 Poor repeater operation, no control op interference

Technician 1997 Unlicensed equipment, giving equipment to unlicensed minor

1 advanced
3 techs one who was a novice
1 tech +
3 Generals
5 extras

Does the Morse test keep the riffraff out? There were only 2 out of 13 people on this list who were *not* tested for Morse code operations.

The dates on the license are a little harder to figure out, because it looks like the date is based on the last renewal, not when the ham first got their license.

But what I draw from this one month look is that it looks like there is not much correlation between the knowledge and testing of Morse code and the character of the ham at *best*. This is a small sample, but 87 percent of these people were tested and passed a Morse code test!

> >Their mistake was to think that "dumbing down" our
> >licensing standards would actually have the effect of
> >reversing the trend toward negative growth in the
> >numbers of licensees.

I doubt that they think that they "dumbed down" the standards.

> >Right now, there may be
> >evidence that this is so; unfortunately, in a few years,
> >when the licenses of the No-Code Tech generation
> >start expiring, we're going to find that we're no longer
> >staying ahead of our losses.

What is your evidence that these amateurs are going to just let their licenses expire?

> The changes in the licensing requirements have meaning
> only if the people who would otherwise have not been
> brought into the avocation STAY within it and advance.

There is a good argument for the need of staying in the hobby, but why does the amateur have to advance? Our club has members who simply enjoy helping at local events. Thier version of the hobby is public service with a handi-talkie. Very good people!

> One of the primary reasons people become Hams, or
> amateur astronomers, or rock hounds, or whatever, is
> because that act separates them a little from the crowd,
> enhances their individuality, and gives them a bit of
> "cachet," of distinctiveness.

This one made me grin a bit! It's aside from the discussion at hand, but there is an old stereotype of a lot of hams, especially the ones who frequent hamfests - that many of them don't pay proper attention to

hygiene, and they do indeed acquire a cachet of de-stink-tivness! 8^)

The fundamental problem here is that who decides what makes for proper character? Some among us don't like liberals, some detest conservatives. Some hams have the old "no kids, no lids, and no space cadets" mentality. Some hams take self regulation to extremes, like the old fellow who almost turned me in to to the FCC because I made a typo on my callsign to him in an email. He looked it up in the database, and since the names didn't match, he went off the deep end accusing me of every "hamcrime" imaginable.

Each of these folk have some pretty solid ideas of what they want ham radio to be.

Problem is, we can't force other people to be like us. We probably wouldn't really want that if we did get it.

If you hear improper activities on the air, then get the FCC involved - that will go a long way towards keeping things on the up and up. Those hams of poor character, including the many who passed a Morse code test back when it was a "real" test will eventually get in line or get out.

- Mike -

393. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 15:25:28 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <I9Fq8.13033$nt1.1082442@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39763

Just checking to see if you're reading the traffic here!

dit dit

de Hans, K0HB

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> My xyl tells me if I stop to get bred on the way home, I'm in BIG
> trouble. 8^)
>
> - Mike -
>
> KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> >
> > > I've been listening in on this cellphone thing, and I really need it
> > > explained to me; just exactly how are cellphones hurting the ARS?
> >
> > There's no longer a need for a 2-meter repeater/autopatch so
> > you can call your wife to see if you should get bred on the way
> > home.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>

394. Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 15:41:02 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uam7in7419l32b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39762

Hello, all!

On April 20th, the local astronomy group, of which I've been an active member for 25 years, will be cooperating in an effort called "National Astronomy Day." We are doing this at a local high school, which has a planetarium, and last year more than 500 members of the general public attended. My goal is to have a "amateur radio presence" at this event and I have already scanned in the "Big Project" logo for use on the sign we will have set up with our equipment. I hope it's OK to do this, copyright wise, ulp! Anyway, I say "our equipment" because one other member of this astro group is also a new ham and we'll be taking turns talking to the public.

So, in support of this effort I was looking at a radio astronomy site last night and saw an account of a problem experienced by an amateur radio operator who also does radio astronomy. That is, when he started to put up his antenna, in his backyard in what must be an upscale development, the "covenant committee" showed up within hours and explained the situation. Luckily, this fellow was able to get around some of the restructions and is now using a 10-foot, semi-steerable dish that he has managed to hide sufficiently.

I can certainly see that this area is a real hornet's nest for the ARS. Years ago, my father, who worked for a painting contractor in Kansas City, a contractor who dealt almost exclusively with, er, ah, "exclusive" homes, sent my father to match finishes between some old and new construction . . . in a house that cost about $5 million.

People with this kind of money are most interesting in many ways, as are many people WITHOUT this kind of money. But, no matter, while my father was in this house he overheard one side of a rather heated con-versation between the homeowner, a third-generation inheritor of a LARGE fortune, and one of his lawyers, about a dispute over an anti-covenant fence.

That is, an interloper had just built, a few hundred feet from the $5 million house, a mere $2 million house,

and then had put up a fence that violated a covenant. The man talking to his lawyer was incensed and as the proceedings reached a crescendo he shouted, "Doesn't she know I can have her SHOT?" We don't know the outcome here since my dad finished up in a couple of days and did not get to hear about any success or failure of hired hit men!

Emotions run high over issues having to do with private residential property and these covenants, and I can certainly see the problems for amateur radio. What is happening here in Columbia, which is a pretty small burg of around 100,000 people, is that most new construction does not have much of a lot attached, even for homes in the $250,000 region, a fair amount of money here. The way these new developments are set up, if you put up an antenna in your back yard then most likely a neighbor will be looking straight at it, possibly from not much farther away than you are.

So, what a mess!

Val
KC0MUB

395. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 16:26:45 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uama8c1vmj8h7a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39764

mike coslo wrote, quite a lot of interesting commentary,
to which I will reply in part. That is, N2EY has convinced
me to stand down in this area.

> "enemies... agitate... scuttle... full scale attack.." Val, your
>sounding pretty nasty here.

Hey, this is UseNet!

> Um, the analogy doesn't quite work. My computer is quite
>tethered to the wall, I got my power cords, my cable modem,
>my regular modem.

I have a friend who is a professional photographer and was
in Hong Kong last year at a conference. At dinner, at his
hotel, another photographer got his laptop out of his brief
case and attached it to his digital camera. After transfering
several hundred images from the camera into the computer,
the photographer got out his cell phone, connected it to that
computer, and in seconds was moving his day's take from
Hong Kong to Tokyo. All without any kind of license, just the
money for the equipment and the connections. Note that
while doing this, the photographer kept up with conversation
and dabbed at his plate. Those Orientals!

> If you think that pulling a cellphone out of your pocket and
>calling Australia is analogous to ham radio, then we have
>radically different ideas of what ham radio is all about. For
>me it's about putting out ten watts on PSK31 and with my
>general purpose dipole, doing a QSO with Australia or
>Antarctica. Or contesting, (har, I just had a vision of a
>contesting weekend with cell phones - the person who
>calls the most people wins!)

I don't think any of this is on the instant point! See above!

> If you think cellphones are like the ARS, try calling random
>numbers and ask whoever answers their name, qth, grid
>locator, etc. 8^) I'll bet you won't be doing that for long.

I think the point was that many people became hams because
they could get that "cell-like" service before it was widely
available to the general public. Now, with literally tens of
billions invested in hardware, the phone company has taken
those folks out of ham radio. How many of these are there?
We'll be finding out over the next few years, I think.

>Do you have the stats of how many hams have been lost
>to cell phones?

I think the growth numbers say it loud and clear. And it's
not just cell phones. As has been pointed out, amateur
radio has to compete with so much more today. When
I was a kid about the only "technical" hobbies I ever saw
were radio and astronomy. Today, computers and soft-
ware have siphoned off tens of thousands, if not hundreds
of thousands, of experimenters, who would be in radio if
it weren't for the PC.

> How [the ARRL] selling hams down the river?

I didn't say that. I said something about a "historical legacy."

>I've been to their site, and in fact, just joined the ARRL, and
>I don't see what you are talking about. Looks like a pretty good
>organization to me.

Yes, they are, and I'll be sending in my check later today,
now that I have a call sign!

> Okay, give some ideas on how we increase the quality
>of the Amateur? Will we have character tests? Who
>decides? One thing I see that flies in the face of all this
>is that many of the people who I hear on the air that are
>misbehaving appear to be long term hams. Certainly a
>look at the enforcement pages shows some interesting
>info:

[snip]

Well, I think you see the area into which I was heading!
However, in the interest of "peace in the valley" I will
not be doing so. After viewing the landscape and the
status what am quo, I am now more than willing to let
nature take its course.

> Does the Morse test keep the riffraff out? There were
>only 2 out of 13 people on this list who were *not* tested
>for Morse code operations.

See comment above.

> But what I draw from this one month look is that it looks
>like there is not much correlation between the knowledge
>and testing of Morse code and the character of the ham
>at *best*. This is a small sample, but 87 percent of these
>people were tested and passed a Morse code test!

I'd like to go there, perhaps, but I am not going to do so.

> I doubt that they think that they "dumbed down" the
>standards.

Not going there anymore.

> What is your evidence that these amateurs are going
>to just let their licenses expire?

A lot of them are, I think, thus the pressure for more change.

>There is a good argument for the need of staying in the
>hobby, but why does the amateur have to advance? Our club
>has members who simply enjoy helping at local events. Their
>version of the hobby is public service with a handi-talkie.
>Very good people!

I certainly would include under "advancement" a person
who steps up to the plate where public interaction is
concerned. If you have people who WANT to give programs
and speak to the public, and are effective at doing that,
well, yes, encourage them all you can because in general
there are never enough of them. However, over time, if
a person does not "move", somewhere, technically, that
person might someday become, er, different. That is, the
behavior you're complaining about among Morse-qualified
Hams is likely the product of people who haven't "advanced"
in QUITE some time! Would you agree with that?

>The fundamental problem here is that who decides what
>makes for proper character? Some among us don't like
>liberals, some detest conservatives. Some hams have the
>old "no kids, no lids, and no space cadets" mentality. Some
>hams take self regulation to extremes, like the old fellow who
> almost turned me in to to the FCC because I made a typo on
>my callsign to him in an email. He looked it up in the database,
>and since the names didn't match, he went off the deep end
>accusing me of every "hamcrime" imaginable. Each of these
>folk have some pretty solid ideas of what they want ham radio
>to be. Problem is, we can't force other people to be like us.
>We probably wouldn't really want that if we did get it.

I think the public policy dimensions of amateur radio demand
quality and committment, not sheer bulk. Here I must stop.

> If you hear improper activities on the air, then get the FCC
>involved -- that will go a long way towards keeping things on the
>up and up. Those hams of poor character, including the many
>who passed a Morse code test back when it was a "real" test
>will eventually get in line or get out.

I haven't heard any improper activity on the air in quite a long
time. Why, even 3950 was calm the one time I pass by a
few weeks ago! Admittedly, those "Tarzan Calls" near that
frequency used to be a TRIP! Is that guy in jail?

Val

396. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 16:35:11 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CAB2F41.AFCC1809@psu.edu>
Source record: 39766

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Hello, all!
>
> On April 20th, the local astronomy group, of which
> I've been an active member for 25 years, will be
> cooperating in an effort called "National Astronomy
> Day." We are doing this at a local high school,
> which has a planetarium, and last year more than
> 500 members of the general public attended.

This should be a lot of fun. I doubt there will be any problems copyright wise.

> Emotions run high over issues having to do with
> private residential property and these covenants,
> and I can certainly see the problems for amateur
> radio.

It is the biggest problem out there for the ARS, IMO! I can understand the need for some regulation, as if you are buying a house, you need *some* confidence that the electrical wiring is safe, and since you can't see it, something has to give.

But these new covenant restricted neighborhoods are repulsive. I guess these people believe they are keeping the standards up. I wouldn't live in one of them if they paid me.

I am alays amazed the lengths some people will go to just to control how others look and act.

In my development, the restrictions are much less stringeent. You can have a tower up to 40 feet. The main restriction is that it can't be a safety problem if it falls over - like hitting the neighbors house-that sort of thing. Now for some lots, it means they can't put up a tower because they are too small. But then there are always wire antennas.

- Mike KB3EIA -

397. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 16:36:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8fb1v$6u4$0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 39765

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > So beginning right now,
> >you are in the PLONK filter where you've belonged all along, right there
> >with Loose Lennie, The TIT and B.Burke AKA The Gadfly.
>
> Can you tell me how I can make the list?
>

So far you haven't turned into a raving lunatic. Your're stuck with me
reading your stuff. Sorry, that's the breaks.

398. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 16:38:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8fb64$6u4$1@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 39767

mike coslo wrote:
>
> If that's the only reason they had ht's and their licenses, then that's
> not really all that bad a thing that they went away if they did.
>

I'm glad we agree. I said something like that here a long time ago and
got slammed real hard for it. Seems I wasn't PC enough to agree that
"ham radio is for everyone". Nuts.

> - Mike - KB3EIA
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > The
> > > reality of cellphones is that they have never been a
> > > competitor of ham radio.
> > >
> >
> > Reall(t)y?? What planet was that on? Not planet Earth. Cellphones very
> > definitely have shrunk the shack-on-the-belt crowd.

399. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 17:01:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204030901.e634c27@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39768

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<a8cnfk$80h$1@news.bignet.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020331232645.15133.00000207@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > There was a single tube 440 transceiver in the late-60s ARRL Handbooks -
> used
> > a single 6CW4 and a couple of transistors in the audio section. A far cry
> from
> > a
> > modern HT!
>
> It's in at least the 1968 edition since I have that copy on the bookshelf.

Also my 1967 edition.

> Big boxy looking thing that used a telephone handset for the speaker mic
> combo.

Yup.

The term "transceiver" in ham use originated as a description of that sort
of rig. They were very popular on the 5 and 2-1/2 meter bands before WW2,
and in WERS service during the war. The classic setup was a single RF tube
used as superregenerative detector on receive and modulated oscillator on
transmit, and a one- or two- tube audio section used as the audio section
on receive and the modulator on transmit.

73 de Jim, N2EY

400. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 17:03:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204030903.5bd92ca3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39769

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA9D97D.5A9CED51@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Musta used an Intel processor to do your math, Cecil. ;-)
>
> I forgot to mentally divide by 2.

Which completely changes the validity of your conclusion that the
restructuring is working perfectly.

> So sue me.

Typical. You blame the messenger for pointing out your mistake.

73 de Jim, N2EY

401. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 17:11:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8fd44$e04$1@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 39770

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA9D97D.5A9CED51@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Musta used an Intel processor to do your math, Cecil. ;-)
> > >
> > I forgot to mentally divide by 2.
>
> Which completely changes the validity of your conclusion that the
> restructuring is working perfectly.
>
> > So sue me.
>
> Typical. You blame the messenger for pointing out your mistake.

That's our boy.

402. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 17:14:15 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <HLGq8.13224$nt1.1097953@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39771

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
> FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:

clip.....

We can all go to the AH0A site and read the tea leaves, and draw all sorts of conclusions regarding [insert favorite agenda item here].

In fact the number of hams (or the number of hams in any given license class) is not a particularly significant indicator of the value of the Amateur Radio service.

Can we move on now?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

403. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 17:31:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204030931.1e139fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39772

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CAA858F.D8876466@IEEE.org>...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > I've been listening in on this cellphone thing, and I really need it
> > explained to me; just exactly how are cellphones hurting the ARS?
>
> Many hams once used repeater phone patches. That was the only reason
> some of them had transceivers in their vehicles. I haven't heard
> a repeater phone patch in a long time.

Around here they are called "autopatches". They are still common
but not nearly so much as they used to be.

I know plenty of hams whose first interest in ham radio was to use the
autopatch and repeater system for "family comms" (also known as "the
honeydew net"). Some of them have since dropped out and some have
become interested in other facets of ham radio. But we're not getting
many newcomers from that source anymore - it's
much cheaper and easier to get a family cellphone plan.

73 de Jim, N2EY

404. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 17:58:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204030958.da7dd35@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39773

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CAA0AE1.55346A55@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > The FCC is at ground level, Cecil, not 30,000 feet.
>
> It was a figure of speech, Jim, indicating that the FCC has a lot more
> to worry about than the ARS in which you are emersed.

Why not just use plain, clear English?

> > On the ham bands where a CW test is required for a license, CW is
> > widely used by hundreds of thousands of hams.
>
> Which represents what percentage of the voters/citizens?

A small percentage. The total number of hams is also a small
percentage. Why
does that matter?

> Amateur radio
> could be abolished today, Jim, and there would not be even a political
> whimper.

That's right. So why does the FCC keep us around?

> We had better fulfill our "basis and purpose" or we will be
> gone and hardly anyone will notice.

Sure. How does the use of Morse code keep us from fulfilling our B&Ps?
>
> > 1) Amateur radio is not a hobby to the FCC. It's a radio service.
>
> It is one of numerous radio "services". It is just a name.

Point is, the word "hobby" does not appear anywhere in Part 97. Nor
does
any word like "avocation" or "recreation".

> We all know that amateur radio is an avocation.
> In fact, it is illegal to get paid or charge for amateur radio "service".

So? Would you say that volunteer firefighters are involved in a
"hobby" or
"avocation"? How about hams like "Jay", who posted here a while back,
who

spent several weeks helping out at Ground Zero?
>
> > 6) The fact that hams use Morse code in the 21st century means Morse code is
> > part of 21st century radio and the world of the 21st century.
>
> Sounds like delusions of grandeur to me.

No, it's a simple fact. I was on the air with Morse code just last
night - 40
meters. Lots of others there, too. In fact there were more hams
operating Morse on 40 meters last evening than people posting to rrap.

> What percentage of the 21st century involves Morse code?

So far, 1.17%. That number increases every day, though.

> That is not to minimize its importance
> within the ARS. It is just to put things in perspective.

In persepective with regard to what?
>
> > > Hams use CW for fun.
> >
> > Sure. And for serious purposes like message handling and other public service
> > uses. Does that mean there MUST be a test? Of course not!
>
> You are rational enough to accept that.

It's just an opinion.

> What about the other PCTA folk?

I don't control what other people say and think. Would you have those
you
disagree with silenced? I wouldn't.
>
> > > Why should fun require a federally sponsored welfare program?
> >
> > Who said anything about a welfare program?
>
> That's what the Morse code test in the 21st century is, Jim, a welfare
> (subsidy) program.

Not at all. It's just a little requirement for an HF/MF license,
that's
all. Nobody is forced to use the mode.

> It reminds me of the time my uncle was paid by the
> federal government not to plant corn.
> He was paid by them again to build
> a lake in his old corn field. He used the water in the lake to increase
> his production of corn per acre by threefold. He produced more corn than
> ever.

So? How does that have any bearing on amateur radio? We are not paid
by the
govt.

>That's what happens when the free market is not allowed to operate.

What form should a "free market" take, in corn and ham radio?
>
> > By your "logic", ham radio is a "hobby" and hams do it for fun. If that's
> > true, then the existence of ham radio itself is a federally sponsored welfare
> > program for fun. You can't have it both ways, Cecil.
>
> IMO, virtually the only reason for the present existence of the Amateur
> Radio Service is for emergency communications during potential disasters.

What about actual disasters?

> We had better hope that enough hams have fun doing emergency
> communications to satisfy the FCC. If not, I don't see any future
> for amateur radio.

Better read the B&Ps again, then. While emergency comms are important,
there
are lots of other reasons for the ARS to exist.

73 de Jim, N2EY

405. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 18:00:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403130055.15236.00001679@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 39774

>Subject: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption
>From: inglem@pobox.removespam.com (Mike Ingle)
>Date: 04/03/02 03:36 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <sazq8.13619$TG6.1924777@bin5.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>

>I understand some countries do have an exemption like this. Has anyone ever
>petitioned for one in the States?

Your "wedding video" is a "maybe" as an exception, but there is no other
reason that an Amateur Radio station should be transmitting music.

There have been, in past years, "exceptions" to transmitting music, and
they were used as excuses for getting the foot in the door to "broadcast".

If you want to transmit music, get the appropriate license in the
Broadcast Service.

73

Steve, K4YZ

406. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 18:04:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403130443.15236.00001682@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 39775

>Subject: Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 04/03/02 11:26 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <uama8c1vmj8h7a@corp.supernews.com>

>Hey, this is UseNet!

Lennie the Liar both uses that as an excuse for his vileness, and then cries foul when what HE percieves as "civility" is transgressed.

Treat people nicely, you get treated nicely. Act a fool, and , well, the results are predictable.

73

Steve, K4YZ

407. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 18:23:49 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <VMHq8.13402$nt1.1107290@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39777
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Ingle" <inglem@pobox.removespam.com> wrote

> Has anyone ever petitioned for one in the States?

Such an exemption is already in the rules for space shuttle communications,
so the precedent exists.

No reason for you not to petition for something similar if you feel it is
needed. The worst that can happen is that they say "No".

73, de Hans, K0HB

"Your goals and dreams belong to you, not your
mother, your father, or Winnie The Pooh, So if your
goals and dreams are yours alone, then what
are you waiting for?

Go do it!"

408. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 18:39:31 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uami1e4k9t64c2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39776

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote, concerning the fact that this
is UseNet and it gets a little out of control at times:

>Lennie the Liar both uses that as an excuse for his vileness,
>and then cries foul when what HE percieves as "civility" is
>transgressed. [snip] Act a fool, and , well, the results are
>predictable.

Yes, especially, as in some cases, such as the one being
referred to here, the fool isn't the least bit witty or entertaining,
either! That REALLY brings out the best in everyone!

Val
KC0MUB

409. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 19:34:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB5928.2AD0CF2D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39778

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Can you tell me how I can make the list? :-)
> >
> > Apparently, if you incessantly hammer at gross irrationality.
>
> Pro or con?

:-) :-) :-) Dang Dave, I didn't know you had a sense of humor.
You should display it more often.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

410. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 19:39:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB5A7E.29C6FDFA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39779

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> > If that's the only reason they had ht's and their licenses, then that's
> > not really all that bad a thing that they went away if they did.
>
> I'm glad we agree. I said something like that here a long time ago and
> got slammed real hard for it. Seems I wasn't PC enough to agree that
> "ham radio is for everyone". Nuts.

There's a big difference between them choosing to go away and them
being chased away. :-) (I sure am glad that Dick isn't going to
read this. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

411. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 19:41:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB5ADD.2F56D74A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39780

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > So sue me.
>
> Typical. You blame the messenger for pointing out your mistake.

Point is, it was an honest mistake, not an attempt at obfuscation
as you seemed to want to imply.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

412. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 19:47:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAB5C76.9A88DB6D@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39781

You shouldn't get slammed for that! I'm can't say I'd care too much for
that when it was in it's heyday. I bet people monitoring the repeater
got to listen to a lot more than they wanted to!

- Mike -

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> >
> > If that's the only reason they had ht's and their licenses, then that's
> > not really all that bad a thing that they went away if they did.
> >
>
> I'm glad we agree. I said something like that here a long time ago and
> got slammed real hard for it. Seems I wasn't PC enough to agree that
> "ham radio is for everyone". Nuts.

413. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:09:30 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204031209.47c93fdd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39783

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:<uajb0tsaul7331@corp.supernews.com>...
> Hello, all!
>
> I have decided to move this exchange, between Mr. Roll
> and myself, to its own thread. Perhaps it will prove
> useful in some way. Mr. Roll's comments are preceded
> by single arrows.

I used to have this "Reply" protocol figured out ... the most recent inclusion had one set of symbols (>, or :, or [something]) ... and each more distant had sets of symbols (>> [for example]).

And each inclusion had an identifying username and address for attribution.

And all that was done by the mail program. Whether of not someone would edit it to make it look like Bill said what Joe actually said, at least the Reply "looked" like the attributions were accurate.

What Val is doing just confuses the heck outta me. First, he was attributing everything backward, and then he was attributing comments without the mailer's ID line.

I really, calmly object. Please let your mailer handle the attributions and the identification symbols. Delete what you don't want to talk about, if you must, but please return to e-mail, USENET, protocol.

KB9RVB

414. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:12:46 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <2nJq8.13650$nt1.1121580@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39784

Val, I read your message several times, and I just
gotta ask ---- "Your point?"

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote >
> N2EY wrote
>
> >I was on the air with Morse code just last
> >night - 40 meters. Lots of others there, too.
> >In fact there were more hams operating Morse
> >on 40 meters last evening than people posting
> >to rrap.
>
>
> Just for information, we have, from another board,
> an interesting discussion concerning long-distance
> international communication, and then shorter-range,
> int-RA-national communication. These four hams are
> responding to a fifth ham whose call sign was being
> misunderstood on SSB.
>
>
> >>I use "Golf Four XXXX XXXX Yankee" and it is
> >>quite often heard as "Golf Four XXXX XXXX Yankee"
>
> >I find "Golf" is the most problematic letter in the
> >NATO Phonetic Alphabet. Many people - especially
> >Spanish speakers - have difficulty n understanding
> >it. I often have to resort to "Germany" or "Guatemala"
> >to make my prefix understood.
>
> >Fortunately, I operate 95% CW, so phonetics are not
> >a major problem! ;-)
>
>
> Now, a third comment, from the same thread as above
> but with yet another poster:
>
> >>>I, too, have some trouble with callsigns. In my case,
> >>>it's not the letters but the number. My "Whiskey XXX
> >>>XXXX Papa," is sometimes heard as WXXP, parti-
> >>>ularly in Eastern Europe. I've never figured out why.
> >>>Guess that's why I operate mostly CW :.)
>
>

> And, finally, one more, also from the same thread,
> indicating that one does not have to be trying to
> communicate internationally to have problems:
>
> >>>>It is difficult to follow U.S. hams from the deep
> >>>>south, although I've never had a problem with hams
> >>>>from the North East, I'm sure that, for some people,
> >>>>the accent would make some words difficult. I'm sure
> >>>>that some folks have a problem with my accent
> >>>>(although it sounds fine to me). Maybe the solution
> >>>>is to listen to your pronunciation and try changing
> >>>>the accent a little on the words that are being mis-
> >>>>heard. Just a thought.
>
> ***
>
>
>
>

415. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:13:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403151339.29664.00000264@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 39787

In article <20020402234411.13698.00001984@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>>6) The fact that hams use Morse code in the 21st century means Morse code >is
>>> part of 21st century radio and the world of the 21st century. The fact
>>> that lots of hams use Morse code means it's a big, important part of ham
>>> radio in the 21st century.
>>
>>Incorrect on the "big, important part of ham radio." That is a
>>subjective viewpoint. In the USA the FCC has not mandated
>>USE of morse code modes in amateur radio for years.
>
> Incorrect on YOUR "incorrect", Lennie. This is because YOU are subjective
>on the Morse Code testing issue and the Morse Code issue ONLY, and are
>completely IGNORANT of other issues within Amateur Radio as a whole.

Incorrect on the "big, important part of ham radio." That is a
subjective viewpoint. In the USA the FCC has not mandated
USE of morse code modes in amateur radio for years.

Supply the last year in which the FCC mandated morse code use
by radio amateurs for any specific time period. Part 97, Title 47
CFR has made ALL allocated modes optional for use by all
licensees for at least the last 6 years.

Note the message thread subject header: "Code Test Fiasco."

>>... Subjective morsemen have been advertising the 1912
>>Titanic ship disaster for years. 1912 is 90 years ago. There
>>is no longer any need for maritime vessels to carry morse mode
>>radio equipment operating on the 500 KHz International Maritime
>>Distress frequency.
>
> Actually, 500kHz is not the only frequency for which emergency traffic
>is passed or initiated, in Morse Code or any other mode. Suggest you
>familiarize yourself with CURRENT maritime practice before making ignorant
>assertions.

GMDSS (Global Marine Distress and Safety System) has been in
worldwide use for three years. The FCC has added commercial
radio operator licenses specifically covering GMDSS operation for
at least 5 years. The USCG no longer monitors 500 KHz.
GMDSS does not require morsemanship skills.

Current maritime radio practice utilizes SSB voice and data at
long distances, VHF and UHF voice in harbor areas.

>>The FCC has radio services specifically for "fun" (hobby) activities
>
> Depending on how you care to "define" the broadcast services, there is
>NO radio service exclusively for "fun", Lennie.

Amateur radio is regulated by the FCC. Under Robeson's logic,
amateur radio CANNOT be fun or enjoyable or a hobby.

Pfui.

> Subparts of Part 95 allow for the hobby use of rf emitters for the remote
>control of models, however even that subpart is not EXCLUSIVELY about
>"models".

So...Robeson extends this NON-fun to all 175 thousand members
of the Academy of Model Aeronautics and all the smaller
associations of hobbyists who enjoy small aircraft and vehicle
radio control?

There seems to be a distinct lack of enjoyment of life by Robeson.

> Again, a suggestion is made that you familiarize yourself with CURRENT
>regulations before inserting your fungus-laden foot into your sewer-like
>mouth in public.

Tsk, tsk, tsk... :-)

>>See the Citizens Band
>>radio service and the Family Radio service. Those are regulations
>>to mitigate RF interference but they are strictly for recreational
>>activities.
>
> Oh? Please cite the paragraph from ANY FCC rule or regulation that
>states ANY service regulated by the FCC is "strictly for recreational
activities".

I just did. Robeson persists in terrible reading comprehension.

>>Since amateur radio is a non-pecuniary radio activity
>>engaged by individuals, that activity cannot be described as anything
>>more than an avocation, a hobby, something done for FUN.
>
> Actually, a radio service that MAY be used for fun, but may also be used
>for experimentation, emergency service, health and welfare, etc etc etc.

Ah! Condescension that FUN is possible?!?!? Cannot be!

> In OTHER words, it provides a SERVICE to the individual in particular or
>the nation as a whole.

The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory
term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

If you wish to become a serviceman, re-enlist in the military. If you wish to do a service to your country other than the military, apply for a job with the government. If you wish to be a civilian serviceman, learn a trade such as washing machine repair or television servicing. If you wish to serve food, take a job as a waitress. If you wish to serve someone, take a job as a servant.

I would suggest taking up tennis where you can serve a ball but no doubt Robeson would argue vehemently about the word "love" in tennis, such as "there is no such specific word in the rules!" No fun, no love, only puritanical service.....

No fun, no recreation in amateur radio according to Steebie.

:-)

Jim Miccolis, your replies are looking more and more like k4yz wrote them. Are you having problems with schizophrenia?

416. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:13:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403151341.29664.00000265@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 39786

In article <20020402234411.13698.00001984@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>>1) Amateur radio is not a hobby to the FCC. It's a radio service.
>>
>>The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory
>>term denoting a type and kind of radio activity. Part 97 defines
>>amateur radio as a radio activity without pecuniary interest, thus
>>qualifying "amateur" as the opposite of "professional."
>
> Contrary to your adamant rants to the contrary, it IS a radio
>SERVICE...A service IS performed...Just as it is in the Broadcast SERVICE, The
>Citizens radio SERVICE, the Common Carrier SERVICE, etc.

The word "service" has different meanings in different contexts. My Webster's New World dictionary has the following groups for "service:"

1. The occupation of a servant.
2a. Public employment [example: diplomatic service]
2b. a branch of this, specifically the military service
3. Work done for others [example: repair service]
4. Any religious ceremony.
5. Benefit or advantage, friendly help or professional service.
6. The act or manner of serving food.
7. A set of articles used in serving [example: tea service]
8. A system of providing people with some utility [gas or water service]
9. The act or manner of serving in tennis.

The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory term denoting a type and kind of radio activity. Part 97 defines amateur radio as a radio activity without pecuniary interest, thus qualifying "amateur" as the opposite of "professional."

> Please cite a radio SERVICE that does not meet SOME need, ergo a >SERVICE
to persons in particular or the nation as a whole.

The FCC is not chartered to regulate government or military radio so (2) above is out. (4) is out due to separation of church and state. (6) and (7) are out since the FDA handles food and the Comm Act of 1934 doesn't cover eating utensils. (9) is out since the FCC does not define tennis terms. That leaves only (1), (3), (5) and (8).

(8) is out since the FCC regulates, does not provide any utilities. (3) is also out since the FCC does not repair anything. While the FCC certainly strives to provide citizens with information, it can be considered friendly, and its staffers are professionals, it

is difficult to define a type of kind of radio activity under the
definition of (5); (5) cannot apply. That leaves only (1), that of
being a servant (presumably of the people of the nation) but that
doesn't fit with a radio activity. The end result is just a regulatory
term, an item (10) which is specialized in legal terms:

The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory
term denoting a type and kind of radio activity. Part 97 defines
amateur radio as a radio activity without pecuniary interest, thus
qualifying "amateur" as the opposite of "professional."

>>>4) The purposes and goals of the ARS are different from other services, and
>>> so the license requirements are different. If there were no difference,
>>> there would be no reason to have a separate service.
>>
>>Non-argument pertaining to nothing. In the dim, dark past of early
>>radio the ONLY way to communicate anything in ALL of radio was
>>by means of on-off (of RF) codings.
>
> It is an arument. A solid one. One youa re trying to ignore and channel
>solely into the "Code test" issue, which is a non-issue.

No, not an "arument" [sic, argument] and it is vaporous, not solid.

See the Subject title in the header "Code Test Fiasco."

Element 1 in the license test requirement still exists. S25.5 in
the ITU-R still exists. Something that exists cannot be
non-existant at the same time.

>>Amateur radio is one of several "personal communication" radio
>>services regulated by the FCC in the USA. It is defined as strictly
>>"non-pecuniary" therefore it is an avocation, not an occupation. An
>>avocationary activity is a hobby.
>
> You attempt to negate Amateur Radio's SERVICE value by the fact that no
>"pecuniary interest" is involved.

Impossible conclusion by Robeson. A definition is a definition,
has neither "positive" nor "negative" parts to it. The "negation"
exists solely in Robeson's sorely wounded pride and ego.

> Pretty thin and pretty stupid. I have dedicated thousands of hours to
>various organizations for which I received NO renumeration, and in which
>human lives were saved. Since I didn't get "paid" for it, does that make the
>services I rendered of no value?

Definitions which apply to ALL citizens are not based on Steven
James Robeson's personal activities nor are they defineable by
him.

>>An objective view of morse code importance cannot be carried out
>>by one who is admittedly subjective on both the subject of morse

>>code testing and morse code use.
>
> You try to make Morse Code testing the ONLY issue. Again, both thin and
>stupid.

Sigh...this whole thread is about "Code Test Fiasco" as indicated
in the subject header. Robeson's reading comprehension is
quite flawed.

>>In entering this new millenium it should be obvious that only
>>amateur radio and some maritime radio services require any
>>morse code ability whatsoever.
>
> Oooooh Lennie! A SERIOUS backpeddle! You have ADAMANTLY stated that
>there was NO use for Morse Code in more than one thread!

I made a statement only on this new millennium. That is not any
"backpeddle." It is merely a fact in the year 2002.

For the year 1999 it also apples...but that is in the old millennium.
No "backpeddle."

417. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:13:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403151343.29664.00000266@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 39788

In article <20020403001540.13715.00001798@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Sorry, Steebie, the US military has outgrown amateurism by so
>>much that it isn't worth mentioning. MARS is a drop in a very
>>large bucket as far as US military communications goes.
>
> That's not what was said.
>
> Two-stepping again, Your Cowardness?

No. US military communications is quite extensive, far more than any MARS activity. Imaginary expansion of MARS activities is not a realistic appraisal.

>>Quoting from the "Milestones" listing of the IEEE History Center.
>
> Nice reading, Lennie....Still not inclusive. QST and other radio
>related publications of the era go back even further. I found them...you can too....

What are those "other radio related publications?"

The special edition of the 50th Anniversary of McGraw-Hill's Electronics magazine biweekly (April 17, 1980) is quite comprehensive and covers the prehistory of radio (physics related work and experiments up to 1896) as well as the early days as a lead-in to the massive amount of history between 1920 and 1980.

As to researched histories that encompass ALL fields of radio, the Internet-available work of Thomas H. White is an excellent source, does not favor any one radio activity, and has an extensive list of references.

Admittedly, a specialty publication such as the Army Times "History of the Army Signal Corps" is hard to access but it is based on publicly-available information of US Army communications from the American Revolutionary War until about 1965. In it is a photo of "horse mobile" radio in operational use in 1932. The Signal Corps on-line Museum collection at Fort Gordon has a picture of the 1936 cavalry radio that was mounted in the saddle guidon socket, held upright by the rider, whip antenna on top, and could be used while in motion.

As to portable-mobile radio use other than in amateur literature, many collectors and non-military military historians have written extensively on the very first Handy-Talky of WW2 (tube type on HF), the AN/PRC-6 of the Korean War, and the AN/PRC-25 of the Vietnam War. See Dennis Starks' excellent descriptions on his own military radio history page on the "prick-25" and its history...130,000 units manufactured by 15 companies over a 40-year operational period attest to its design excellence in harsh environments. [includes the all-solid-state variant, the PRC-77]

>>See, you don't have your references handy. Do a search for
>>"Thomas H. White" and go to those pages for a real history
>>documentation effort.
>
> YOU need references on other than JUST "preofessional" radio, Your
>Uninformedness. Sorry.

Thomas H. White is a REAL historian, doesn't confine his research into "just professional radio." The problem with Steebie (actually one of many) is that he refuses to understand that nearly ALL of the progress in radio arts and nearly ALL of the activity in radio has been carried out by professional people.

Some more simple web-searching will turn up a huge amount of historical material on radio, many of those sites authored by radio amateur license holders. There is an extensive biography with on-line digital images of reference material on Edwin Armstrong, including reproductions of his lab notebook pages and patent papers filed for his regeneration and superheterodyne inventions. There are many and varied sites on Guglielmo Marconi and his 1901 one-way communications experimentation from Cornwall to New Foundland across the Atlantic...using a kite-lofted antenna wire at the New Foundland receiver, about as "portable" as one could get. There is the totally HUGE "Military Equipment List" (a work in progress) that has both nomenclature and many photographs of US military radios from the beginning of military radio to today...site put up and maintained by a ham. Note: The military is perhaps the very largest radio user of mobile or portable equipment.

For HF long-distance communications, the first chapter of the Pappenfus, Bruehne, and Schoenike ("Collins Sideband book" in familiar name) is an informative overview of commercial carriers circuit networks prior to WW2 and just afterwards. Henney's old "Radio Communication Engineering" and F. Langford-Smith's "Radiotron Designer's Handbook" has many references and mentions of radio history during and prior to WW2 (my original was traded long ago and I now have Fritz' epic tome on CD-ROM produced by an audio electronics seller). Harris Corporation's website had an excellent overview of post-WW2 HF communications and technical

detail as does parts of Fed Std 1045 on ALE as background
to the techniques of Automatic Link Establishment. There is
a tutorial available for free download on quartz crystals in
frequency control at an IEEE web page which, surprisingly,
offers considerable history of radio (get .pdf version rather
than .pps).

> (Cites Lennie provided all good reading, however NOT "all-inclusive" of
>history of the era)
>
>>If it's "stupid" then you should immediately go to the IEEE website
>>and tell all those "stupid" folks off!
>
> No. Lennie...What's STUPID is that you try to make an argument on a
>subject for which you obviously do not have a thourough preparation for.
>Your references are good reading, but again, are NOT "all-inclusive" of the
era.

"All-inclusive" means encompassing ALL histories, not the self-
promoting and rather biased ARRL history publications concerning
just amateur radio. To be truly "all-inclusive" one has to count all
the existing organizations such as the Radio Club of America and
their membership, some of which have already produced historical
works on radio (one example already cited is the Armstrong bio).

I've just mentioned a few items of history that I can recall by
memory. I have many more in my personal collection and can
access many more through the Web. That doesn't seem to be a
worthwhile effort since the "dialogue" is only one-way and usually
resorts to this inanity -

> Hams DID help pioneer portable and mobile radio communications.
>
> I KNOW you don't like it, but "oh well".....

No specifics given, only broad generalities. The above is no more
"conclusive" than saying "hams helped pioneer early automobiles"
(because some bought and drove them). [automobiles and the
internal combustion engine parallel the evolution of radio and
electronics]

In order to be conclusive, one has to quote some references which
cover the entire area, not just one specific minor activity. As done
above by Robeson, it is NOT specific, just a broad general statement
having nothing conclusive or quantifiable or referencible. It is just a
propaganda phrase repeated for the nth time.

418. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:13:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403151344.29664.00000267@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 39785

In article <ual5r2reheg96@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Valentine Germann wrote:
>
>>"Radio Frequency Interference"
>
>I mean this in a GOOD way. That is, your work
>includes finding ways to ameliorate interference
>problems, I think?

Had you been reading this newsgroup since '98 as claimed,
you would have long since known that Ed Hare picked that
specific callsign under the Vanity system. He said so in
plain English. :-)

419. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:18:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB6384.32844186@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39789

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > It was a figure of speech, Jim, indicating that the FCC has a lot more
> > to worry about than the ARS in which you are emersed.
>
> Why not just use plain, clear English?

"The view from 30,000 ft." is extremely common in the American language,
Jim. Where have you been that you didn't understand it?

> > Which represents what percentage of the voters/citizens?
>
> A small percentage. The total number of hams is also a small
> percentage. Why does that matter?

You forgot to add the smiley face to your joke. The FCC is an arm
of a political entity. Votes count probably more than anything else.
Too bad amateur radio was not protected under the Bill of Rights.

> > Amateur radio
> > could be abolished today, Jim, and there would not be even a political
> > whimper.
>
> That's right. So why does the FCC keep us around?

IMO it is for emergency communications. The present Morse code
requirement chases away lots of potential emergency operators.

> > We had better fulfill our "basis and purpose" or we will be
> > gone and hardly anyone will notice.
>
> Sure. How does the use of Morse code keep us from fulfilling our B&Ps?

The *use* of Morse code doesn't. The Morse code *requirement* does.
Many potential emergency HF operators are chased away from amateur
radio by the Morse code requirement. Wouldn't it be better to have
double the number of emergency operators available even if they
don't know Morse code?

> Point is, the word "hobby" does not appear anywhere in Part 97. Nor
> does any word like "avocation" or "recreation".

Point is, amateurs are expressly prohibited from making an on-the-air
vocation out of amateur radio. That is very, very clear.

> > We all know that amateur radio is an avocation.
> > In fact, it is illegal to get paid or charge for amateur radio "service".
>
> So? Would you say that volunteer firefighters are involved in a
> "hobby" or "avocation"?

My Dad was a volunteer firefighter. It was his hobby even though he was
dead serious about it. If hams were as dead serious about their hobby
as my Dad was about his, there would be a minimum of problems.

> > > 6) The fact that hams use Morse code in the 21st century means Morse code is
> > > part of 21st century radio and the world of the 21st century.
> >
> > Sounds like delusions of grandeur to me.
>
> No, it's a simple fact. I was on the air with Morse code just last
> night - 40 meters.

That would mean something if you were the center of the universe.

> > What percentage of the 21st century involves Morse code?
>
> So far, 1.17%. That number increases every day, though.

1.17% is negligible. Where did that figure come from?

> > That is not to minimize its importance
> > within the ARS. It is just to put things in perspective.
>
> In persepective with regard to what?

The 99+% of the rest of the 21st century. Do your own poll at
the local mall and get back to us.

> > That's what the Morse code test in the 21st century is, Jim, a welfare
> > (subsidy) program.
>
> Not at all. It's just a little requirement for an HF/MF license,
> that's all. Nobody is forced to use the mode.

That where you are wrong, Jim. Every HF ham is forced to use the
mode to pass a Morse code exam to meet the requirements. Why is
that so difficult to understand? A potential ham who hates Morse code
still *must* use Morse code to gain HF access. Morse code is an extremely
small part of being a sucessful ham. Potential emergency operators are
being barred from amateur radio because of the Morse code requirement.
I know. I worked with many of them at Intel. You can argue that they
are choosing to be barred. I accept that. But that still leaves us
without those otherwise willing emergency operators that we may someday
need.

> So? How does that have any bearing on amateur radio? We are not paid
> by the govt.

I assume you are talking about money. There are many other ways of
being rewarded. We HF hams are rewarded (subsidized) by the government
for choosing to learn Morse code.

> > IMO, virtually the only reason for the present existence of the Amateur
> > Radio Service is for emergency communications during potential disasters.
>
> What about actual disasters?

:-) Actual disasters are potential disasters before they happen.

> Better read the B&Ps again, then. While emergency comms are important,
> there are lots of other reasons for the ARS to exist.

I have read them, Jim, and that's what bothers me.
ï¿½97.1(a) is emergency communications.
ï¿½97.1(b) is contributions to the radio art.
IMO, we don't do that anymore.
ï¿½97.1(c) is advancing skills and technical phases
IMO, we don't do that anymore.
ï¿½97.1(d) reservoir of trained operators, techs, and electronic experts
IMO, our training is mostly obsolete. That some extras consider themselves
to be God's gift to Amateur Radio because they passed the Extra exam
is comical.
ï¿½97.1(e) enhancing international good will
IMO, we don't do that except within amateur radio and that's not
worth very much in today's international market.

So, I repeat: IMO, we had better be very good at emergency communications
if we want the ARS to survive.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

420. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:19:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB63D9.EFFBF91D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39790

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> There have been, in past years, "exceptions" to transmitting music, and
> they were used as excuses for getting the foot in the door to "broadcast".

I've transmitted with Rush Limbaugh in the background. Does that count?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

421. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:20:51 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uamnvapfjosn29@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39782

N2EY wrote

>I was on the air with Morse code just last
>night - 40 meters. Lots of others there, too.
>In fact there were more hams operating Morse
>on 40 meters last evening than people posting
>to rrap.

Just for information, we have, from another board,
an interesting discussion concerning long-distance
international communication, and then shorter-range,
int-RA-national communication. These four hams are
responding to a fifth ham whose call sign was being
misunderstood on SSB.

>>I use "Golf Four XXXX XXXX Yankee" and it is
>>quite often heard as "Golf Four XXXX XXXX Yankee"

>I find "Golf" is the most problematic letter in the
>NATO Phonetic Alphabet. Many people - especially
>Spanish speakers - have difficulty n understanding
>it. I often have to resort to "Germany" or "Guatemala"
>to make my prefix understood.

>Fortunately, I operate 95% CW, so phonetics are not
>a major problem! ;-)

Now, a third comment, from the same thread as above
but with yet another poster:

>>>I, too, have some trouble with callsigns. In my case,
>>>it's not the letters but the number. My "Whiskey XXX
>>>XXXX Papa," is sometimes heard as WXXP, parti-
>>>ularly in Eastern Europe. I've never figured out why.
>>>Guess that's why I operate mostly CW :.)

And, finally, one more, also from the same thread,
indicating that one does not have to be trying to
communicate internationally to have problems:

>>>>It is difficult to follow U.S. hams from the deep
>>>>south, although I've never had a problem with hams
>>>>from the North East, I'm sure that, for some people,
>>>>the accent would make some words difficult. I'm sure
>>>>that some folks have a problem with my accent
>>>>(although it sounds fine to me). Maybe the solution
>>>>is to listen to your pronunciation and try changing

>>>>the accent a little on the words that are being mis-
>>>>heard. Just a thought.

***

422. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:25:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB6541.85005E2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39791

Carl Zager wrote:
> What Val is doing just confuses the heck outta me. First, he was
> attributing everything backward, and then he was attributing comments
> without the mailer's ID line.
>
> I really, calmly object.

I have told him twice that he is violating the net news attribution
guidelines. He doesn't seem to care. Just what the ARS needs -
another rule-breaking troublemaker.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

423. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 20:54:08 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204032053350.12837-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 39794

```
On Wed, 3 Apr 2002, CAM wrote:
>Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>> There have been, in past years, "exceptions" to transmitting music, and
>> they were used as excuses for getting the foot in the door to "broadcast".
>
>I've transmitted with Rush Limbaugh in the background. Does that count?

Mindless pinko noise isn't music? :-)
```

424. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 21:00:45 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uamqa48934jp15@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39792

Carl Zager wrote:

>I really, calmly object. Please let your mailer handle the
>attributions and the identification symbols. Delete what
>you don't want to talk about, if you must, but please
>return to e-mail, USENET, protocol.

Sorry to have screwed that message up. But, not
to worry, I'm out of the long reply business now!

Val
KC0MUB

425. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 21:06:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8fqsu$n12$0@208.207.71.172>
Source record: 39795

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
>
> Can we move on now?

To which of your fantasies?

426. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 21:09:17 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uamqq3rjf44f6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39793

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:

>Val, I read your message several times,
>and I just gotta ask ---- "Your point?"

Why, I put that message on JUST to provoke
a reply from YOU, of course. It's what I live for,
doncha know!

Val
KC0MUB

P.S. My response above comes under the
rubric of . . . oh, heavens, never mind.

**

427. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 21:32:13 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <xxKq8.13836$nt1.1130622@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39796

"Valentine Germann" wrote

> P.S. My response above comes under the
> rubric of . . . oh, heavens, never mind.

I'm serious, your post seemed a complete non-sequitur, and unrelated to the context of the post to which you responded.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

428. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 21:46:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204031346.4dee65ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39797

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<a8dmfn$1t8$0@208.207.71.137>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<a8cif8gsf0@208.207.71.131>...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > > The fact that the most sweeping license test changes since the mid-1960s
> > > > gathered
> > > > only about 2500 comments and reply comments indicates most hams and would-be
> > > > hams
> > > > simply didn't care all that much how it turned out.
> >
> > > I disagree, and what I heard was what you said earlier- "FCC will just
> > > do whatever they want anyway, what I have to say won't make any
> > > difference. Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
> > > me even more frustration."
> >
> > Dick,
> >
> > I never wrote:
> >
> > "FCC will just do whatever they want anyway, what I have to say won't make any
> > difference. Commenting is just a waste of my time and effort, and causes
> > me even more frustration."
> >
> >
> My apologies, that wasn't meant to be a direct quote, but it sure came
> out that way.

Ah - now I understand.

> It was, however, the approximate meaning I read from your
> earlier post to the extent that the FCC will do whatever it wishes
> without regard to what hams think.

Sorry if I wasn't clear. What I am/was saying is that while FCC reads
all comments, proposals and other input, they are not REQUIRED to follow
majority opinion on anything. So even though code testing has majority
support, FCC has the power to override the majority for reasons they
(the FCC) thinks are more important.

This works both ways. Anybody remember columnist Jack Anderson and his
column about ham radio vs. cb allocations back in the early 1970s?
Good thing the FCC didn't listen to "the majority" back then.

> > nor do I think that way. I commented on 98-143 and other NPRMs. My comments on
> > the restructuring were posted here. I also encouraged others to comment.
>
>
> Yep, some of us did. Didn't make any difference, FCC just did what Bill
> Cross decided.

Sure. On that one issue. Wonder what they will do about "refarming"? Or 160
meters?

> > However, I DO think that the tiny percentage of hams who commented on 98-143
> > gave the FCC a lot of leeway in their decisions. Also, while giving my "history
> > of ham licensing" talk at local amateur radio clubs, I found that very few of
> > the local hams planned to comment on the NPRM.
>
> Most hams I've talked to think FCC doesn't care much at all what they
> think. I believe they're right. It's what Bill Cross thinks that counts.

The purpose of comments and other input is to try to influence how Mr. Cross
& Co. think about certain issues. If nothing else, to show that there is a
range of opinion on an issue.

> > > As you know, I did comment.
> >
> > As did I and some other rrappers. Oddly enough, some of the most frequent
> > posters here did not.

> That's no surprise.

Exactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

429. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 22:03:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204031403.2488736d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39798

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:<u%uq8.1328$QC1.119088@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >> FCC rulings are NOT the result of
> >> popular opinion polls based on how
> >> many commentors favor one outcome vs another.
>
> Jim, N2EY, wrote:
> > I would say that in many cases the majority opinion
> > prevails, but the FCC is not bound to follow majority
> > opinion in all cases. Majority opinion is a factor but
> > not an absolute controlling factor.
>
> Back not too long after the New Deal when I took my
> two courses in Government in college, a lot of these
> three-lettered Federal agencies (FCC, SEC, ICC, FTC,
> etc) were described to me as being "quasi-judicial".
> If my memory is correct, this description meant that
> although they performed subsidiary functions of the
> executive, legislative and judicial branches, their
> primary approach to the matters within their purview
> was to be deliberative and judicial.

I've never heard it said that way, but it sure fits the
role of those agencies. In many cases they act as lawmaker,
judge and jury all rolled into one.

> So it doesn't
> come as a big surprise that they would tend to place
> more weight on a logically valid point made by one
> respondent than on a tenuous one put forth by an
> army of respondents.

It also doesn't come as a big surprise that they would place
more weight on a minority point that agrees with their opinion
and vision of an issue rather than a majority one opposing it.

Way back in 1983 the FCC said they did NOT deny, nor want to reduce,
the importance of Morse Code in the ARS. They simply questioned the
need for ALL hams to be tested on it, particularly for access to
VHF/UHF.

> It's not who has the most lawyers
> in their courtroom but rather who has the better case.

It helps if the judge agrees with you, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

430. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-03 22:30:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8fvpn$7ri$0@208.207.71.172>
Source record: 39799

N2EY wrote:
>

I commented on 98-143 and other NPRMs. My comments on
> > > the restructuring were posted here. I also encouraged others to comment.
> >
> >
> > Yep, some of us did. Didn't make any difference, FCC just did what Bill
> > Cross decided.
>
> Sure. On that one issue. Wonder what they will do about "refarming"? Or 160
> meters?
>

Good question, one that points out the danger in one individual making
all the rules and decisions for the ARS.
I'm sure I'm not the only one reading here who noted Bill Cross' speech
at Dayton where he said that hams need to reach a consensus on what we
want the ARS to be since "You don't want *me* making the decisions for
you, for you may not like them". Looks to me like we've already been
there, and really have no desire go go again. And once again, with a
"consensus" within ham radio even further away from being possible than
ever, it looks like that is exactly what will happen- HE will make the
rules. And his statement is something of a non-sequitar anyway, since
"make the rules for us" is exactly what he has already been doing.
And you'll note that he didn't say "us at the FCC make the rules for
you ...'" he said "ME". I believe him.
Imagine what the situation might look like if he retired and was
succeeded by a freebander with the right connections to get the job...
Goodbye ARS!

> > > However, I DO think that the tiny percentage of hams who commented on 98-143
> > > gave the FCC a lot of leeway in their decisions. Also, while giving my "history
> > > of ham licensing" talk at local amateur radio clubs, I found that very few of
> > > the local hams planned to comment on the NPRM.
> >
> > Most hams I've talked to think FCC doesn't care much at all what they
> > think. I believe they're right. It's what Bill Cross thinks that counts.
>
> The purpose of comments and other input is to try to influence how Mr. Cross
> & Co. think about certain issues. If nothing else, to show that there is a
> range of opinion on an issue.

We can't know what influences Cross responded to in the late R&O, but
it's clear that FCC's main thrust is minimal work and hassle for

themselves, whatever the resulting effect on ARS. I imagine they don't worry a whole lot about us, and if ARS becomes unmanageable (which historically isn't likely) they can always drop the hammer on the whole service if that's justified.

73, Dick W0EX

431. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 00:02:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB981F.E4D0EC4D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39800

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
> > Can we move on now?
>
> To which of your fantasies?

Dick, it doesn't do any good to put me on your kill list and then
keep acting like an irrational dunce. If you are going to change
your dumb$hit image, you are going to have to change your dumb$hit
style.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

432. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 00:08:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAB9969.90AD4994@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39701

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I'm sure I'm not the only one reading here who noted Bill Cross' speech
> at Dayton where he said that hams need to reach a consensus on what we
> want the ARS to be since "You don't want *me* making the decisions for
> you, for you may not like them".

Too bad you didn't take him seriously.

> We can't know what influences Cross responded to in the late R&O, but
> it's clear that FCC's main thrust is minimal work and hassle for
> themselves, whatever the resulting effect on ARS.

They've been ordered to reduce their budget. How would you accomplish
that? What radio service(s) require more attention than they are worth?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

433. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 01:23:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403202354.09489.00000241@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 39702

In article <HLGq8.13224$nt1.1097953@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
>> FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>
>> As of May 14, 2000:
>
>clip.....
>
>We can all go to the AH0A site and read the tea leaves, and draw all sorts
>of conclusions regarding [insert favorite agenda item here].

Except as noted in the posts, I do not use AH0A's numbers.

I started this thread so there would be a reliable source of US amateur radio
license numbers in the future. As long as USENET archives exist, they will be
available in plain-ASCII format by simply looking up these posts.

>In fact the number of hams (or the number of hams in any given license
>class) is not a particularly significant indicator of the value of the
>Amateur Radio service.

Agreed! But it sure seems to be of interest to many people, particularly in
policy
matters.

>Can we move on now?

Go right ahead.

73 de Jim, N2EY

434. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 01:30:49 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <d1Oq8.3129$Rw2.235080@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39703

Regarding the FCC restructuring rule-making,
Dick Carroll, W0EX, wrote:

> Certainly not, but the main point is that
> they are not obligated to base their
> decisions on any viewpoint whatever other
> than their own....

That was my point. All judges, or quasijudges,
render decisions that are basically their own
opinions of the matters before them. The way
the system works is that those opinions are
the ones that count. Supposedly they are
honest in writing out their opinions and one
can gain an insight into the thought processes
involved in forming them.

> .... I believe it quite likely
> they decided to drop code testing to 5wpm
> for all mainly to rid themselves of the
> medical waiver problem. The fact that so
> much whining was going on only reinforced it.

I think it's safe to say that they had evidence
in front of them that the code-test waiver was
'troublesome'. And they were very likely
searching for an 'out' in the situation that
wouldn't get them cross-ways with Congress and
its ADA. That wasn't their sole consideration,
of course, and the way they finessed the situation,
I think, was to roll up all the points into some
Solomonic decision that cut the baby into several
pieces and left all parties semi-pissed. Remember,
NCI didn't get anything close to what it ultimately
wants either.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

435. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 01:49:05 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <liOq8.3165$Rw2.237580@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39704

Jim, N2EY, wrote (about FCC decision-making):

> It also doesn't come as a big surprise that they would place
> more weight on a minority point that agrees with their opinion
> and vision of an issue rather than a majority one opposing it.

Perhaps the real question is: How did they form their opinion and vision? I don't think it leapt to their cosciousness fully formed. I'm sure there was informal input from their staffers. And there isn't any prohibition in being aware of reportage in the press. And there's their own background thought processes always cranking out partially unbidden insights. Unlike a jury, they don't have to restrict their purview to legally admitted evidence in front of them. They can take in the big picture and act accordingly. And they did.

The bitter truth is that none of the current FCC regulations are chiseled in stone. They are all on the chopping block all the time. It was just the code test's turn this time around.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

436. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 01:52:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8gbkadak0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 39705

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <HLGq8.13224$nt1.1097953@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> "KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
> >> FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >>
> >> As of May 14, 2000:
> >
> >clip.....
> >
> >We can all go to the AH0A site and read the tea leaves, and draw all sorts
> >of conclusions regarding [insert favorite agenda item here].
>
> Except as noted in the posts, I do not use AH0A's numbers.
>
> I started this thread so there would be a reliable source of US amateur radio
> license numbers in the future. As long as USENET archives exist, they will be
> available in plain-ASCII format by simply looking up these posts.
>
> >In fact the number of hams (or the number of hams in any given license
> >class) is not a particularly significant indicator of the value of the
> >Amateur Radio service.
>
> Agreed! But it sure seems to be of interest to many people, particularly in
> policy
> matters.
>
> >Can we move on now?
>
> Go right ahead.

Hey Hans! Don't wait up for us, OK?

437. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 02:02:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cabb421_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39706

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020401203154.06846.00001451@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: David Stinson arc5@ix.netcom.com
>
> >People have attempted to found competing organizations many times,
> >some of them funded and quite serious.
> ***
> >Carping and fragmenting into little cults like NCI
> >won't solve anything and creates its own problems.
>
> There are many such "cults" in Amateur Radio -- NCI formed to promote the
> removal of code testing; QRP ARCI (and others) to promote QRP; TAPR to
promote
> digital operation -- and each of these organizations represents the
interests
> of that organization better than ARRL does. I belong to several of them.
>
> But none of those organizations consistently represents the interests of
> Amateur Radio across its broad spectrum of activities and interests. None
of
> the above offered comments wrt the current 70 cm RFID matter, just as an
> example.

Ed,

I seriously considered asking the NCI Board to agree to
file comments on the 70 cm RFID matter, however, the
last time that NCI filed comments "outside of its charter"
in the interest of "doing the right thing for amateur radio,"
we got railed on by all of the PCTA folks for doing so ...
if I recall correctly, even your colleague Jon Bloom was
critical of our doing so ...

Since I knew that you were "on top of the situation"
I decided it wasn't worth the grief and bitching it
would cause if NCI "tried to help out."

73,
Carl - wa6vse

438. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 02:23:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403212323.00506.00001804@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39707

>Subject: Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio
>From: kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager)
>Date: 04/03/02 15:09 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <77f1797e.0204031209.47c93fdd@posting.google.com>

>the most recent
>inclusion had one set of symbols (>, or :, or [something]) ... and
>each more distant had sets of symbols (>> [for example]).

Here's what I do...If it's more than 2 (>>), it doesn't need to be
"quoted"..It's a waste of bandwidth and no one can follow the thing anyway.

K.I.S.S.

73

Steve, K4YZ

439. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 02:24:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403212458.00506.00001805@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39708

>Subject: Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 04/03/02 15:25 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3CAB6541.85005E2@IEEE.org>

>I have told him twice that he is violating the net news attribution
>guidelines.

Can you show us the specifications on net news attributions, Cecil?

73

Steve, K4YZ

440. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 02:35:09 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1fa14ae.1fhwcne1qc6nuxN%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 39709

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > ... And "B" is for "Bubba,"
> > I guess. It sure as hell could be a lot WORSE!
>
> All you need is naughty phonetics to get another endless
> "ARS is headed for destruction" thread going. The 'B'
> could stand for 'Boobs' just to get it started.

Congrats!
--
If people from Poland are called Poles, why
aren't people from Holland called Holes?
- George Carlin

441. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:09:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403220910.00451.00002006@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39710

>Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/03/02 15:13 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020403151339.29664.00000264@mb-bk.aol.com>

>In the USA the FCC has not mandated
>USE of morse code modes in amateur radio for years.

Who said they did?

>Supply the last year in which the FCC mandated morse code use
>by radio amateurs for any specific time period. Part 97, Title 47
>CFR has made ALL allocated modes optional for use by all
>licensees for at least the last 6 years.

Why should I, Your Wierdness? I never even REMOTELY suggested they did.

Your point?

>>Actually, 500kHz is not the only frequency for which emergency traffic
>>is passed or initiated, in Morse Code or any other mode. Suggest you
>>familiarize yourself with CURRENT maritime practice before making ignorant
>>assertions.
>
>GMDSS (Global Marine Distress and Safety System) has been in
>worldwide use for three years. The FCC has added commercial
>radio operator licenses specifically covering GMDSS operation for
>at least 5 years. The USCG no longer monitors 500 KHz.
>GMDSS does not require morsemanship skills.

I guess that's as close as we will ever get to Lennie "admitting" that he
stuck his foot in it again.

>Current maritime radio practice utilizes SSB voice and data at
>long distances, VHF and UHF voice in harbor areas.

Like I said.......

>>>The FCC has radio services specifically for "fun" (hobby) activities
>>
>> Depending on how you care to "define" the broadcast services, there is
>>NO radio service exclusively for "fun", Lennie.
>
>Amateur radio is regulated by the FCC. Under Robeson's logic,
>amateur radio CANNOT be fun or enjoyable or a hobby.

Andersonian Big Lie Technique failed again. Nothing of the like was said,
but of course you TRIED to make it sound that way...Baaaaaad Lennie.

>> Subparts of Part 95 allow for the hobby use of rf emitters for the
>remote
>>control of models, however even that subpart is not EXCLUSIVELY about
>>"models".
>
>So...Robeson extends this NON-fun to all 175 thousand members
>of the Academy of Model Aeronautics and all the smaller
>associations of hobbyists who enjoy small aircraft and vehicle
>radio control?

Try to spin it any way you care to, Lennie, but that's not what was
said...but you have fun trying , OK?

(Sheeeesh...putziness musta been on sale the day Lennie was hatched...His
momma bought a whole lot for him!)

>There seems to be a distinct lack of enjoyment of life by Robeson

Sure, Lennie....Wanna meet me on 20 meters and we'll discuss
it?...Oooops...forgot, you CAN'T meet me on the air...Guess I will ahve fun
without ya!

442. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:24:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403222442.00451.00002009@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39711

>Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/03/02 15:13 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020403151339.29664.00000264@mb-bk.aol.com>

>>>See the Citizens Band
>>>radio service and the Family Radio service. Those are regulations
>>>to mitigate RF interference but they are strictly for recreational
>>>activities.
>>
>> Oh? Please cite the paragraph from ANY FCC rule or regulation that
>>states ANY service regulated by the FCC is "strictly for recreational
>activities".
>
>I just did. Robeson persists in terrible reading comprehension.

Uh huh...YOU stated that FRS and CB were "strictly for recreational
activities".

I asked you to please cite the FCC rule or regulation that so specifies
that.

You have, so far, not done so. So who has the comprehension probelm, Your
Misleadiningness?

>The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory
>term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

Yep. And each "administrative division" of the FCC's rules and
regulations provides a "SERVICE" to the citizens of the United States. Whether
"you" like it or not, Your Licenselessness.

>If you wish to serve someone, take a job as a servant.

Your contempt for those who find enjoyment from providing volunteer
service is glaring. Not that it's "new" to anyone in THIS newsgroup. Your
contempt for ANYTHING that is not "you".

I "SERVE" as a volunteer medic. I "SERVE" as a SAR pilot in CAP. I
"SERVE" as a volunteer nurse with the Red Cross and other agencies. I "SERVE"
as a volunteer with ARES and SkyWarn. But in NO case could I be even remotely
considered a "servant" in the definition YOU would apply.

>No fun, no recreation in amateur radio according to Steebie.

Another Big Lie brought to you by one of the founding fathers of
"Pathalogical Liars Association". Jon Lovitz would be proud of you, Your
Truthlessness.

Again.

Steve

443. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:35:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020403223512.04364.00000715@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 39714

In article <uam7in7419l32b@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Emotions run high over issues having to do with
>private residential property and these covenants,
>and I can certainly see the problems for amateur
>radio. What is happening here in Columbia, which
>is a pretty small burg of around 100,000 people, is
>that most new construction does not have much of a
>lot attached, even for homes in the $250,000 region,
>a fair amount of money here. The way these new
>developments are set up, if you put up an antenna
>in your back yard then most likely a neighbor will be
>looking straight at it, possibly from not much farther
>away than you are.
>
>So, what a mess!

Val:

You can say that again. There's a lot of the same thing going on
here in Delaware -- enormous, expensive houses, 3K sq. ft. class,
going up on lots as small as a quarter acre and spaced so tight
you can't walk between them without a shoehorn and a bucket of
grease! The CC&R's in these developments not only tell you
how hard you're allowed to sneeze, but which hand you have to
hold the Kleenex in! If I could afford a quarter-mil for a house, I'd
want to at least not have to listen to my neighbor's toilet flushing
in the middle of the night! Ham radio? Fuhgedaboudit!

BTW: Aren't you glad they didn't get your call sign suffix backwards?
Then you would have had a BUM call sign!

Your phonetics could be: "Mightly Useless Bum." Sorry, just kiddin'.

73 de Larry, K3LT

444. "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:35:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020403223513.04364.00000716@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 39712

In article <3CAA8689.E9E52C1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Kim, OTOH, deliberately choose W5TIT as a Vanity
>> Call Sign, for the express purpose of calling attention to herself ...
>
>Actually, Kim obtained that callsign on a dare.

Cecil:

Really? Well, all that shows is that she cannot refrain from acting
impulsively on something as immature as a dare. Speaks volumes
for her character -- or, lack thereof. However, nothing new here,
based on what we know of her.

73 de Larry, K3LT

445. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:35:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020403223513.04364.00000717@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 39713

In article <3CAAA61A.D88D6BFE@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> At the same time, and keeping everything said above in mind,
>> I wish to belatedly congratulate Kim Walker, W5TIT, for passing
>> her ham radio tests and becoming a ham! I feel that this is a
>> remarkable achievement for her, and that she must feel very
>> proud of having accomplished what must have been, for her, an
>> extremely challenging and difficult task! It is unfortunate that
>> you will never progress any further than Technician, Kim, but
>> at least you got that far, and can at least call yourself a ham
>> radio operator! Congratulations, Kim -- I'm sure very few people
>> would have guessed that you had it in you!
>
>Kim, you'll just have to study for and get your extra.....
>

Naaa -- never happen!

73 de Larry, K3LT

446. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:38:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403223859.00451.00002012@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39715

>Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/03/02 15:13 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020403151341.29664.00000265@mb-bk.aol.com>

>The word "service" has different meanings in different contexts. My
>Webster's New World dictionary has the following groups for "service:"

(SNIP)

>5. Benefit or advantage, friendly help or professional service.

Were you actually READING your Websters as you copied these, Lennie, or
did Mommy Lennie tell you what letter to type one at a time?

>The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory
>term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

Which fits YOUR citing of Websters perfectly. Thanks, Your Putziness.

>Part 97 defines
>amateur radio as a radio activity without pecuniary interest, thus
>qualifying "amateur" as the opposite of "professional."

You keep reciting this, Lennie, yet YOU are the one who seems to not be
able to seperate that which is "amateur" and that which is "professional".

>The word "service" as used throughout Title 47 CFR is a regulatory
>term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

And fit's YOUR citing of Websters as I noted above perfectly.

>Element 1 in the license test requirement still exists. S25.5 in
>the ITU-R still exists. Something that exists cannot be
>non-existant at the same time.

The test only exists due to treaty obligations. The rest is simple
argumentitiveness on your part. Perhaps because you are a fool.

>>You attempt to negate Amateur Radio's SERVICE value by the fact that no
>>"pecuniary interest" is involved.
>
>Impossible conclusion by Robeson.

"Impossible conclusion"...?!?!?

BWWWWAAAHAHAH

>> Pretty thin and pretty stupid. I have dedicated thousands of hours to
>>various organizations for which I received NO renumeration, and in which
>>human lives were saved. Since I didn't get "paid" for it, does that make
>the
>>services I rendered of no value?
>
>Definitions which apply to ALL citizens are not based on Steven
>James Robeson's personal activities nor are they defineable by
>him.

You make assinine assertions then fail to justify them. Your "answer" is rhetorical silliness. Just plain and simple. What a PUTZ!

>I made a statement only on this new millennium. That is not any
>"backpeddle." It is merely a fact in the year 2002.

Oh...I SEEEEEEEE! Any change of calenders means anything you have said before is moot, and we should wait until you take the opportunity to redefine yourself to us....

Rrrrrrrright.

>For the year 1999 it also apples...but that is in the old millennium.
>No "backpeddle."

Yes it is.....ya got caught. Again.

447. VK5GY Silent Key.!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:41:25 UTC
From: Stef Daniels VK5HSX <vk5hsx@wia.org.au>
Message-ID: <MPG.17166f646f45f41c989683@news.bigpond.com>
Source record: 39716
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Greetings and thanks for reading this message..

It is with much regret that the news of John Eastaugh VK5GY
passing, be posted to the Amateur community. I happened Tues 28th Mar
2002. He was a valued member of South Coast Amateur Radio Club Inc. [SA]
and will be sorely missed. We pass on our sincere condolences to his
family..

--
Regards,

Stef Daniels
vk5hsx@wia.org.au
Adelaide, South Australia
---

448. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:50:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403225045.00451.00002015@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39717

>Subject: Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/03/02 15:13 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020403151343.29664.00000266@mb-bk.aol.com>

>Some more simple web-searching will turn up a huge amount of
>historical material on radio, many of those sites authored by
>radio amateur license holders.

Yep. And the articles from QST, "Radio", and others demonstrated "mobile"
amatuer radio stations going back to the 19-teens and early 20's.

Thanks for another multi-page atttempt to obfuscate the truth, Lennie.
You are trying to convince yourself that Amateurs were not involved in the
"pioneering" of mobile communications.

That is foolish.

>"All-inclusive" means encompassing ALL histories, not the self-
>promoting and rather biased ARRL history publications concerning
>just amateur radio.

However YOU specifically eliminate any ARRL publications.

Please, Your Lyingness, tell us how second and third decade Amateurs
concocted all those QST items in order to provide 2002-era Amateurs with a
false history of early radio development.

>As done
>above by Robeson, it is NOT specific, just a broad general statement
>having nothing conclusive or quantifiable or referencible. It is just a
>propaganda phrase repeated for the nth time.

Please prove that Amateurs did NOT help pioneer early mobile radio
communications, Lennie.

Since there's no one who will play with you anyway, I am sure you will
have fun concocting a story about how all the early radio magazines showing
Ham's mobile stations as some sort of ARRL lodge hall black magic.

I can't wait.

449. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:53:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403225331.00451.00002016@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39718

>Subject: Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/03/02 15:13 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020403151344.29664.00000267@mb-bk.aol.com>

>Had you been reading this newsgroup since '98 as claimed,
>you would have long since known that Ed Hare picked that
>specific callsign under the Vanity system. He said so in
>plain English.

Perhaps, unlike you, Val has a life ouside of RRAP and missed that?

One CAN "read" something over a period of time and NOT have memorized
every page or detail.

Anything ELSE you'd care to be insulting about?

450. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:54:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8gitfckc1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39719

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8e0pisti0@208.207.71.141...
>
>
> K7JEB wrote:
> So it doesn't
> > come as a big surprise that they would tend to place
> > more weight on a logically valid point made by one
> > respondent than on a tenuous one put forth by an
> > army of respondents.
>
> Certainly not, but the main point is that they are not obligated to
> base their decisions on any viewpoint whatever other than their own.

Sorry Dick, they (FCC) still must use rational
decision making. The FCC can be challenged if it acts
in an arbitrary and capricious manner. The reality, however,
is that the R&O for NPRM 98-143 was more than
adequately prepared to avoid any charge of it being
arbitrary and/or capricious.

> I believe it quite likely they decided to drop code testing to 5wpm
> for all mainly to rid themselves of the medical waiver problem.

Perhaps so...which alone would justify the FCC R&O.

> The fact that so much whining was going on only reinforced it.

If it makes you feel good, believe what you want.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

451. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 03:59:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020403225923.00451.00002018@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39721

>Subject: An Answer Please, Lennie...
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 04/03/02 00:02 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020403000255.13715.00001794@mb-da.aol.com>

> I will now ask you to please cite the specific FCC rule or regulation
>that
>restricts ANY radio service or activity to STRICTLY (your adjective, not
>anyone
>else's) recreational pursuits.

Lennie, did you not understand the request?

Steve

452. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 04:15:53 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uanjq0pjsbqc42@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39720

Fred Garvin wrote:

> Congrats!

Thanks! Checked in to my first club net tonight. Neat!

>If people from Poland are called Poles, why
>aren't people from Holland called Holes?
>- George Carlin

And Laplanders could be "Lapells," stretching the
analogy! :-)

Val
KC0MUB

453. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 04:40:38 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uanl8dtbiobe38@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39722

mike coslo wrote:

> But these new covenant restricted neighborhoods are
>repulsive. I guess these people believe they are keeping
>the standards up. I wouldn't live in one of them if they paid
>me. I am always amazed the lengths some people will go
>to just to control how others look and act.

The world just isn't as nice a place these days as it was
not so long ago, I guess. It all seems part of a general
INsecurity that may not get better soon. It's truly sad.

Val
KC0MUB

454. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 04:47:06 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uanlkflp0upo55@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39723

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>BTW: Aren't you glad they didn't get your call sign
>suffix backwards? Then you would have had a BUM
>call sign! Your phonetics could be: "Mightly Useless
>Bum." Sorry, just kiddin'.

I wonder, do they just NOT give certain calls, like
one that might end in "BUM," for example? You
would think that certain combinations would be,
as Monty Python might say, "RIGHT OUT!" :-)

Val

455. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 04:52:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CABDC1C.A23C8F24@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39726

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 04/03/02 15:25 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3CAB6541.85005E2@IEEE.org>
>
> >I have told him twice that he is violating the net news attribution
> >guidelines.
>
> Can you show us the specifications on net news attributions, Cecil?

I searched the web and posted the URLs about a year ago, Steve.
It even has a specification number as I recall. But I don't
still have a copy of it. I think anyone could do the search.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

456. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 04:55:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CABDCD7.DB02385@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39727

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Actually, Kim obtained that callsign on a dare.
>
> Really? Well, all that shows is that she cannot refrain from acting
> impulsively on something as immature as a dare.

Uhhhhhhh Larry, it was a group of hams who dared her to do it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

457. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:01:34 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uanmfj3jtna4cd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39724

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote, concerning my missing
Mr. Hare's description of the origin of his call sign:

> One CAN "read" something over a period of time
>and NOT have memorized every page or detail.

I read this group very closely for several months in
1997 and 1998, and then from time to time until just
a few weeks ago, when I began reading it closely
again. I still have a notebook from the spring of '98,
and some messages saved from other periods,
if they looked particularly interesting.

But, somehow, gee, I simply missed Mr. Hare's
account of the origin of his call sign! How could
that EVER have happened? Wow!

Val
KC0MUB

458. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:02:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CABDE4D.61581E52@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39729

Valentine Germann wrote:
> I was humorous, though, being lectured on
> ANY kind of "etiquette" by our ol' buddy CAM!

You were humorous?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

459. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:08:22 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8hh1k31vu1@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39747

Well.... I look at it this way..... That is their opinion, and that is it.
And opinions are like A$$holes... everyone has them....

I can look at Larry and Dick (and Curly and Moe) this way.... we can agree
that we disagree about certain topics.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:nguq8.2758$bF1.516672677@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
> Dick and Larry will tell you that you're not a ham.
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:a8c8ac61qnr@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > Oh no Cecil.... now us hams are gonna be associated with Trekkies!
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CA7F1F2.16555B31@IEEE.org...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > > Remember how screwed up Dr. McCoy got after a mind meld with
Spock?
> > > > > Maybe Val's mind meld with Dick is having the same effect?
> > > >
> > > > Was that before or after Spock went into heat?
> > >
> > > Spock went into heat on TV. The mind meld with Dr. McCoy spanned
> > > two movies, Star Trek IV (Wrath of Khan) and Star Trek V (Search
> > > for Spock).
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > >
> > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

> >
> >
>
>

460. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:09:23 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uanmu89if61i13@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39725

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>Can you show us the specifications on net
>news attributions, Cecil?

I have to plead guilty to screwing up several
messages by trying to "clean them up." If you're
going to do something different, it helps to do
it properly. However, it IS only UseNet, after all,
and the world has continued to spin!

I was humorous, though, being lectured on
ANY kind of "etiquette" by our ol' buddy CAM!

Val

461. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:10:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404001000.13101.00000363@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 39731

In article <3CAB5ADD.2F56D74A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> > So sue me.
>>
>> Typical. You blame the messenger for pointing out your mistake.
>
>Point is, it was an honest mistake, not an attempt at obfuscation
>as you seemed to want to imply.

Where do I imply anything of the sort? All I did was point out your mistake.
If it really was an honest mistake, you'd be thanking me.

Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
restructuring is working perfectly?

73 de Jim, N2EY

462. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:10:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404001000.13101.00000364@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 39732

In article <3CAA8110.9DAEE659@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Yep, I asked for the elimination of all ham license classes except General.

Good thing the FCC didn't act on that. Think what it would mean:

- all newcomers would have to learn at least 5 wpm code and General level theory
just to get started

- full privileges would be granted without learning any of the stuff in the Extra test

When you got started, there was an easy-to-get beginner's license. Your idea would deny today's newcomers the help you had.

73 de Jim, N2EY

463. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:10:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CABE032.855A2D7C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39730

Valentine Germann wrote:
> I have to plead guilty to screwing up several
> messages by trying to "clean them up."

A quick search turned up this URL about netnews.
http://www.ptialaska.net/~kmorgan/nquote.html
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

464. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:12:19 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8hh1l41vu1@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39740

I would agree.... I have let my cellphone go and only keep it in the truck for the purposes of 911 when I cannot either reach a ham (90% of my operation is at night when 99% of the hams are in bed due to the fact most old farts are in bed by 9pm, at least around here) or in an area where I do not have access to an autopatch.

90% of my former cell phone usage was short calls with a clear intention in the message. I have never really be a chatty person on a phone. Make the connection, deliver the message and hang up so to speak...

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a8dvgreqa1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
> Mike,
>
> They (cellphones) aren't hurting the ARS.
>
> Bill K2UNK
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAA7F7F.F6D1F8FB@adelphia.net...
> > I'vve been listening in on this cellphone thing, and I really need it
> > explained to me; just exactly how are cellphones hurting the ARS?
> >
> > - Mike - KB3EIA
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > > There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
> > > > within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general. That is,
> > > > when Big Money moves in on you (and this is what has
> > > > happened to Ham Radio with the cell phones)
> > >
> > > "Big Money" moved in on ham radio...cellphones?
> > > What, another conspiracy. The advent and deployment of wireless
> > > telecommunications cared not a twit about any impact
> > > on ham radio. To describe cellphones as a big money
> > > move against ham radio is akin to suggesting the automobile
> > > was a big money invasion against casual hoseback riding.

>
>

465. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:14:24 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uann7sm35trs02@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39728

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>Here's what I do...If it's more than 2 (>>), it doesn't need
>to be "quoted"..It's a waste of bandwidth and no one can
>follow the thing anyway.

Yes, this is my view, too, since things get really ugly once
those arrows start proliferating. I tried to make a couple
of messages, with lots of arrows, "easier to read" by
modifying them. But, I got in a hurry with them and did
not follow through. Luckily, I have my Anti-Aircraft guns
fully loaded, and when the U.N. Black Helicopeters come
to get me (called in by CAM!), I'll be READY! :-)

Val
KC0MUB

466. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:16:13 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8hh1m51vu1@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39748

Yes Cecil.... that is true, but it would show at least that we do in fact
give a damn about this hobby!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CAB033C.2A988AB7@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Can you imagine a mailing campaign where if
> > even half of the licensed hams wrote a letter to their elected officials
and
> > the FCC at least once a month for the next 12 months stating their
> > intentions of what they wanted ham radio to be? Sounds like it would
drive
> > them nuts!
>
> It would drive then nuts trying to resolve 100,000 conflicting opinions.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

467. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:20:09 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CABE289.57C2213A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39733
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
> No reason for you not to petition for something similar if you feel it is
> needed. The worst that can happen is that they say "No".

Ask someone at the ARRL before the FCC. If it falls in a gray
area, then it may be legal. But if you ask someone at the FCC,
they will probably say "no" to cover their ass in a gray situation.

468. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:21:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CABE2F1.144F743E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39734

> >If people from Poland are called Poles, why
> >aren't people from Holland called Holes?
> >- George Carlin
>

What about Poles who work for the phone company?
"Telephone Poles?"

> And Laplanders could be "Lapells," stretching the
> analogy! :-)

469. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 05:40:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CABE743.194CD22A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39735

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> The term "transceiver" in ham use originated as a description of that sort
> of rig. They were very popular on the 5 and 2-1/2 meter bands before WW2,
> and in WERS service during the war. The classic setup was a single RF tube
> used as superregenerative detector on receive and modulated oscillator on
> transmit, and a one- or two- tube audio section used as the audio section
> on receive and the modulator on transmit.

I have a few 6 meter "toys" like that. I say "toy" because they are
just those China made 49MHz AM walkie talkies I moved to
the AM/SSB portion of the 6 meter band, at 50.3714MHz. I actually
had a contact through this via a friend's 6m/2m dual band rig set up
as a dual band repeater 6m AM to 2m FM. Other ham said
"Some people will do anything to get on a band!".

470. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 06:24:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8gri7$47j$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 39736

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3CAAA61A.D88D6BFE@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> >> At the same time, and keeping everything said above in mind,
> >> I wish to belatedly congratulate Kim Walker, W5TIT, for passing
> >> her ham radio tests and becoming a ham! I feel that this is a
> >> remarkable achievement for her, and that she must feel very
> >> proud of having accomplished what must have been, for her, an
> >> extremely challenging and difficult task! It is unfortunate that
> >> you will never progress any further than Technician, Kim, but
> >> at least you got that far, and can at least call yourself a ham
> >> radio operator! Congratulations, Kim -- I'm sure very few people
> >> would have guessed that you had it in you!
> >
> >Kim, you'll just have to study for and get your extra.....
> >
>
> Naaa -- never happen!

Why is it any more unlikely than her getting a Tech?

471. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 06:27:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8grp2$47j$1@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 39737

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a8e0pisti0@208.207.71.141...
> >
> >
> > K7JEB wrote:
> > So it doesn't
> > > come as a big surprise that they would tend to place
> > > more weight on a logically valid point made by one
> > > respondent than on a tenuous one put forth by an
> > > army of respondents.
> >
> > Certainly not, but the main point is that they are not obligated to
> > base their decisions on any viewpoint whatever other than their own.
>
> Sorry Dick, they (FCC) still must use rational
> decision making.

Not so, and you know it.

The FCC can be challenged if it acts
> in an arbitrary and capricious manner.

Sure, ARRL sued the FCC over the 220 mhz giveaway to UPS. Did a lot of
good too, didn't it??

The reality, however,
> is that the R&O for NPRM 98-143 was more than
> adequately prepared to avoid any charge of it being
> arbitrary and/or capricious.
>

If that makes you feel good, believe what you want.

> > I believe it quite likely they decided to drop code testing to 5wpm
> > for all mainly to rid themselves of the medical waiver problem.
>
> Perhaps so...which alone would justify the FCC R&O.
>
> > The fact that so much whining was going on only reinforced it.
>
> If it makes you feel good, believe what you want.

What if it makes me feel bad?

472. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 06:31:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8gs0e$47j$2@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 39738

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CAA8110.9DAEE659@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Yep, I asked for the elimination of all ham license classes except General.
>
> Good thing the FCC didn't act on that. Think what it would mean:
>
> - all newcomers would have to learn at least 5 wpm code and General level
> theory
> just to get started
>
> - full privileges would be granted without learning any of the stuff in the
> Extra test
>
> When you got started, there was an easy-to-get beginner's license. Your idea
> would deny today's newcomers the help you had.
>

Yeah, but he'd *feel good* about it!

473. Re: Dimmy's Work Day?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 10:36:59 UTC
From: w2zb&ke4tewaregaylovers@queer.com
Message-ID: <3CAC2CC8.A00724F@queer.com>
Source record: 39739
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Georgie wrote:
KE4TEW, vicadin selling scumbag and husband of Rita Garcia, a multi-married whore wrote:

Vicadin inspired rant snipped.

W2ZB, the alcoholic loser fired twice by the FCC, has been located.After jamming on twenty meters and multiple vhf/uhf frequencies for the last year with a fake 610,
the loser was df'ed to his real address. He is currently busy with the Department
of Family and Children's services and his homeowners association,who want him
out.Hopefully, Arselicks kid will eventually kill himself like TEW's kid, that is one way to get the beatings from his drunken 5'2" father to stop. The FCC changed Georgie the drunks 610 for him, since he was so drunk he did not know his address.This is the location for the best amateur radio jammer the FCC ever produced:

http://www.qrz.com/detail/W2ZB

KE4TEW, the infamous Tampa Turd, has been jamming twenty meters for the past 5 years from his cinder-block craphole in Tampa.Being a vicadin dealer and a drug
addict does not leave him much concious time to jam hf, or much money to buy decent equipment. His wretched life consists mostly of posting juvinile comments from compuserve, the lamest dial-up on the net. More to come on this loser. No wonder his son killed himself.

More to come on both of these losers.

474. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 13:09:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404080953.27399.00000252@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 39743

In article <1fa14ae.1fhwcne1qc6nuxN%Garvin@Truss.net>, Garvin@Truss.net (Fred Garvin) writes:

>If people from Poland are called Poles, why
>aren't people from Holland called Holes?
>- George Carlin
>
Why do we park in driveways and drive on parkways?

Why are they called buildings after they are already built?

Why are they called apartments even though they're all stuck together?

If somebody says "a penny for your thoughts" and you "put your two cents in", what happens to the other penny?

What hair color do they put down for bald men's driver's licenses?

73 de Jim, N2EY

475. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 13:09:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404080953.27399.00000251@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 39744

In article <3CAB1BE2.182E550C@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Valentine Germann wrote:
>
>> FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
>> by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
>> competition this can be effective. However, code testing
>> has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
>> supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
>> FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
>> non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
>> and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did)
>> and thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd,
>> well, things might have been more interesting. However,
>> it appears to me now that since there was serious desire
>> to scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!), FISTS,
>> or any other similiar organization, had very little chance
>> of success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
>> a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
>> have had even a prayer, and that not much.
>
> "enemies... agitate... scuttle... full scale attack.." Val, your
>sounding pretty nasty here.

No more so than the language used by many nocodetest folks. Such language
benefits no one.

FISTS' purpose is to promote the USE of Morse. Mandatory testing is only one
way to do that. FISTS focuses on other ways.

>> >I think the thing that has Ham Radio, and the ARRL,
>> >"shaking in it's boots" is the effect of the Internet
>> >and the explosion of wireless technology. These days,
>> >being able to communicate without being physically
>> >tied to a wall outlet of some sort is a common, everyday
>> >occurrence experienced by anyone with the wherewithal
>> >to acquire the technology.
>
> Um, the analogy doesn't quite work. My computer is quite tethered to
>the wall, I got my power cords, my cable modem, my regular modem.

Wireless 'net access is in its infancy. How many years do you think it will be
until radio-equipped lappers are as common as cellphones?

>> >Quite frankly, we (radio
>> >amateurs) will never be able to come close to dupli-

>> >cating the capability of even one of the most ubiquitous
>> >cell phones, and do so without cost to the user. Sure, we
>> >can talk worldwide with our fellow hams with very portable
>> >equipment, but not equipment that is shirt-pocket sized,
>> >and can connect to particular individuals at a time of the
>> >user's choosing.
>
> If you think that pulling a cellphone out of your pocket and calling
>Australia is analogous to ham radio, then we have radically different
>ideas of what ham radio is all about. For me it's about putting out ten
>watts on PSK31 and with my general purpose dipole, doing a QSO with
>Australia or Antarctica. Or contesting, (har, I just had a vision of a
>contesting weekend with cell phones - the person who calls the most
>people wins!)
>
> If you think cellphones are like the ARS, try calling random numbers
>and ask whoever answers their name, qth, grid locator, etc. 8^) I'll bet
>you won't be doing that for long.

You're missing the point, Mike. It was not long ago that amateur radio technology such
as autopatching from an HT or 1200 baud packet BBS was gee-whiz stuff to non-hams. Not so today.

Hams in my area used to be well known to all the 911 dispatchers because we reported all sorts of trouble on the highway. Today such things are mostly reported by nonhams via cellphone. 911 is a free call, btw.
>
>> There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
>> within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general. That is,
>> when Big Money moves in on you (and this is what has
>> happened to Ham Radio with the cell phones) and takes
>> away the mass market, well, you MUST move upscale.

I wouldn't say there was a complete failure, just that we must continue and improve our efforts in the publicity area. That's part of what the "Big Project"
is about.

>> That is, you must re-position yourself in the market as
>> the HIGH-QUALITY experience. And, I hate to say it, part
>> of that "quality" is the historical aspect of your product,
>> which the ARRL is busy selling down the river, even as
>> they earmark funds for a museum there at HQ.

How is ARRL doing that? There is more to amateur radio history than tests for Morse code.

> How are they selling hams down the river? I've been to their site, and
>in fact, just joined the ARRL, and I don't see what you are talking
>about. Looks like a pretty good organization to me.

I've been to Hq. Very impressive.
>
>> Radio MUST stop worrying about just "the numbers" and
>> start thinking about the QUALITY of the people it is going
>> to attract. I think it's the ONLY way, in the long run.
>> If the quality is there then, in the end, sufficient numbers
>> will be there, too!

Yup.
>
> Okay, give some ideas on how we increase the quality of the Amateur?
>Will we have character tests? Who decides?

It's a matter of projecting a positive, "quality" image to everyone. A big part
of this is
setting a good example.

>One thing I see that flies in
>the face of all this is that many of the people who I hear on the air
>that are misbehaving appear to be long term hams. Certainly a look at
>the enforcement pages shows some interesting info:
>
>March 2002
>
>Advanced - last license issuance 1995
>Tech + - 1995
>Tech 1998 Repeater interference
>General-1993 obscenities
>Tech (was novice) 1999 deliberate interference
>Extra - 1996 uncoordinated interfering repeater
>Extra - 1997 same
>General - 1999 Same
>Extra - 1993 Same
>Extra - 2001 Same
>General -couldn't get date no longer in database-retake license
>Extra 1998 Poor repeater operation, no control op interference
>Technician 1997 Unlicensed equipment, giving equipment to unlicensed minor
>
>1 advanced
>3 techs one who was a novice
>1 tech +
>3 Generals
>5 extras
>
> Does the Morse test keep the riffraff out? There were only 2 out of 13
>people on this list who were *not* tested for Morse code operations.

Some points, Mike:

- the endoforcement letters on the ARRL and other websites are not
comprehensive.
They are only a sample.

- most US hams have taken code tests. Those who haven't are not allowed to use the bands where they can be easily heard over large areas.

- it takes time to build up a case to the point where an enforcement letter is issued.
In almost all cases, there have to be substantial complaints against a person, which
are then verified before any enforcement action is taken

- all of the above also took written exams which dealt directly with the regs, yet they
misbehaved anyway.

- "one sparrow doesn't make a spring" - look at a year's worth, not just one month.

- for many years there was very little FCC enforcement at all. Much of the enforcement
being done is catch-up work on the worst offenders who have been at it for quite a
while. And how many big fines and/or license revocations does the FCC do in a year?
How long from initial complaint to final action?

Biggest point:

How many of those cited were using Morse code on the air to commit their alleged
violations? Maybe it's not the test but the use of the mode that is important.

>
> The dates on the license are a little harder to figure out, because it
>looks like the date is based on the last renewal, not when the ham first
>got their license.

True. All you can see is the last renewal.
>
> But what I draw from this one month look is that it looks like there is
>not much correlation between the knowledge and testing of Morse code and
>the character of the ham at *best*. This is a small sample, but 87
>percent of these people were tested and passed a Morse code test!

See above. ALL of them passed written tests, too - shall we dispense with written
tests because some hams break the rules?

FCC is convinced that the Morse code test does not function as a "filter" against
"bad apples". End of story.
>
>> >Their mistake was to think that "dumbing down" our
>> >licensing standards would actually have the effect of
>> >reversing the trend toward negative growth in the
>> >numbers of licensees.

>
> I doubt that they think that they "dumbed down" the standards.

Of course they don"t think so. But the requirements have been reduced - not
just code, but written tests too. Has there been a flood of new hams? Nope -
growth is substantially unchanged from before the restructuring.
>
>> >Right now, there may be
>> >evidence that this is so; unfortunately, in a few years,
>> >when the licenses of the No-Code Tech generation
>> >start expiring, we're going to find that we're no longer
>> >staying ahead of our losses.
>
> What is your evidence that these amateurs are going to just let their
>licenses expire?

The first Techs issued after the rules changes of '91 have been expiring for
more
than a year. Most are being renewed.
>
>> The changes in the licensing requirements have meaning
>> only if the people who would otherwise have not been
>> brought into the avocation STAY within it and advance.
>
>There is a good argument for the need of staying in the hobby, but why
>does the amateur have to advance? Our club has members who simply enjoy
>helping at local events. Thier version of the hobby is public service
>with a handi-talkie. Very good people!

Exactly! I know some satellite ops who are quite "advanced" but have no HF
interest or equipment at all. Some got Extras just for the callsign!
>
>> One of the primary reasons people become Hams, or
>> amateur astronomers, or rock hounds, or whatever, is
>> because that act separates them a little from the crowd,
>> enhances their individuality, and gives them a bit of
>> "cachet," of distinctiveness.
>
> This one made me grin a bit! It's aside from the discussion at hand,
>but there is an old stereotype of a lot of hams, especially the ones who
>frequent hamfests - that many of them don't pay proper attention to
>hygiene, and they do indeed acquire a cachet of de-stink-tivness! 8^)

HAW! But there's a serious point to be made there, Mike. It's VERY important
that we present a positive, attractive, "quality" image at all times.
"Distinctiveness"
needs to be positive!
>
> The fundamental problem here is that who decides what makes for proper
>character? Some among us don't like liberals, some detest conservatives.
>Some hams have the old "no kids, no lids, and no space cadets"

>mentality. Some hams take self regulation to extremes, like the old
>fellow who almost turned me in to to the FCC because I made a typo on my
>callsign to him in an email. He looked it up in the database, and since
>the names didn't match, he went off the deep end accusing me of every
>"hamcrime" imaginable.
>
> Each of these folk have some pretty solid ideas of what they want ham
>radio to be.
>
> Problem is, we can't force other people to be like us. We probably
>wouldn't really want that if we did get it.

But what we CAN do is set a good example. Too many hams set a bad one.
>
> If you hear improper activities on the air, then get the FCC involved -
>that will go a long way towards keeping things on the up and up.

Tapes. FCC wants recordings - reports without tapes are not of much use to
them.

>Those
>hams of poor character, including the many who passed a Morse code test
>back when it was a "real" test will eventually get in line or get out.
>
Yup. Thanks to Riley & Co. We need lots more, though - a dozen Rileys would be
a
good start.

The truly amazing thing is that most hams are so well behaved
given the lack of adequate enforcement for so long.

73 de Jim, N2EY

476. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 13:09:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404080954.27399.00000253@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 39742

In article <uanlkflp0upo55@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
>>BTW: Aren't you glad they didn't get your call sign
>>suffix backwards? Then you would have had a BUM
>>call sign! Your phonetics could be: "Mightly Useless
>>Bum." Sorry, just kiddin'.
>
>I wonder, do they just NOT give certain calls, like
>one that might end in "BUM," for example?

There are certain calls that the FCC will not issue sequentially.
Kim's call is one example. Such calls will be issued by the FCC
only if requested via the vanity program.

>You
>would think that certain combinations would be,
>as Monty Python might say, "RIGHT OUT!" :-)
>
Is this the right newsgroup for an argument?

73 de Jim, N2EY

477. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 13:16:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAC442E.F50ACCE7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39745

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > So sue me.
> >
> > Typical. You blame the messenger for pointing out your mistake.
>
> Point is, it was an honest mistake, not an attempt at obfuscation
> as you seemed to want to imply.

Do you mean it is similiar to when I made a typo and you simply accused
me of being a liar?

Dave K8MN

478. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 13:18:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204040518.56213953@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39741

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:<liOq8.3165$Rw2.237580@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> Jim, N2EY, wrote (about FCC decision-making):
>
> > It also doesn't come as a big surprise that they would place
> > more weight on a minority point that agrees with their opinion
> > and vision of an issue rather than a majority one opposing it.
>
> Perhaps the real question is: How did they form their
> opinion and vision? I don't think it leapt to their
> cosciousness fully formed. I'm sure there was informal
> input from their staffers. And there isn't any
> prohibition in being aware of reportage in the press.
> And there's their own background thought processes
> always cranking out partially unbidden insights. Unlike
> a jury, they don't have to restrict their purview to
> legally admitted evidence in front of them. They
> can take in the big picture and act accordingly. And
> they did.

I agree 100%. And I would add that they may consider and be
affected by things that are not made public, or maybe not
even talked about directly.

For example, "freebanding" and other sorts of "pirate radio"
have been a problem for the FCC since the late 1960s. Perhaps
FCC sees ham radio as a way to clean up the mess by making it
easier to get a ham license. A licensed person has more
incentive to follow the rules than an unlicensed one.

FCC is also subject to things like personnel changes and pressure
from Congress and the White House (that's how we got medical
waivers).

> The bitter truth is that none of the current FCC
> regulations are chiseled in stone.

I know, but some hams don't realize that simple fact.

> They are all
> on the chopping block all the time.

Some of them are secured by international treaty,
however.

> It was just
> the code test's turn this time around.

Yup.

In fact, the code test treaty issue has been moved to WRC 2003 from earlier conferences. This may have actually led to its removal. Had S25.5 been considered for removal, in, say, 1997, it might have been reaffirmed or modified slightly - and its reconsideration avoided for many more years. By delaying consideration until 2003, opinions have porbably changed enough to simply remove it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

479. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 13:26:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAC4651.7F00AC91@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39746

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Actually, Kim obtained that callsign on a dare.
> >
> > Really? Well, all that shows is that she cannot refrain from acting
> > impulsively on something as immature as a dare.
>
> Uhhhhhhh Larry, it was a group of hams who dared her to do it.

Do you do something just because someone dares you to do it?

Dave K8MN

480. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 14:56:04 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaopa7ojipk90f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39749

N2EY wrote:

>Why do we park in driveways and drive on parkways?

. . . and several other humorous items!

My burning question: Why do they shoot ducks and geese
when the fall alone would kill them? :-)

Val
KC0MUB

481. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 15:07:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8hq8c$q7t$0@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 39651

N2EY wrote:
>
"freebanding" and other sorts of "pirate radio"
> have been a problem for the FCC since the late 1960s. Perhaps
> FCC sees ham radio as a way to clean up the mess by making it
> easier to get a ham license. A licensed person has more
> incentive to follow the rules than an unlicensed one.

There is historical support for this view in the literature. It's been many years and I no longer remember where I read it, but I once read something that said the FCC had no idea that CB would turn out to be a "hobby" acitivity at all, since they always held the view that anyone wanting to use radio as a hobby would get a ham radio license. Maybe they're still trying to make it happen.

482. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 15:20:02 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaoqnc2b4aem93@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39750

N2EY wrote:

>Is this the right newsgroup for an argument?

An argument, here!!!??? Nevah hapen, Gee EyeI!

Val

483. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 15:36:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAC7317.BA11EA33@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39652

N2EY wrote:
> Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
> restructuring is working perfectly?

Yep, I begin to worry when the ham population starts to decrease.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

484. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 15:40:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAC7402.C9CB63B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39653

N2EY wrote:
> - all newcomers would have to learn at least 5 wpm code and General level
> theory just to get started

All that is needed for such a General exam is safety, rules, and regulations.

> - full privileges would be granted without learning any of the stuff in the
> Extra test

That's the way it was for the first 16 years of my ham career.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

485. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 15:43:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAC748A.AC003D33@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39654

KC8PMX wrote:
> Yes Cecil.... that is true, but it would show at least that we do in fact
> give a damn about this hobby!

The FCC wants hams to bring them solutions, not more problems.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

486. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 15:50:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAC762C.32E5B751@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39655

Dave Heil wrote:
> Do you mean it is similiar to when I made a typo and you simply accused
> me of being a liar?

You lied about making the typo, Dave, when it was there for all
the world to see, including you. You continued for days to insist
that you didn't make the typo.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

487. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 15:51:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAC7691.DE4F904A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39656

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Uhhhhhhh Larry, it was a group of hams who dared her to do it.
>
> Do you do something just because someone dares you to do it?

Yep, quite often. I once jumped in a lake because someone dared
me to do it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

488. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 17:41:39 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CAC9053.D30BBA18@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39657

Re: W5TIT

Jesus, Mary and Joseph!

When are you bunch of cranky, dilapidated, fossilized old farts
going to stop beating you chest over that friggin' call sign?
You sound like a bunch of old biddies gossiping
after church about someone wearing a "shameless" dress or something.
Christalmighty! Go play shuffle board, or poker,
or with yourself, for pity's sake!
What would Jesus do?
He's turn you 70 year old children over his knee
and spank the crap out of you, that's what.

You guys don't have much to do.
Leave her the hell alone and GET OVER IT!

Dave S.

489. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 18:15:48 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <oL0r8.16243$ml2.1265129@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39658

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
> restructuring is working perfectly?
>

Considering that the FCC-stated purpose of restructuring was to streamline
the rules, and further considering there was no stated purpose related to
"growth of the amateur service", then growth-per-year is not a measure of
whether restructuring is working or not working.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

490. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 18:26:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAC9AD5.CAEBBA11@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39659

David Stinson wrote:
> What would Jesus do?

Nothing, as he didn't speak English. However, he might object to
the callsigns that spell something dirty in Aramaic (MUB) even
though they don't spell anything dirty in English.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

491. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 19:16:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8i8r6$4p4$0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 39660

David Stinson wrote:
>
>
> Re: W5TIT

> What would Jesus do?

What DID he do? He would tell her, "Go, and sin no more".

492. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 19:20:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8i92o$5hr$0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 39661

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
> > restructuring is working perfectly?
> >
>
> Considering that the FCC-stated purpose of restructuring was to streamline
> the rules, and further considering there was no stated purpose related to
> "growth of the amateur service", then growth-per-year is not a measure of
> whether restructuring is working or not working.

Would you mind pointing that out to Carl Stevenson? (Cecil, too).
(T)he(y) didn't seem to get the word. We're still waiting for the
battalion of reformers to update the ARS, while Carl yaks on SSB and
Cecil sruggles along on CW at 10wpm..

493. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 19:48:49 UTC
From: KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG>
Message-ID: <B62r8.16506$ml2.1276127@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39662

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> .....while Carl yaks on SSB and
> Cecil sruggles along on CW at 10wpm..

Do those activities by Carl and Cecil harm the Amateur Radio service?

Somewhere near the center of your radio there probably is a large black
rotary knob.......

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

494. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 20:32:01 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRIC_SMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <5L2r8.16576$ml2.1281362@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39663
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

>
> Ask someone at the ARRL before the FCC. If it falls in a gray
> area, then it may be legal. But if you ask someone at the FCC,
> they will probably say "no" to cover their ass in a gray situation.
>

In 97.113(a)(4) it is clearly prohibited. ARRL cannot change that. The
only solution is a petition to the FCC for a rule change.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

495. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 20:56:18 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CACBDF1.994BB835@psu.edu>
Source record: 39664

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CAB1BE2.182E550C@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> > Okay, give some ideas on how we increase the quality of the Amateur?
> >Will we have character tests? Who decides?
>
> It's a matter of projecting a positive, "quality" image to everyone. A big > part of this is setting a good example.

Hard to argue with that, Jim. But we have to be careful.

> >One thing I see that flies in
> >the face of all this is that many of the people who I hear on the air
> >that are misbehaving appear to be long term hams. Certainly a look at
> >the enforcement pages shows some interesting info:
> >
> >March 2002
> >
> >Advanced - last license issuance 1995
> >Tech + - 1995
> >Tech 1998 Repeater interference
> >General-1993 obscenities
> >Tech (was novice) 1999 deliberate interference
> >Extra - 1996 uncoordinated interfering repeater
> >Extra - 1997 same
> >General - 1999 Same
> >Extra - 1993 Same
> >Extra - 2001 Same
> >General -couldn't get date no longer in database-retake license
> >Extra 1998 Poor repeater operation, no control op interference
> >Technician 1997 Unlicensed equipment, giving equipment to unlicensed minor
> >
> >1 advanced
> >3 techs one who was a novice
> >1 tech +
> >3 Generals
> >5 extras
> >
> > Does the Morse test keep the riffraff out? There were only 2 out of 13
> >people on this list who were *not* tested for Morse code operations.
>
> Some points, Mike:
>
> - the endoforcement letters on the ARRL and other websites are not

> comprehensive. They are only a sample.

Very true, but I wanted to use that sample to just get an idea of who's doing the bad stuff.

> - most US hams have taken code tests. Those who haven't are not allowed to > use the bands where they can be easily heard over large areas.
> - it takes time to build up a case to the point where an enforcement
> letter is issued.
> In almost all cases, there have to be substantial complaints against a
> person, which are then verified before any enforcement action is taken
> - all of the above also took written exams which dealt directly with the
> regs, yet they misbehaved anyway.
> - "one sparrow doesn't make a spring" - look at a year's worth, not just
> one month.

I'll start here. I'm not out to prove any particular thing, here. But In the context of the thread, I'm very skeptical that the ARS is going to hell in a handbasket and that dropping the morse Code testing is allowing the less desirable elements into the hobby.

Even so, I am pro-morse code. Perhaps it sounds like a contradiction, but I just don't believe the apocolyptic visions. I know that dropping it to 5wpm for general got me involved, and I'm just the sweetest guy on the block! 8^)

Regards the small sample size, you are right, but I didn't have much time to do my research. Had to get to work and all. But if the bad boys and girls are being let in by the new dumbed down testing, I would have expected a split much different than 87% to 13%.

> - for many years there was very little FCC enforcement at all. Much of the
> enforcement being done is catch-up work on the worst offenders who have
> been at it for quite a while. And how many big fines and/or license
> revocations does the FCC do in a year?

This is all indicitive of something good though. If the FCC is finally starting to crack down on the baddies, it can only improve the quality of the service

> How long from initial complaint to final action?

This I note as a problem. It will probably never be fast enough. Just verification that the complaint is not bogus will take plenty of time. I note that many complaints have been filed where the FCC ends up admonishing the complainant!

> Biggest point:
>
> How many of those cited were using Morse code on the air to commit their
> alleged violations? Maybe it's not the test but the use of the mode that
> is important.

Well, I can't particularly agree with this one. If we start to include the mode, it takes the discussion in a different direction. The number of possible violations decrease when confining activity to a single mode.

But my overall point was that if the present day testing is allowing riffraff on the bands, we should be able to see that in the enforcement actions, not unlike how you can go through a police logs in a newspaper and see that a large percentage of automobile accidents are caused by teenage males, that most drug offenses are by young people - that sort of thing.

> > But what I draw from this one month look is that it looks like there is
> >not much correlation between the knowledge and testing of Morse code and
> >the character of the ham at *best*. This is a small sample, but 87
> >percent of these people were tested and passed a Morse code test!
>
> See above. ALL of them passed written tests, too - shall we dispense with
> written tests because some hams break the rules?

I hope you don't think I was trying to suggest anything of the sort, Jim!!!! It's all in how I was trying to see a correlation as noted above.

<Snippage>

> > This one made me grin a bit! It's aside from the discussion at hand,
> >but there is an old stereotype of a lot of hams, especially the ones who
> >frequent hamfests - that many of them don't pay proper attention to
> >hygiene, and they do indeed acquire a cachet of de-stink-tivness! 8^)
>
> HAW! But there's a serious point to be made there, Mike. It's VERY
> important that we present a positive, attractive, "quality" image at all
> times. "Distinctiveness" needs to be positive!

One of the things on this line that I think is important is to not project the stereotype of the "nerd ham". Not that there is anything wrong with being a nerd - I am one - part time. But I think it is important that a cross-section of types need to be presented. What else do we do? I saw a web page from a ham who combines his ATV ham interests with his other interest Motocross racing, I play ice hockey and go 4wd'ing. The potential ham needs to know that we are not all just sitting behind our radios in our underwear all night long.

>
> The truly amazing thing is that most hams are so well behaved
> given the lack of adequate enforcement for so long.

Most of us are pretty good people.

- Mike - KB3EIA

496. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 21:09:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404160941.09446.00000261@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 39666

In article <3CAB6384.32844186@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> > It was a figure of speech, Jim, indicating that the FCC has a lot more
>> > to worry about than the ARS in which you are emersed.
>>
>> Why not just use plain, clear English?
>
>"The view from 30,000 ft." is extremely common in the American language,
>Jim. Where have you been that you didn't understand it?

I've lived in the USA all my life. Never seen or heard that phrase meant that
way.

>> > Which represents what percentage of the voters/citizens?
>>
>> A small percentage. The total number of hams is also a small
>> percentage. Why does that matter?
>
>You forgot to add the smiley face to your joke.

Not a joke. Why does it matter?

>The FCC is an arm
>of a political entity. Votes count probably more than anything else.
>Too bad amateur radio was not protected under the Bill of Rights.

Citizens don't vote for FCC officials.
>
>> > Amateur radio
>> > could be abolished today, Jim, and there would not be even a political
>> > whimper.
>>
>> That's right. So why does the FCC keep us around?
>
>IMO it is for emergency communications.

That's one reason.

>The present Morse code
>requirement chases away lots of potential emergency operators.

You have proof of this?
>
>> > We had better fulfill our "basis and purpose" or we will be

>> > gone and hardly anyone will notice.
>>
>> Sure. How does the use of Morse code keep us from fulfilling our B&Ps?
>
>The *use* of Morse code doesn't.

Bingo.

>The Morse code *requirement* does.

Proof, please?

>Many potential emergency HF operators are chased away from amateur
>radio by the Morse code requirement. Wouldn't it be better to have
>double the number of emergency operators available even if they
>don't know Morse code?
>
Did the reduction in code test requirements to the bare minimum two years ago,
or the elimination of the code test for Technicians 11 years ago give us twice
the
number of emergency operators?

Nope.

>> Point is, the word "hobby" does not appear anywhere in Part 97. Nor
>> does any word like "avocation" or "recreation".
>
>Point is, amateurs are expressly prohibited from making an on-the-air
>vocation out of amateur radio. That is very, very clear.

All that's prohibited is being paid for service. A schoolteacher can be paid
for operating a ham station as an educational activity.
>
>> > We all know that amateur radio is an avocation.
>> > In fact, it is illegal to get paid or charge for amateur radio "service".
>>
>> So? Would you say that volunteer firefighters are involved in a
>> "hobby" or "avocation"?
>
>My Dad was a volunteer firefighter. It was his hobby even though he was
>dead serious about it. If hams were as dead serious about their hobby
>as my Dad was about his, there would be a minimum of problems.

So, in your book, a "hobby" is anyhting you don't get paid money to do.
>
>> > > 6) The fact that hams use Morse code in the 21st century means Morse
>code is
>> > > part of 21st century radio and the world of the 21st century.
>> >
>> > Sounds like delusions of grandeur to me.
>>
>> No, it's a simple fact. I was on the air with Morse code just last
>> night - 40 meters.

>
That was 2 days ago. Last night I was on 80. Nice QSO with a ham in KY.

>That would mean something if you were the center of the universe.

How do you know I'm not? Do you know where the center is?
>
>> > What percentage of the 21st century involves Morse code?
>>
>> So far, 1.17%. That number increases every day, though.
>
>1.17% is negligible.

Would you eat food that was 1.17% poison?

> Where did that figure come from?

Divide 427 by 36525
>
>> > That is not to minimize its importance
>> > within the ARS. It is just to put things in perspective.
>>
>> In persepective with regard to what?
>
>The 99+% of the rest of the 21st century. Do your own poll at
>the local mall and get back to us.

Most of the world doesn't care about ham radio one way or the other, let alone
testing.
>
>> > That's what the Morse code test in the 21st century is, Jim, a welfare
>> > (subsidy) program.
>>
>> Not at all. It's just a little requirement for an HF/MF license,
>> that's all. Nobody is forced to use the mode.
>
>That where you are wrong, Jim.

Not at all. I may be mistaken, but I'm not wrong.

>Every HF ham is forced to use the
>mode to pass a Morse code exam to meet the requirements.

They are simply required to pass a basic test. They are not required to use
it on the air at all.

> Why is
>that so difficult to understand? A potential ham who hates Morse code
>still *must* use Morse code to gain HF access.

Nope. Just pass the test. Use of the mode requires a radio set.

> Morse code is an extremely
>small part of being a sucessful ham.

To you, maybe. Not to many others. Are you the center of the universe?

> Potential emergency operators are
>being barred from amateur radio because of the Morse code requirement.

Nonsense. If that were so, there would have been a flood of new hams after
1991.
But there wasn't.

>I know. I worked with many of them at Intel.

Is Intel the center of the universe?

> You can argue that they
>are choosing to be barred. I accept that.

There you are.

> But that still leaves us
>without those otherwise willing emergency operators that we may someday
>need.

So? The FCC has reduced the test to its minimum reasonable level. They cannot
do more
without a change in S25.5, which will almost certainly happen at WRC 2003.

Let's fast-forward a couple of years. Suppose the code tests all disappear
because S25.5 is
deleted at WRC 2003, and there is no big flood of newcomers. Will you and
others admit that
it wasn't a barrier, and move to put it back? Will the FCC? No way!
>
>> So? How does that have any bearing on amateur radio? We are not paid
>> by the govt.
>
>I assume you are talking about money. There are many other ways of
>being rewarded. We HF hams are rewarded (subsidized) by the government
>for choosing to learn Morse code.

And theory, and regs, and lots of other stuff.
>
>> > IMO, virtually the only reason for the present existence of the Amateur
>> > Radio Service is for emergency communications during potential disasters.
>>
>> What about actual disasters?
>
>:-) Actual disasters are potential disasters before they happen.

No, actual disasters happen after potential disasters.
>
>> Better read the B&Ps again, then. While emergency comms are important,
>> there are lots of other reasons for the ARS to exist.
>
>I have read them, Jim, and that's what bothers me.
>ï¿½97.1(a) is emergency communications.

>ï¿½97.1(b) is contributions to the radio art.
> IMO, we don't do that anymore.

Maybe YOU don't, but others do. Wasn't PSK31 a "contribution to the radioart"?
Code tested hams did that.

>ï¿½97.1(c) is advancing skills and technical phases
> IMO, we don't do that anymore.

Maybe YOU don't, but others do. My skills and technical knowledge are
constantly
improving, even after almost 35 years as a ham.

>ï¿½97.1(d) reservoir of trained operators, techs, and electronic experts
> IMO, our training is mostly obsolete. That some extras consider themselves
> to be God's gift to Amateur Radio because they passed the Extra exam
> is comical.

So? You need to hang out with different folks, Cecil. I know lots of trained
operators, techs and electronic experts who are hams. I learn much from them.

>ï¿½97.1(e) enhancing international good will
> IMO, we don't do that except within amateur radio and that's not
> worth very much in today's international market.

Maybe YOU don't but others sure do. I remember all the noise about how the
Rooskies and the Cubans were all big bad evil Commies - but it tuirns out that
at least some of them were hams, and not so bad after all.
>
>So, I repeat: IMO, we had better be very good at emergency communications
>if we want the ARS to survive.
>--
Don't put all your eggs in one basket. And don't blind yourself to all the good
things that are going on every day in ham radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

497. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 21:09:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404160942.09446.00000262@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 39665

In article <3CAC7317.BA11EA33@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
>> restructuring is working perfectly?
>
>Yep, I begin to worry when the ham population starts to decrease.

Then you oughta be worried. According to the AH0A website, the US ham population peaked in March 2001 and has decreased slightly since then. All of the growth claimed for the restructuring happened in less than a year.

http://www.ah0a.org

73 de Jim, N2EY

498. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 21:16:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8ifrv$o3f$0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 39667

KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > .....while Carl yaks on SSB and
> > Cecil sruggles along on CW at 10wpm..
>
> Do those activities by Carl and Cecil harm the Amateur Radio service?

Not at all, they just fly in the face of all their criticizing rants.
The old "Do as I say, not as I do" crapola.

>
> Somewhere near the center of your radio there probably is a large black
> rotary knob.......

I never had but one HF rig that didn't have it..

499. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 21:36:33 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uapgpabr2nflb0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39668

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> Lennie, did you not understand the request?

You've apprently just about stymied this guy, you know it?
Or maybe he sprained a finger, or has a hangnail, or needs
to feed his goldfish, or work on his rig. Oh, wait, he's not
likely working on his rig since HE'S NOT A LICENSE
HOLDER in the service relative to this group! Too BAD!

Val
KC0MUB

500. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 21:52:20 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRIC_SMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <oW3r8.16715$ml2.1292989@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39669

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> Oh, wait, he's not likely working on his rig since HE'S
> NOT A LICENSE HOLDER in the service relative to
> this group!

Until a few short days ago you weren't a license holder
either. Are you suddenly some righteous elevated being,
and Lennie a child of a lesser God?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

501. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 22:00:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404170020.09510.00001655@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 39670

>Subject: Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...
>From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRIC_SMOKE.NET
>Date: 04/04/02 16:52 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <oW3r8.16715$ml2.1292989@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Until a few short days ago you weren't a license holder
>either. Are you suddenly some righteous elevated being,
>and Lennie a child of a lesser God?

Val IS a licensee, and at NO TIME did he spend any of his pre-licensure days "telling" us how to do things. He's applying himself towards learning AMATEUR practice, NOT trying to tell Amateurs how they SHOULD be doing it based upon a dubious career in "professional" radio.

73

Steve, K4YZ

502. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 22:06:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8iiof$2sq$0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 39671

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote
>
> > Oh, wait, he's not likely working on his rig since HE'S
> > NOT A LICENSE HOLDER in the service relative to
> > this group!
>
> Until a few short days ago you weren't a license holder
> either. Are you suddenly some righteous elevated being,
> and Lennie a child of a lesser God?
>

Catching anything, Hans? You sure are doing an awful lot of
trolling....

503. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 22:06:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204041406.76c6ad13@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39672

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<a8fvpn$7ri$0@208.207.71.172>...
> N2EY wrote:

> I commented on 98-143 and other NPRMs. My comments on
> > > > the restructuring were posted here. I also encouraged others to comment.

> > > Yep, some of us did. Didn't make any difference, FCC just did what Bill
> > > Cross decided.

> > Sure. On that one issue. Wonder what they will do about "refarming"? Or 160
> > meters?

> Good question, one that points out the danger in one individual making
> all the rules and decisions for the ARS.

Roger that!

> I'm sure I'm not the only one reading here who noted Bill Cross' speech
> at Dayton where he said that hams need to reach a consensus on what we
> want the ARS to be since "You don't want *me* making the decisions for
> you, for you may not like them". Looks to me like we've already been
> there, and really have no desire go go again. And once again, with a
> "consensus" within ham radio even further away from being possible than
> ever, it looks like that is exactly what will happen- HE will make the
> rules. And his statement is something of a non-sequitar anyway, since
> "make the rules for us" is exactly what he has already been doing.
> And you'll note that he didn't say "us at the FCC make the rules for
> you ...'" he said "ME". I believe him.

Interesting point - I think you are on to something.

Perhaps the message is simply this: The FCC wants us hams to work out
our problems/issues/differences amongst ourselves, then present a
workable solution to the FCC, which they will rubber-stamp into law.
But if we bicker amongst ourselves and cause them to actually have to
make a decision, we may not like the decision. And it may not be in
the
best interest of the ARS.

Example:

Suppose for the purpose of discussion that S25.5 goes away at WRC
2003.
What should our license structure look like besides dropping Element
1?
Should there be more changes?

I can see two possibilities:

1) The issue is not taken seriously, and the FCC does something dumb
like
simply dropping Element 1 but not giving Techs any HF. Or maybe they
funnel all existing hams into one or two classes. Or maybe the old
system
creaks along for years to come.

2) We produce a proposal for a revised license structure and present
it to
the FCC. This structure has wide support among individual hams and
amateur
groups. It also reduces FCC admin work. FCC does the NPRM thing and
sees
80-90% support for the idea, with lots of comments and little dissent.
They
take path of least resistance and it becomes official.

Repeat this enough times and we almost become a self-governing
service.

Which is better for the ARS' future?

> Imagine what the situation might look like if he retired and was
> succeeded by a freebander with the right connections to get the job...

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAARRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRGGGGGGGGGGGHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!!!!
!!!!!!!!!!

> Goodbye ARS!

Not goodbye - something far worse.

> > > > However, I DO think that the tiny percentage of hams who commented on 98-143
> > > > gave the FCC a lot of leeway in their decisions. Also, while giving my "history
> > > > of ham licensing" talk at local amateur radio clubs, I found that very few of
> > > > the local hams planned to comment on the NPRM.
> > >
> > > Most hams I've talked to think FCC doesn't care much at all what they
> > > think. I believe they're right. It's what Bill Cross thinks that counts.
> >
> > The purpose of comments and other input is to try to influence how Mr. Cross
> > & Co. think about certain issues. If nothing else, to show that there is a
> > range of opinion on an issue.

> We can't know what influences Cross responded to in the late R&O, but
> it's clear that FCC's main thrust is minimal work and hassle for
> themselves, whatever the resulting effect on ARS.

AMEN! And we have to think that way too.

> I imagine they don't
> worry a whole lot about us, and if ARS becomes unmanageable (which
> historically isn't likely) they can always drop the hammer on the whole
> service if that's justified.
>

Or even if it's not.

But they may keep us around for a different reason. Dumping the ARS could
result in even more freebanding and pirate stations on the air. And lots
of cheap equipment for those who are want to freeband.

73 de Jim, N2EY

504. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 22:21:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CACD1E1.D77DD311@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39674

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >"The view from 30,000 ft." is extremely common in the American language,
> >Jim. Where have you been that you didn't understand it?
>
> I've lived in the USA all my life. Never seen or heard that phrase meant that
> way.

It means getting the top-down. I'm amazed you haven't heard of it.
I'm was also amazed you had never heard of LEXX, Dr. Dean Edell,
and Neal Boortz.

> Not a joke. Why does it matter?

Why does a large voting block matter? Refresh my memory - what
country do you live in?

> Citizens don't vote for FCC officials.

Citizens vote for the FCC officials' bosses.

> >The present Morse code
> >requirement chases away lots of potential emergency operators.

> You have proof of this?

Yep, half of the nocode techs I knew at Intel fall into that category.

> Did the reduction in code test requirements to the bare minimum two years ago,
> or the elimination of the code test for Technicians 11 years ago give us twice
> the number of emergency operators?

"Twice" was just a talking point. But the elimination of the code test for
techs certainly did give us a whole bunch of new emergency operators. A
lot of those guys would be willing to transfer their talents to HF if
it were not for the Morse code test.

> All that's prohibited is being paid for service. A schoolteacher can be paid
> for operating a ham station as an educational activity.

A schoolteacher cannot make amateur radio his/her vocation. Ham radio
is an avocation.

> So, in your book, a "hobby" is anything you don't get paid money to do.

Of course, that's one of the definitions of "avocation".

> >That would mean something if you were the center of the universe.
>
> How do you know I'm not?

There, there, Jim, of course you are the center of the universe.

> >1.17% is negligible.
>
> Would you eat food that was 1.17% poison?

I probably do it every day.

> Most of the world doesn't care about ham radio one way or the other, let alone
> testing.

My point exactly. Your observations are from within the ARS. Think outside
the box for a more objective perspective.

> >Every HF ham is forced to use the
> >mode to pass a Morse code exam to meet the requirements.
>
> They are simply required to pass a basic test. They are not required to use
> it on the air at all.

You didn't say "on the air". You said they didn't have to use it.

> > Why is
> >that so difficult to understand? A potential ham who hates Morse code
> >still *must* use Morse code to gain HF access.
>
> Nope. Just pass the test. Use of the mode requires a radio set.

Uhhhh Jim, Morse code is not a mode. My statement still stands.

> > Morse code is an extremely small part of being a sucessful ham.
>
> To you, maybe. Not to many others. Are you the center of the universe?

I should have said: Morse code doesn't have to be a large part of
being a successful ham.

> > Potential emergency operators are
> >being barred from amateur radio because of the Morse code requirement.
>
> Nonsense. If that were so, there would have been a flood of new hams after
> 1991. But there wasn't.

Huh? There was a flood after 1991. That's what kept ham radio afloat.

> >I know. I worked with many of them at Intel.
>
> Is Intel the center of the universe?

Intel is representative of the large technical corporations of which
there are many.

> Let's fast-forward a couple of years. Suppose the code tests all disappear
> because S25.5 is deleted at WRC 2003, and there is no big flood of newcomers.
> Will you and others admit that it wasn't a barrier, and move to put it back?
> Will the FCC? No way!

Of course not, Jim. If the code requirement is removed and nothing happens,
then it was unnecessary and shouldn't have existed anyway. Governmental
regulations that don't do anything certainly don't deserve to exist.

> >:-) Actual disasters are potential disasters before they happen.
>
> No, actual disasters happen after potential disasters.

No???? You are saying that potential disasters don't exist before
actual disasters happen??????? What a strange thing to say.

> So? You need to hang out with different folks, Cecil. I know lots of trained
> operators, techs and electronic experts who are hams. I learn much from them.

I'm sure they are like the hams I know. Most of their technical knowledge
came from their formal education and vocation, not directly from ham radio.

> Don't put all your eggs in one basket. And don't blind yourself to all the good
> things that are going on every day in ham radio.

IMO, if the ARS ceased all emergency communications, it wouldn't be allowed
to exist for very much longer.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

505. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 22:22:35 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Lm4r8.16785$ml2.1297166@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39673

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Catching anything, Hans?

Yup, just snagged a W0EX and a K4YZ. Tossed 'em both back in the lake.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

506. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 22:23:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CACD270.CE161647@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39675

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CAC7317.BA11EA33@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
> >> restructuring is working perfectly?
> > >
> >Yep, I begin to worry when the ham population starts to decrease.
>
> Then you oughta be worried. According to the AH0A website, the US ham
> population peaked in March 2001 and has decreased slightly since then. All of
> the growth claimed for the restructuring happened in less than a year.

If that's true, we had better hurry and get rid of that Morse code
requirement. :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

507. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 22:25:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CACD2E7.64A90D2C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39676

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> > > .....while Carl yaks on SSB and
> > > Cecil sruggles along on CW at 10wpm..
> > >
> > Do those activities by Carl and Cecil harm the Amateur Radio service?
>
> Not at all, they just fly in the face of all their criticizing rants.
> The old "Do as I say, not as I do" crapola.

So you think I should stop struggling with CW and spend my
time on PACTOR II?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP
```

508. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 22:29:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CACD3CF.BB762351@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39677

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> Val IS a licensee, and at NO TIME did he spend any of his pre-licensure
> days "telling" us how to do things.

Huh? That's exactly what he did before he took his Tech exam.
I commented on it myself.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

509. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 23:09:43 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <X25r8.16868$ml2.1305472@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39678

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> Val IS a licensee, and at NO TIME did he spend any of his pre-licensure
> days "telling" us how to do things.

Ah, let me count the ways! (Prior to April Fools day).

(1)

> Is it really true that "reliable international communi-
> cations" require all that hardware? Well, no, it does
> not, if you're using CW. No, something tells me that
> this kind of an outfit is required for phone, since my
> near neighbor can work the world on a low-impact
> antenna and 100 watts, CW.

(2)

> There comes a time to simply stop responding to
> people who are worthless individuals and are on
> the net soley to perform as absolute asswipes --
> and have been doing so for YEARS.

(3)

> But this is, I think, a very cheesy position to take, VERY,
> and quite reminds me of an old movie in which a loving
> relative, pushing a wheelchair-bound uncle down a boardwalk,
> speaks for several minutes in cooing terms . . . then pushes
> the crippled oldster into the ocean. That is, what is ARRL
> going to do vis-�-vis CW besides wishing it well . . . all
> the way to the water? That is, I think CW is part of the historical
> legacy of amateur radio and is now UNIQUE to amateur radio,
> and so is worth protecting and encouraging, at the highest level.

Well, I could go on and on, but I'll leave that as an exercise for
you. Val's strident huffery and puffery looks for all the world as
a mirror image of the puffery and huffery of Mr. Anderson,
Point/counterpoint., no more, no less.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

510. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-04 23:23:36 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CACE078.2C0021E9@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39679

> >You
> >would think that certain combinations would be,
> >as Monty Python might say, "RIGHT OUT!" :-)
> >
> Is this the right newsgroup for an argument?
>
>

That's the next newsgroup on your list. This newsgroup
is for insults, you stupid get. :-)

511. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 00:22:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8ir2dbcf1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39680

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8grp2$47j$1@208.206.142.95...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:a8e0pi$sti$0@208.207.71.141...
> > >
> > > K7JEB wrote:
> > > So it doesn't
> > > > come as a big surprise that they would tend to place
> > > > more weight on a logically valid point made by one
> > > > respondent than on a tenuous one put forth by an
> > > > army of respondents.
> > >
> > > Certainly not, but the main point is that they are not obligated to
> > > base their decisions on any viewpoint whatever other than their own.
> >
> > Sorry Dick, they (FCC) still must use rational
> > decision making.
>
> Not so, and you know it.

Wrong. The factvthat you say otherwise in no
way has any credibility to it. It's your opinion
only.

> The FCC can be challenged if it acts
> > in an arbitrary and capricious manner.
>
> Sure, ARRL sued the FCC over the 220 mhz giveaway to UPS. Did a lot of
> good too, didn't it??

People sue over many things. The court decision was such
that they ruled the FCC did NOT act contrary to their
charter, and or in an arbitrary or capricious mmanner.

> > The reality, however,
> > is that the R&O for NPRM 98-143 was more than
> > adequately prepared to avoid any charge of it being
> > arbitrary and/or capricious.
>
> If that makes you feel good, believe what you want.

Works fine for me.
```

> > > I believe it quite likely they decided to drop code testing to 5wpm
> > > for all mainly to rid themselves of the medical waiver problem.
> >
> > Perhaps so...which alone would justify the FCC R&O.
> >
> > > The fact that so much whining was going on only reinforced it.
> >
> > If it makes you feel good, believe what you want.
>
> What if it makes me feel bad?

You just gotta live with yourself and your bad
feelings then...OR, if you really believe the FCC
was wrong, go sue them :-) :-) Maybe it'd make
you feel better then.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

512. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 00:56:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8isoo$86c$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 39681

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a8grp2$47j$1@208.206.142.95...
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a8e0pi$sti$0@208.207.71.141...
> > > >
> > > > K7JEB wrote:
> > > > So it doesn't
> > > > > come as a big surprise that they would tend to place
> > > > > more weight on a logically valid point made by one
> > > > > respondent than on a tenuous one put forth by an
> > > > > army of respondents.
> > > >
> > > > Certainly not, but the main point is that they are not obligated to
> > > > base their decisions on any viewpoint whatever other than their own.
> > >
> > > Sorry Dick, they (FCC) still must use rational
> > > decision making.
> >
> > Not so, and you know it.
>
> Wrong. The factvthat you say otherwise in no
> way has any credibility to it. It's your opinion
> only.
>

And yours is chiseled in stone. Would you be interested in a bridge
across East River?

> > The FCC can be challenged if it acts
> > > in an arbitrary and capricious manner.
> >
> > Sure, ARRL sued the FCC over the 220 mhz giveaway to UPS. Did a lot of
> > good too, didn't it??
>
> People sue over many things. The court decision was such
> that they ruled the FCC did NOT act contrary to their
> charter, and or in an arbitrary or capricious mmanner.

When was the last time you ever knew of anyone winning a suit against
the FCC for any reason at any time? Not in my memory. Courts simply
```

defer to the FCC as the final authority in the field. No one says they
have to be right.

>
> > > The reality, however,
> > > is that the R&O for NPRM 98-143 was more than
> > > adequately prepared to avoid any charge of it being
> > > arbitrary and/or capricious.
> >
> > If that makes you feel good, believe what you want.
>
> Works fine for me.
>

Doesn't mean its accurate.

513. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 01:05:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CACF876.C2BA31A1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39682

> > >
> > >Kim, you'll just have to study for and get your extra.....
> > >
> >
> > Naaa -- never happen!
>
> Why is it any more unlikely than her getting a Tech?

Larry would never live it down if she did..... :-)

514. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:04:50 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CAD0642.DF55C00@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39683

Dick Carroll wrote:

> > What would Jesus do?
>
> What DID he do? He would tell her, "Go, and sin no more".

He also said "he who is without sin, cast the first stone."
I sure wish some people would run out of rocks.

515. Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:34:20 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <M28r8.17475$ml2.1343710@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39684

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

>
> Yes, there is an aura of desperation around this whole thing,
> especially evident in the article on page 94 of the March
> issue of QST. That article absolutely reeks of, well, of what
> can only be called panic, or something very close to it!
>

The so-called "article on page 94", which Val waves around here on a number of occasions is not an "article" at all, but simply an "Op-Ed" column, or featured "letter to the editor". As such, it is not an ARRL pronouncement, opinion, statement, staff study, or anything else approaching an ARRL position statement. It is but merely one persons view on a topic, a view which might or might not reflect ARRL policy.

In fact, in a sidebar on the same page, the Editor points out that submissions of such opinion pieces "need NOT be consistent with League policy".

So much for "panic" and "desperation"!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

516. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:35:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <548r8.2329$7_4.98609358@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39685

Yep, Star Trek is fun, but I'm not deep in it. I got in to ham radio for
emergency communication, and I never considered CW for such use.
None-the-less, I'm a ham whether tweedle dee, tweedle dim and tweedle dum
like it.

Brian

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a8hh1k31vu1@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Well.... I look at it this way..... That is their opinion, and that is it.
> And opinions are like A$$holes... everyone has them....
>
> I can look at Larry and Dick (and Curly and Moe) this way.... we can agree
> that we disagree about certain topics.
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
>
> www.qsl.net/w8kea
>
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:nguq8.2758$bF1.516672677@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
> > Dick and Larry will tell you that you're not a ham.
> >
> > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:a8c8ac61qnr@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > Oh no Cecil.... now us hams are gonna be associated with Trekkies!
> > >
> > > Ryan KC8PMX
> > >
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3CA7F1F2.16555B31@IEEE.org...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > > > Remember how screwed up Dr. McCoy got after a mind meld with
> Spock?
> > > > > > Maybe Val's mind meld with Dick is having the same effect?
> > > > > >

> > > > > Was that before or after Spock went into heat?
> > > >
> > > > Spock went into heat on TV. The mind meld with Dr. McCoy spanned
> > > > two movies, Star Trek IV (Wrath of Khan) and Star Trek V (Search
> > > > for Spock).
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > > > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

517. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:44:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5c8r8.2341$sQ4.98083895@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39686

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAA7763.FA9C589D@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CA74A42.E2EDEAAC@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > Amateur radio is not a company.
> > > >
> > > > Exactly! Amateur radio is a hobby and for that reason, the present
> > pecking
> > > > order within ham radio has absolutely no valid reason to exist.
> > >
> > > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> > > States should become a radio amateur.
> >
> > Why not? We even have non-citizens with US licenses.
>
> Now we do. That was not formerly possible.

How formerly?

As to the why not portion,
> why not think about what was stated and see if you can develop an answer
> for your question after thorough pondering?

Dave, why don't you want every citizen to be a radio amateur? Is this the
best argument for the code that you've got? Keeping people out?

518. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:45:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_c8r8.2343$vx5.100826482@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39687

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8e1h2$20u$0@208.207.71.141...
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3CA74A42.E2EDEAAC@earthlink.net...
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > > Amateur radio is not a company.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Exactly! Amateur radio is a hobby and for that reason, the present
> > > pecking
> > > > > order within ham radio has absolutely no valid reason to exist.
> > > > >
> > > > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> > > > States should become a radio amateur.
> > > >
> > > Why not? We even have non-citizens with US licenses.
> > >
> > Now we do. That was not formerly possible. As to the why not portion,
> > why not think about what was stated and see if you can develop an answer
> > for your question after thorough pondering?
>
> For Brian, pondering hurts.

Dick hurts.
```

519. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:48:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5g8r8.2347$FA5.101007553@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39688

"KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> wrote in
message news:OPaq8.9406$ml2.740542@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > Aw, well maybe I just didn't notice since I took the General,
> > Advanced and Extra writtens at the same setting.
>
> You must be a new guy. Us Real Hams(tm) had to have time
> in grade before taking their Amateur Extra exam.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

He must be one of them new, dumbed-down hams.

520. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:53:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Wk8r8.2357$5A5.100974973@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39689

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020402231729.00472.00000076@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3CAA1449.47FF745D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Valentine Germann wrote:
> >> ... And "B" is for "Bubba,"
> >> I guess. It sure as hell could be a lot WORSE!
> > >
> > >All you need is naughty phonetics to get another endless
> > >"ARS is headed for destruction" thread going. The 'B'
> > >could stand for 'Boobs' just to get it started.
> >
> > Cecil:
> >
> > KC0MUB is Val's sequentially-issued call sign; he did not select it
> > for himself. Kim, OTOH, deliberately choose W5TIT as a Vanity
> > Call Sign, for the express purpose of calling attention to herself

That's what vanity callsigns do, Larry. That's why they are called
"vanity."

and
> and what she considers to be her extraordinary secondary sexual
> characteristics, for the purpose of her amusement at the reactions
> of other hams, and to offer her the opportunity to respond with
> righteous indignation when the reaction is, predictably, negative.

Is this anything like "K 3 Larry Troll?"

> I have no doubt that if Val chooses to select a Vanity call sign,
> it will be one which is both distinctive and wholly appropriate for
> the family-oriented nature of the ARS.

Like "your friend" sending FU in cw?

521. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:56:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7n8r8.2359$uG5.101310826@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39690

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8i8r6$4p4$0@208.206.142.65...
>
>
> David Stinson wrote:
> >
> >
> > Re: W5TIT
>
> > What would Jesus do?
>
>
>
> What DID he do? He would tell her, "Go, and sin no more".

He wouldn't stone her?

522. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:58:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%o8r8.2365$1I5.101395817@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39691

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CAB1BE2.182E550C@psu.edu...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> > FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
> > by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
> > competition this can be effective. However, code testing
> > has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
> > supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
> > FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
> > non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
> > and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did)
> > and thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd,
> > well, things might have been more interesting. However,
> > it appears to me now that since there was serious desire
> > to scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!), FISTS,
> > or any other similiar organization, had very little chance
> > of success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
> > a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
> > have had even a prayer, and that not much.
>
> "enemies... agitate... scuttle... full scale attack.." Val, your
> sounding pretty nasty here.

Val Vicious.

523. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 02:59:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aq8r8.2370$bJ5.101454107@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39692

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uama8c1vmj8h7a@corp.supernews.com...
>
> mike coslo wrote, quite a lot of interesting commentary,
> to which I will reply in part. That is, N2EY has convinced
> me to stand down in this area.
>
> > "enemies... agitate... scuttle... full scale attack.." Val, your
> >sounding pretty nasty here.
>
> Hey, this is UseNet!

Same crappy attitude that Larry has. The Amateur's Code doesn't apply here.

524. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 03:02:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <yt8r8.2386$wB5.101051556@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39693

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020404080953.27399.00000251@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3CAB1BE2.182E550C@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> >> FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
> >> by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
> >> competition this can be effective. However, code testing
> >> has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
> >> supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
> >> FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
> >> non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
> >> and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did)
> >> and thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd,
> >> well, things might have been more interesting. However,
> >> it appears to me now that since there was serious desire
> >> to scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!), FISTS,
> >> or any other similiar organization, had very little chance
> >> of success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
> >> a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
> >> have had even a prayer, and that not much.
> >
> > "enemies... agitate... scuttle... full scale attack.." Val, your
> >sounding pretty nasty here.
>
> No more so than the language used by many nocodetest folks. Such language
> benefits no one.

Are you saying that Val shouldn't use, "enemies... agitate... scuttle...
full scale attack... ?"

> FISTS' purpose is to promote the USE of Morse. Mandatory testing is only
one
> way to do that. FISTS focuses on other ways.

FISTS advocates mandatory Morse tests. It's a new focus.

525. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 03:11:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8j4k9$se4$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 39694

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Yes, there is an aura of desperation around this whole thing,
> > especially evident in the article on page 94 of the March
> > issue of QST. That article absolutely reeks of, well, of what
> > can only be called panic, or something very close to it!
> >
>
> The so-called "article on page 94", which Val waves around
> here on a number of occasions is not an "article" at all,
> but simply an "Op-Ed" column, or featured "letter to the
> editor". As such, it is not an ARRL pronouncement, opinion,
> statement, staff study, or anything else approaching an
> ARRL position statement. It is but merely one persons view
> on a topic, a view which might or might not reflect ARRL
> policy.
>
> In fact, in a sidebar on the same page, the Editor points out
> that submissions of such opinion pieces "need NOT be consistent
> with League policy".
>
> So much for "panic" and "desperation"!

What I've seen of ARRL HQ strongly suggests that by the time they wake up and realize it's time for action it's aleady too late to cure the situation that should have created some panic.

526. Re: Another Long Reply to an N2EY Long Reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 03:21:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020404222159.00944.00000886@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 39696

In article <uanmfj3jtna4cd@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>
>But, somehow, gee, I simply missed Mr. Hare's
>account of the origin of his call sign! How could
>that EVER have happened? Wow!
>
>Val
>KC0MUB

Val:

Ed picked his call sign because he is the ARRL's resident expert
on Radio Frequency Interference. His call sign is both clever and
meaningful -- unlike another particular call sign which gets a lot
of attention on this newsgroup! (No, Cecil, I don't mean mine!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

527. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 03:22:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020404222200.00944.00000888@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 39697

Dave:

Kim selected her call sign for the specific purpose of calling attention
to herself. Now she is merely reaping that which she has herself
sown. (Sewn?) Anyway, she's the one beating her chest, as it were --
not us. She picked the call sign.

73 de Larry, K3LT

In article <3CAC9053.D30BBA18@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Re: W5TIT
>
>Jesus, Mary and Joseph!
>
>When are you bunch of cranky, dilapidated, fossilized old farts
>going to stop beating you chest over that friggin' call sign?
>You sound like a bunch of old biddies gossiping
>after church about someone wearing a "shameless" dress or something.
>Christalmighty! Go play shuffle board, or poker,
>or with yourself, for pity's sake!
>What would Jesus do?
>He's turn you 70 year old children over his knee
>and spank the crap out of you, that's what.
>
>You guys don't have much to do.
>Leave her the hell alone and GET OVER IT!
>
>Dave S.
>

528. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 03:22:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020404222200.00944.00000887@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 39698

In article <3CAD0642.DF55C00@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>> > What would Jesus do?
>>
>> What DID he do? He would tell her, "Go, and sin no more".
>
>He also said "he who is without sin, cast the first stone."
>I sure wish some people would run out of rocks.

Dave:

I can't speak for anyone but myself, but I sure didn't deliberately select
a sexually-suggestive call sign (allegedly on a dare) for the purpose of
being a voluntary object of controversy in a family-oriented radio service.
That was Kim's own doing. Now, she is simply being held accountable
for her actions.

73 de Larry, K3LT

529. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 03:22:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020404222201.00944.00000889@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 39695

In article <a8gri7$47j$0@208.206.142.95>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> >Kim, you'll just have to study for and get your extra.....
>> >
>>
>> Naaa -- never happen!
>
>
> Why is it any more unlikely than her getting a Tech?

Dick:

Well, I guess I shouldn't say "never," in fact, I'm sure Kim is just
as capable as anyone of getting her Extra. Perhaps, in my own
way, I'm providing the encouragement she needs to do so. In
which case, if she does, it will have been because of me! I have
no problem with her getting her Nickle Extra. It will just prove
that anyone can do it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

530. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 03:24:59 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a8j5eb$2t2k$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 39700

Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:
>mike coslo wrote:
>> But these new covenant restricted neighborhoods are
>>repulsive. I guess these people believe they are keeping
>>the standards up. I wouldn't live in one of them if they paid
>>me. I am always amazed the lengths some people will go
>>to just to control how others look and act.
>
>The world just isn't as nice a place these days as it was
>not so long ago, I guess. It all seems part of a general
>INsecurity that may not get better soon. It's truly sad.

That sounds like one of those "it was great in the old days" whines.
It is hardly new. My house has deed restrictions about making
alcohol on the property, and about people "not of the caucasian
race" (I quote) living there, that were placed on the deed when
the original farm lot was subdivided in 1926, so it seems like
the general INsecurity dates back to at least then.

For a lot of people whether it is "insecurity" or "keeping the
property values up" seems to depend strongly on whether the
restrictions on others bother them personally or not.

Dennis Ferguson

531. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 03:27:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8j5ja$12p$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 39699

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <a8gri7$47j$0@208.206.142.95>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >> >Kim, you'll just have to study for and get your extra.....
> >> >
> >>
> >> Naaa -- never happen!
> >
> >
> > Why is it any more unlikely than her getting a Tech?
>
> Dick:
>
> Well, I guess I shouldn't say "never," in fact, I'm sure Kim is just
> as capable as anyone of getting her Extra. Perhaps, in my own
> way, I'm providing the encouragement she needs to do so. In
> which case, if she does, it will have been because of me! I have
> no problem with her getting her Nickle Extra. It will just prove
> that anyone can do it.

My point exactly.

532. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 03:34:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020404223436.00944.00000890@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 39801

In article <uaopa7ojipk90f@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>My burning question: Why do they shoot ducks and geese
>when the fall alone would kill them? :-)

Not to mention being chomped in the neck by a Labrador Retriever!

73 de Larry, K3LT

533. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:06:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404230604.00401.00002188@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39802

>Subject: Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...
>From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 4/4/2002 5:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <X25r8.16868$ml2.1305472@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Well, I could go on and on, but I'll leave that as an exercise for
>you. Val's strident huffery and puffery looks for all the world as
>a mirror image of the puffery and huffery of Mr. Anderson,
>Point/counterpoint., no more, no less.

Huh? Any of the stuff that Val wrote, agree or disagree, is NOWHERE in the same category as any of Lenie's bile! Not even CLOSE!

Sheesh! Got that line a bit far out don't ya, Fisherman?

73

Steve, K4YZ

534. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:07:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404230743.00401.00002189@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39803

>Subject: Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 4/4/2002 4:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3CACD3CF.BB762351@IEEE.org>

>Huh? That's exactly what he did before he took his Tech exam.
>I commented on it myself.

I've seen him get a bit confused and MILDLY arrogant, but how can you
equate ANYthing he's written in the same bilgecrap as Lennie?

73
Steve, K4YZ

535. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:14:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020404231400.00386.00002370@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39804

>Subject: An Answer Please, Lennie...
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 4/2/2002 11:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020403000255.13715.00001794@mb-da.aol.com>
>
> In another thread, Leonard H. Anderson, allegedly once a "professional"
>in
>the radio electronics field, made the following really stupid assertion

>QUOTE:
>
>The FCC has radio services specifically for "fun" (hobby) activities.

Snip.

Still no answer. Nothing I didn't expect.

Putz.

536. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:20:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAD17F3.2E660990@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39805

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Do you mean it is similiar to when I made a typo and you simply accused
> > me of being a liar?
>
> You lied about making the typo, Dave, when it was there for all
> the world to see, including you. You continued for days to insist
> that you didn't make the typo.

That is totally absurd. Things seem to be one way when done by you and another way when done by others. If we are to be fair, you are then a liar.

Dave K8MN

537. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:21:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAD183C.264D3796@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39806

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Uhhhhhhh Larry, it was a group of hams who dared her to do it.
> >
> > Do you do something just because someone dares you to do it?
>
> Yep, quite often. I once jumped in a lake because someone dared
> me to do it.

That certainly calls your judgement and common sense into question.

Dave K8MN

538. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:21:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAD265F.C6FA8906@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39807

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org wrote:
> >Huh? That's exactly what he did before he took his Tech exam.
> >I commented on it myself.
>
> I've seen him get a bit confused and MILDLY arrogant, but how can you
> equate ANYthing he's written in the same bilgecrap as Lennie?

Huh? Who said anything about Lennie? Here's what I responded to:

> Val IS a licensee, and at NO TIME did he spend any of his pre-licensure
> days "telling" us how to do things.

Do you see Lennie mentioned anywhere in your sentence?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

539. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:29:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAD281F.5EC5B4D6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39808

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Do you mean it is similiar to when I made a typo and you simply accused
> > > me of being a liar?
> >
> > You lied about making the typo, Dave, when it was there for all
> > the world to see, including you. You continued for days to insist
> > that you didn't make the typo.
>
> That is totally absurd. Things seem to be one way when done by you and
> another way when done by others. If we are to be fair, you are then a
> liar.

I did NOT deny making the mistake, Dave. You did, for days. It is one
thing to make a simple error. But it is an altogether different thing
to deny making the error over and over for days even after I had
reposted it for you more than once. What kind of person continues
to deny that he posted something even after it has been quoted back
to him multiple times?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

540. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:30:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAD2872.F1CF7F4A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39809

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Uhhhhhhh Larry, it was a group of hams who dared her to do it.
> > >
> > > Do you do something just because someone dares you to do it?
> >
> > Yep, quite often. I once jumped in a lake because someone dared
> > me to do it.
>
> That certainly calls your judgement and common sense into question.

Bipolar personalities tend to be somewhat spontaneous.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

541. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:48:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAD2C86.DADECC09@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39810

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Do you mean it is similiar to when I made a typo and you simply accused
> > > me of being a liar?
> >
> > You lied about making the typo, Dave, when it was there for all
> > the world to see, including you. You continued for days to insist
> > that you didn't make the typo.
>
> That is totally absurd. Things seem to be one way when done by you and
> another way when done by others. If we are to be fair, you are then a
> liar.

You lie was easy to find, Dave. I just searched for "comparting". Here's
what you said.

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.

After I reposted what you said above, you responded with:

> I said you were "comparing" not "comparting".

For days, you continued to deny saying "comparting". The history is
all there on Google.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

542. Re: You will worship me

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:51:39 UTC
From: Ewan Grantham <egainc@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <R3ar8.2875$ht7.1317356723@twister2.starband.net>
Source record: 39811
Cross-posted to: alt.hentai.sailor-moon,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

"TGOS" <tgos@spamcop.net> wrote in message
news:a85o27cqgn@207.18.225.54...
> I'm taking over all of Usenet!

My, my. Seems that Kibo has put his position up for sale?

FWIW,
Ewan Grantham
POTD - www.a1161.com

543. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:53:01 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8kgua21ko2@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39849

I was referring more to the congresspersons/senators that writing to the FCC, guess I should have made that clearer. Although I still believe they need to hear from us.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3CAC748A.AC003D33@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Yes Cecil.... that is true, but it would show at least that we do in fact
> > give a damn about this hobby!
>
> The FCC wants hams to bring them solutions, not more problems.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> ------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

544. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 04:54:04 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8kgub31ko2@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 39844

Wouldn't that be Pole Poles? :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> What about Poles who work for the phone company?
> "Telephone Poles?"
>
> > And Laplanders could be "Lapells," stretching the
> > analogy! :-)
>

545. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 05:11:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAD23F2.2950D87A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39812

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAA7763.FA9C589D@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3CA74A42.E2EDEAAC@earthlink.net...
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > > > Amateur radio is not a company.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Exactly! Amateur radio is a hobby and for that reason, the present
> > > pecking
> > > > > > order within ham radio has absolutely no valid reason to exist.
> > > > >
> > > > > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> > > > > States should become a radio amateur.
> > > >
> > > > Why not? We even have non-citizens with US licenses.
> > >
> > > Now we do. That was not formerly possible.
> >
> > How formerly?

Look up the dates if you're curious. In the past, it was not even
possible for a resident alien to obtain an amateur ticket in the U.S.

> As to the why not portion,
> > why not think about what was stated and see if you can develop an answer
> > for your question after thorough pondering?
>
> Dave, why don't you want every citizen to be a radio amateur? Is this the
> best argument for the code that you've got? Keeping people out?

You haven't pondered enough. I have never been in favor of trying to
keep people out of amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

546. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 05:18:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAD2596.D040EE11@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39813

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Do you mean it is similiar to when I made a typo and you simply accused
> > > > me of being a liar?
> > >
> > > You lied about making the typo, Dave, when it was there for all
> > > the world to see, including you. You continued for days to insist
> > > that you didn't make the typo.
> >
> > That is totally absurd. Things seem to be one way when done by you and
> > another way when done by others. If we are to be fair, you are then a
> > liar.
>
> I did NOT deny making the mistake, Dave. You did, for days. It is one
> thing to make a simple error. But it is an altogether different thing
> to deny making the error over and over for days even after I had
> reposted it for you more than once. What kind of person continues
> to deny that he posted something even after it has been quoted back
> to him multiple times?

Right, Cec, only a simple typo for you--it's a lie for me. Your usual
double standard is revealed.

"Pay no attention to that man behind the curtain! The Great Oz has
spoken!".

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

547. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 05:23:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAD26BE.BCA1DB45@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39814

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Uhhhhhhh Larry, it was a group of hams who dared her to do it.
> > > > >
> > > > > Do you do something just because someone dares you to do it?
> > > >
> > > Yep, quite often. I once jumped in a lake because someone dared
> > > me to do it.
> > >
> > That certainly calls your judgement and common sense into question.
>
> Bipolar personalities tend to be somewhat spontaneous.

We always called it "following the herd".

Dave K8MN
```

548. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 05:26:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAD2770.F5B0F3AF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39815

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Do you mean it is similiar to when I made a typo and you simply accused
> > > > me of being a liar?
> > >
> > > You lied about making the typo, Dave, when it was there for all
> > > the world to see, including you. You continued for days to insist
> > > that you didn't make the typo.
> >
> > That is totally absurd. Things seem to be one way when done by you and
> > another way when done by others. If we are to be fair, you are then a
> > liar.
>
> You lie was easy to find, Dave. I just searched for "comparting". Here's
> what you said.
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
>
> After I reposted what you said above, you responded with:
>
> > I said you were "comparing" not "comparting".
>
> For days, you continued to deny saying "comparting". The history is
> all there on Google.

...and only a nit pecker (I love the newly coined term) would make an
issue of it. I wrote that the term was a typo. You knew that it was a
typo yet you continued to attempt to make issue of it. It was a mote
then. It is a mote now. Your double standard is exposed.

Dave K8MN
```

549. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 05:27:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8jcj9$i1d$1@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 39816

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Dave, why don't you want every citizen to be a radio amateur? Is this the
> > best argument for the code that you've got? Keeping people out?
>
> You haven't pondered enough. I have never been in favor of trying to
> keep people out of amateur radio.

It hurts The Gadfly to ponder. He can't imagine that if ham radio was
for everyone, everyone would have a license.

550. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 08:41:20 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaqnnjjabd6604@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39817

K0HB wrote, under the influence of the rather large
burr I've obviously put under his saddle:

>The so-called "article on page 94", which Val waves
>around here on a number of occasions is not an "article"
>at all, but simply an "Op-Ed" column, or featured "letter
>to the editor".

Hm. Let me see. The editors of ARRL, who have just
announced that they are whacking out of the magazine
the minutes of their own board of directors' meetings, see
to it that this particular piece is featured. Hm. I guess
I'm just dense (NOT) but I think I see policy formation and
concensus generation under way here. Though I may have
had my first ARS license for a rather short time, I think
I can recognize editorial decision-making for what it is
when I plainly see it in action. This article is a CALL to
action, for the BIG PROJECT. It is DIRECTLY in line
with ARRL policy and was placed because of that fact.
Whatever I've done to hack you off, I'm going to have to
do some more of it, because at the rate your going, your
IQ is going to be below grade in about four more weeks.
With all kind wishes.

>As such, it is not an ARRL pronouncement, opinion,
>statement, staff study, or anything else approaching an
>ARRL position statement. It is but merely one persons
>view on a topic, a view which might or might not reflect
>ARRL policy.

Bull, and you know it.

>In fact, in a sidebar on the same page, the Editor points out
>that submissions of such opinion pieces "need NOT be
>consistent with League policy".

So what? What about THIS particular piece? Can you read?

>So much for "panic" and "desperation"!

If you insist . . . there DOES seem to be some "panic" and more
than a little "desperation" in the tone of that piece, which I think
falls under the aegis of "whacking the readers upside the head
with a two-by-four," in editor-speak. Are you really as dense as
you appear? The BIG PROJECT is, er, ah, BIG!

>With all kind wishes,

I don't think so . . . and don't give a rat's a** , either.

Val

P.S. And I'm going to be talking to members of the general public, a LOT of them, and many of them students, on April 20th. Along with a couple of friends, both Hams, and both in our astronomy club, we'll be encouraging as many people as possible to get involved in the amateur radio. I have HEARD the call.

**

551. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 08:47:21 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaqo2sf84rn5e1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39818

K0HB wrote, about me:

>Until a few short days ago you weren't a license holder
>either. Are you suddenly some righteous elevated being,
>and Lennie a child of a lesser God?

Lennie is the b*stard child of . . . wait a minute. . . YOU'RE
his DADDY!

With all kind wishes, doublin' back atcha!

Val

552. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 08:55:35 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaqoi9sa9c4701@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39819

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote, about me:

>Val IS a licensee, and at NO TIME did he spend any of his
>pre-licensure days "telling" us how to do things.

That is open to interpretation . . . and some will interpret! :-)

Val

553. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 09:00:30 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaqoro39aora76@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39820

CAM wrote:

>I commented on it myself.

There's a lesson here for us all. If you just comment
on EVERYTHING, all day, every day, and all the time,
you're bound to get in SOMETHING that you can claim
MIGHT be right! That's UseNet genius at work!

Val

554. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 09:04:50 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaqp3oj3h6eae3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39821

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote, about me:

>I've seen him get a bit confused and MILDLY arrogant . . .

Hear, hear! I resent that MILDLY business! When I want
to be I can be just as arrogant as anyone on this newgroup,
and TWICE on Sunday! Grrrr!

> . . . but how can you equate ANYthing he's written in the
>same bilgecrap as Lennie?

Now, think about it, just WHO are you asking this question of?
I think the answer's in there somewhere!

Val
KC0MUB

555. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 09:10:09 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaqpdka22shb56@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39822

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote, about Lennie:

> Still no answer. Nothing I didn't expect.

Oh, no, he's justa whomping up a GOOD ONE for ya!
You'll see. He's justa pourin' over that rulebook, lookin'
for clues. You'll find out! And when he finally finds that
clue, well, he'll come justa ROARING after ya, yes he WILL!
Wait and see, you'll find out!

NOT!

Val
KC0MUB

556. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 11:45:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <h7gr8.4062$OW3.783458511@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39823

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAD23F2.2950D87A@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:

> > > > > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> > > > > States should become a radio amateur.
> > > >
> > > > Why not? We even have non-citizens with US licenses.
> > >
> > > Now we do. That was not formerly possible.
> >
> > How formerly?
>
> Look up the dates if you're curious. In the past, it was not even
> possible for a resident alien to obtain an amateur ticket in the U.S.

Also in the past, there was no exam, there was no licensing, foreign
national or not.

557. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 11:45:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <G7gr8.4063$%S3.783210647@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39824

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8jcj9$i1d$1@208.207.71.175...
>
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > Dave, why don't you want every citizen to be a radio amateur? Is this
the
> > > best argument for the code that you've got? Keeping people out?
> >
> > You haven't pondered enough. I have never been in favor of trying to
> > keep people out of amateur radio.
>
>
> It hurts The Gadfly to ponder. He can't imagine that if ham radio was
> for everyone, everyone would have a license.

Dick hurts.

558. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 12:34:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8k5p1$ce4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39825

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8isoo$86c$0@208.207.71.175...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:a8grp2$47j$1@208.206.142.95...
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:a8e0pi$sti$0@208.207.71.141...
> > > > >
> > > > > K7JEB wrote:
> > > > > So it doesn't
> > > > > > come as a big surprise that they would tend to place
> > > > > > more weight on a logically valid point made by one
> > > > > > respondent than on a tenuous one put forth by an
> > > > > > army of respondents.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Certainly not, but the main point is that they are not obligated
to
> > > > > base their decisions on any viewpoint whatever other than their
own.
> > > > >
> > > > Sorry Dick, they (FCC) still must use rational
> > > > decision making.
> > > >
> > > Not so, and you know it.
> > >
> > Wrong. The fact that you say otherwise in no
> > way has any credibility to it. It's your opinion
> > only.
>
> And yours is chiseled in stone.

At least mine is based on past history, government regulations
and case law.

> Would you be interested in a bridge across East River?

Maybe :-)
```

> > > The FCC can be challenged if it acts
> > > > in an arbitrary and capricious manner.
> > >
> > > Sure, ARRL sued the FCC over the 220 mhz giveaway to UPS. Did a lot
of
> > > good too, didn't it??
> >
> > People sue over many things. The court decision was such
> > that they ruled the FCC did NOT act contrary to their
> > charter, and or in an arbitrary or capricious mmanner.

> When was the last time you ever knew of anyone winning a suit against
> the FCC for any reason at any time? Not in my memory.

Courts have reversed FCC decisions at various times. Probably
not on amateur (i.e. Part 97) rulings, but the hsitory of
telecommunications regulation has more than one example if
you wish to go look into such things.

> Courts simply
> defer to the FCC as the final authority in the field. No one says they
> have to be right.

Sorry, wrong again.

> > > > The reality, however,
> > > > > is that the R&O for NPRM 98-143 was more than
> > > > > adequately prepared to avoid any charge of it being
> > > > > arbitrary and/or capricious.
> > >
> > > If that makes you feel good, believe what you want.
> >
> > Works fine for me.
>
> Doesn't mean its accurate.

In you opinion anyway. My opinion is at least shared
with the FCC ruling itself.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

559. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 12:37:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8k5vh$7q0$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39826

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:yt8r8.2386$wB5.101051556@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020404080953.27399.00000251@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > FISTS' purpose is to promote the USE of Morse. Mandatory
> > testing is only one way to do that. FISTS focuses on other ways.
>
> FISTS advocates mandatory Morse tests. It's a new focus.

Is that "new focus" clearly stated anywhere as part of
FISTS charter, mission or goals statements?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

560. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 12:42:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAD9BB6.F63C5278@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39827

Dave Heil wrote:
> Right, Cec, only a simple typo for you--it's a lie for me. Your usual
> double standard is revealed.

Making a typo is human, Dave. Lying about making the typo is a lie.
I didn't lie about making a typo - you did. The lie is the difference
between you and me. It's not a double standard at all.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

561. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 12:53:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8k7h8$n8e$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39831

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:a8j5eb$2t2k$1@heap.juniper.net...
> Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:
> >mike coslo wrote:
> >> But these new covenant restricted neighborhoods are
> >>repulsive. I guess these people believe they are keeping
> >>the standards up. I wouldn't live in one of them if they paid
> >>me. I am always amazed the lengths some people will go
> >>to just to control how others look and act.
> >
> >The world just isn't as nice a place these days as it was
> >not so long ago, I guess. It all seems part of a general
> >INsecurity that may not get better soon. It's truly sad.
>
> That sounds like one of those "it was great in the old days" whines.
> It is hardly new. My house has deed restrictions about making
> alcohol on the property, and about people "not of the caucasian
> race" (I quote) living there, that were placed on the deed when
> the original farm lot was subdivided in 1926, so it seems like
> the general INsecurity dates back to at least then.
>
> For a lot of people whether it is "insecurity" or "keeping the
> property values up" seems to depend strongly on whether the
> restrictions on others bother them personally or not.

Exactly! I have no CC&Rs, but we once had a neighbor who
just could not understand why I would not park my car(s)
in the garage. She believed that if you have a garage, you must
put your car(s) away every day and not leave them in the
driveway.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

562. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 12:55:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAD9EDF.58155587@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39828

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > For days, you continued to deny saying "comparting". The history is
> > all there on Google.
>
> ...and only a nit pecker (I love the newly coined term) would make an
> issue of it. I wrote that the term was a typo.

Only a nit pecker would make an issue out of your lying about making
a typo? The issue is not that you made a typo, Dave. The issue is that
for days, you wouldn't even admit that it was a typo. You kept denying
that you said "comparting" instead of "comparing" even after I had
proven to you multiple times that you had said "comparting". Only after
your lie was days old did you finally grudgingly admit that you had
made a typo. Everyone makes typos. You're the only person who I know
who has ever lied about such for days.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

563. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 13:04:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8k7h9$n8e$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39830

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uaqnnjjabd6604@corp.supernews.com...
> K0HB wrote, under the influence of the rather large
> burr I've obviously put under his saddle:
>
> >The so-called "article on page 94", which Val waves
> >around here on a number of occasions is not an "article"
> >at all, but simply an "Op-Ed" column, or featured "letter
> >to the editor".
>
> Hm. Let me see. The editors of ARRL, who have just
> announced that they are whacking out of the magazine
> the minutes of their own board of directors' meetings, see
> to it that this particular piece is featured. Hm. I guess
> I'm just dense (NOT) but I think I see policy formation and
> concensus generation under way here.

You see lots of things aparently via your fantasyland
analysis.

> Though I may have
> had my first ARS license for a rather short time, I think
> I can recognize editorial decision-making for what it is
> when I plainly see it in action. This article is a CALL to
> action, for the BIG PROJECT. It is DIRECTLY in line
> with ARRL policy and was placed because of that fact.

So sayeth the new adition to RRAP from the hallowed
halls of academia. Gees, how'd we ever get by without all this
new crystal ball analysis into other peoples and
organizations minds. (PS - Still waiting for even a shred
of cridible eveidence of Val's ARRL-NCI seceret alliance
fantasy.)

> Whatever I've done to hack you off, I'm going to have to
> do some more of it, because at the rate your going, your
> IQ is going to be below grade in about four more weeks.
> With all kind wishes.

Buy, I bet Hans is just quacking in his boots.

> >As such, it is not an ARRL pronouncement, opinion,
> >statement, staff study, or anything else approaching an
> >ARRL position statement. It is but merely one persons
> >view on a topic, a view which might or might not reflect
> >ARRL policy.

>
> Bull, and you know it.

Another well thought and well reasoned argument from Val.

> >In fact, in a sidebar on the same page, the Editor points out
> >that submissions of such opinion pieces "need NOT be
> >consistent with League policy".
>
> So what? What about THIS particular piece? Can you read?

Val.....the words read: "In fact, in a sidebar on the same
> >page, the Editor points out
> >that submissions of such opinion pieces "need
> >NOT be consistent with League policy".

> >So much for "panic" and "desperation"!
>
> If you insist . . . there DOES seem to be some "panic" and more
> than a little "desperation" in the tone of that piece, which I think
> falls under the aegis of "whacking the readers upside the head
> with a two-by-four," in editor-speak. Are you really as dense as
> you appear? The BIG PROJECT is, er, ah, BIG!

More thouroughly researched argument I see.

> >With all kind wishes,
>
> I don't think so . . . and don't give a rat's a** , either.

So much for rational and reasoned debate.

> P.S. And I'm going to be talking to members of the general public,
> a LOT of them, and many of them students, on April 20th. Along
> with a couple of friends, both Hams, and both in our astronomy
> club, we'll be encouraging as many people as possible to get in-
> volved in the amateur radio. I have HEARD the call.

Good. That's THE first thing you've said in days that
I can agree with.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

564. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 13:08:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CADA1CA.B17A6580@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39832

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote, about me:
> > . . . but how can you equate ANYthing he's written in the
> >same bilgecrap as Lennie?
>
> Now, think about it, just WHO are you asking this question of?
> I think the answer's in there somewhere!

Trouble is, Val, I didn't equate anything with anything. Steve
made a stand-alone statement about you. Nobody else was
mentioned in his statement.

> Steve said:
> > Val IS a licensee, and at NO TIME did he spend any of his pre-licensure
> > days "telling" us how to do things.

This was a statement about you and about nobody else. You spent
a lot of time before you were licensed, telling us how things
ought to be done within amateur radio. There's nothing wrong
with doing that. But Steve's statement was false.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

565. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 13:09:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405080927.19000.00000455@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 39833

In article <3CACD1E1.D77DD311@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >"The view from 30,000 ft." is extremely common in the American language,
>> >Jim. Where have you been that you didn't understand it?
>>
>> I've lived in the USA all my life. Never seen or heard that phrase meant
>that
>> way.
>
>It means getting the top-down. I'm amazed you haven't heard of it.

I don't care what it means. Plain English works better.

>I'm was also amazed you had never heard of LEXX, Dr. Dean Edell,
>and Neal Boortz.

Why? Are they important people?

I know LEXX is a fictional character on a cable TV scifi chow. I have no
idea who Edell and Boortz are.

But I do know where my towel is, and who my artificial relatives are. Hi-ho.

Your protests are kind of hollow, Cecil, considering how you described yourself

as a "CW expert" some time back but you had no knowledge of Ten Tec.
>
>> >The present Morse code
>> >requirement chases away lots of potential emergency operators.
>
>> You have proof of this?
>
>Yep, half of the nocode techs I knew at Intel fall into that category.

They won't participate in emergency communications because of the
Morse code test?
>
>> Did the reduction in code test requirements to the bare minimum two years
>ago,
>> or the elimination of the code test for Technicians 11 years ago give us
>twice
>> the number of emergency operators?
>
>"Twice" was just a talking point.

You said we'd have twice as many. Now you backpedal.

. But the elimination of the code test for
>techs certainly did give us a whole bunch of new emergency operators.

How many?

>A
>lot of those guys would be willing to transfer their talents to HF if
>it were not for the Morse code test.
>
So there is no emergency communication on VHF/UHF?

>> >1.17% is negligible.
>>
>> Would you eat food that was 1.17% poison?
>
>I probably do it every day.

You'd be dead if that were true.
>
>> Most of the world doesn't care about ham radio one way or the other, let
>alone
>> testing.
>
>My point exactly.

Then there's no problem.

>> > Potential emergency operators are
>> >being barred from amateur radio because of the Morse code requirement.
>>
>> Nonsense. If that were so, there would have been a flood of new hams after
>> 1991. But there wasn't.
>
>Huh? There was a flood after 1991. That's what kept ham radio afloat.

Nope. There was growth in the years leading up to 1991, and more growth after
1991. Then the growth slowed down.

Ham radio wasn't "sinking" before 1991.

>> Let's fast-forward a couple of years. Suppose the code tests all disappear
>> because S25.5 is deleted at WRC 2003, and there is no big flood of
>newcomers.
>> Will you and others admit that it wasn't a barrier, and move to put it
>back?
>> Will the FCC? No way!
>
>Of course not, Jim.

So it's a one-way street.

>If the code requirement is removed and nothing happens,
>then it was unnecessary and shouldn't have existed anyway.

"Nothing happens" means more than just "no change in numbers".

And you avoid the real question: Will you and others admit it wasn't a barrier?

>> So? You need to hang out with different folks, Cecil. I know lots of
>trained
>> operators, techs and electronic experts who are hams. I learn much from
>them.
>
>I'm sure they are like the hams I know.

HoW? You don't know them.

>Most of their technical knowledge
>came from their formal education and vocation, not directly from ham radio.

Ham radio set me and many others on the road to technical learning. It also
helps keep us interested.
>
>> Don't put all your eggs in one basket. And don't blind yourself to all the
>good
>> things that are going on every day in ham radio.
>
>IMO, if the ARS ceased all emergency communications, it wouldn't be allowed
>to exist for very much longer.

Maybe. But the FCC may be keeping us around for other reasons.

73 de Jim, N2EY

566. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 13:11:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CADA273.1334AFC3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39834

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > Look up the dates if you're curious. In the past, it was not even
> > possible for a resident alien to obtain an amateur ticket in the U.S.

Uhhhhhhhh Dave, yesterday is "in the past".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

567. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 13:15:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CADA382.F4AFDA69@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39835

Bill Sohl wrote:
> I have no CC&Rs, but we once had a neighbor who
> just could not understand why I would not park my car(s)
> in the garage. She believed that if you have a garage, you must
> put your car(s) away every day and not leave them in the
> driveway.

Did you tell her your car wouldn't fit because of all the
ham radio junk? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

568. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 13:17:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204050517.568253af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 39829

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<yt8r8.2386$wB5.101051556@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020404080953.27399.00000251@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > In article <3CAB1BE2.182E550C@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
> >
> > >Valentine Germann wrote:
> > >
> > >> FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
> > >> by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
> > >> competition this can be effective. However, code testing
> > >> has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
> > >> supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
> > >> FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
> > >> non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
> > >> and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did)
> > >> and thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd,
> > >> well, things might have been more interesting. However,
> > >> it appears to me now that since there was serious desire
> > >> to scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!), FISTS,
> > >> or any other similiar organization, had very little chance
> > >> of success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
> > >> a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
> > >> have had even a prayer, and that not much.
> > >
> > > "enemies... agitate... scuttle... full scale attack.." Val, your
> > >sounding pretty nasty here.
> >
> > No more so than the language used by many nocodetest folks. Such language
> > benefits no one.
>
> Are you saying that Val shouldn't use, "enemies... agitate... scuttle...
> full scale attack... ?"

I think there are much better choices of words than those terms. Just like
there are better choices for Bruce Perens than "battle" and "fight" and
"front" (as in "frontline"). And better choices for Carl Stevenson than
"idiot", "twit", "olde fartz", "dinosaur dung encrusted". And better choices
... well, you get the idea.

> > FISTS' purpose is to promote the USE of Morse. Mandatory testing is only
> one
> > way to do that. FISTS focuses on other ways.
>

> FISTS advocates mandatory Morse tests.

Where? I just visited the website. No mention of tests. FISTS did not submit comments to the FCC on the issue and does not have an official position on it. One can be a member of both FISTS and No-Code International without any contradiction of either organization's rules or requirements.

Of course it's probably true that most FISTS members favor mandatory code tests. But as far as I know FISTS as an organization has no official position on the issue. FISTS membership does not limit the freedom of its members to hold and express differing opinions on code testing.

>It's a new focus.

Show us where FISTS, as an organization, advocates mandatory code testing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

569. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 13:57:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CADAD4D.20D20C6D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39836

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >It means getting the top-down. I'm amazed you haven't heard of it.
>
> I don't care what it means. Plain English works better.

Plain English is boring. I see I left out a word. The "view from
30,000 ft." means getting the objective top-down view (rather than
the subjective bottom-up view).

> I know LEXX is a fictional character on a cable TV scifi chow. I have no
> idea who Edell and Boortz are.

LEXX is a science fiction version of Monty Python type humor. Edell
and Boortz are radio talk show hosts. Edell puts me to sleep at
night and Boortz wakes me up in the morning. If you're interested:
http://www.healthcentral.com/drdean/aboutdrdean/aboutdrdean.cfm
hppt://www.boortz.com

> Your protests are kind of hollow, Cecil, considering how you described yourself
> as a "CW expert" some time back but you had no knowledge of Ten Tec.

I obtained my CW expertise before Ten Tec even existed. Does that
mean there were not CW experts before Ten Tec existed?

> >Yep, half of the nocode techs I knew at Intel fall into that category.
>
> They won't participate in emergency communications because of the
> Morse code test?

They can't participate in HF emergency communications because of
the Morse code test.

> >"Twice" was just a talking point.
>
> You said we'd have twice as many. Now you backpedal.

Two was simply the next natural number up from one. One would have
been wrong. Don't you like natural?

> > But the elimination of the code test for
> >techs certainly did give us a whole bunch of new emergency operators.
>
> How many?

Don't know exactly. That's why I said a "whole bunch". How many Techs
are there? 200,000? It would naturally be some percentage of the number

of Techs.

> >A
> >lot of those guys would be willing to transfer their talents to HF if
> >it were not for the Morse code test.
> >
> So there is no emergency communication on VHF/UHF?

Did I say that? Nope, I didn't. My statement doesn't need interpreting.
I could ask you: Does that mean that you think HF emergency comms
are unimportant? I could but I won't.

> >> >1.17% is negligible.
> >>
> >> Would you eat food that was 1.17% poison?
> >
> >I probably do it every day.
>
> You'd be dead if that were true.

What percentage poison is scotch?

> >Huh? There was a flood after 1991. That's what kept ham radio afloat.
>
> Nope. There was growth in the years leading up to 1991, and more growth after
> 1991. Then the growth slowed down.

The growth in the Tech class didn't slow down. Subtract out the Techs and
ham radio would have been going downhill fast. The flood of Techs was the
only thing that kept the ARS membership at a reasonable level.

> And you avoid the real question: Will you and others admit it wasn't a barrier?

It was and is a barrier, Jim. The Morse code exam is the only thing that
keeps me from QSOing with my friend in Colorado. He has promised to upgrade
to General and get on HF just as soon as the Morse code requirement is dropped.
There are many other Techs just like him.

> >Most of their technical knowledge
> >came from their formal education and vocation, not directly from ham radio.
>
> Ham radio set me and many others on the road to technical learning. It also
> helps keep us interested.

That's nice but irrelevant to the discussion. My statement stands. I suspect
most of your technical knowledge, like mine, came from your formal education
and vocation, not directly from ham radio.

> >IMO, if the ARS ceased all emergency communications, it wouldn't be allowed
> >to exist for very much longer.
>
> Maybe. But the FCC may be keeping us around for other reasons.

But IMO, not *just* for other reasons. I believe emergency communications
is more than half the reason the ARS continues to exist. We had better
make sure that we are good at it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

570. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 13:58:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAD9F88.6CCED5D0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39837

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAD23F2.2950D87A@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > > > > > > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> > > > > > > States should become a radio amateur.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Why not? We even have non-citizens with US licenses.
> > > > >
> > > > > Now we do. That was not formerly possible.
> > >
> > > How formerly?
> >
> > Look up the dates if you're curious. In the past, it was not even
> > possible for a resident alien to obtain an amateur ticket in the U.S.
>
> Also in the past, there was no exam, there was no licensing, foreign
> national or not.

Sorry, Brian. I thought you were really interested in knowing.

Dave K8MN

571. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 14:03:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CADA0BC.882AF91D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39838

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Right, Cec, only a simple typo for you--it's a lie for me. Your usual
> > double standard is revealed.
>
> Making a typo is human, Dave. Lying about making the typo is a lie.
> I didn't lie about making a typo - you did. The lie is the difference
> between you and me. It's not a double standard at all.

Sure it is, Cecil. You accuse another of a lie and that is supposed to make it fact. I'm now using your own tactic. Your statement was obviously no typo. It must have been a lie. There have been a number of times which you've stated things here which are not true. Rather than attributing those to gaps in your knowledge, I'll now state that they must have been lies.

You have now overlooked twice my statement that I acknowledged a typo and have continued to say that I deliberately told an untruth. That is simply a lie. Your double standard continues.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

572. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 14:06:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CADA14B.312C0922@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39839

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > For days, you continued to deny saying "comparting". The history is
> > > all there on Google.
> >
> > ...and only a nit pecker (I love the newly coined term) would make an
> > issue of it. I wrote that the term was a typo.
>
> Only a nit pecker would make an issue out of your lying about making
> a typo? The issue is not that you made a typo, Dave. The issue is that
> for days, you wouldn't even admit that it was a typo. You kept denying
> that you said "comparting" instead of "comparing" even after I had
> proven to you multiple times that you had said "comparting". Only after
> your lie was days old did you finally grudgingly admit that you had
> made a typo. Everyone makes typos. You're the only person who I know
> who has ever lied about such for days.

You are the only person I know who has tried to make issue over an
obvious and acknowledged typo. You are still doing that. That makes
you worse than a liar.

Dave K8MN

573. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 14:08:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CADA1E3.D76E53A8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39840

CAM wrote:
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > Look up the dates if you're curious. In the past, it was not even
> > > possible for a resident alien to obtain an amateur ticket in the U.S.
>
> Uhhhhhhhh Dave, yesterday is "in the past".

You're really on top of your game today, aren't you?

Did you have a point?

Dave K8MN

574. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 14:10:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CADB072.445F0F97@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39841

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm now using your own tactic. Your statement was
> obviously no typo. It must have been a lie.

Nope Dave, I immediately admitted it was a typo. You denied for days
that you had made a typo - big difference.

> You have now overlooked twice my statement that I acknowledged a typo...

I haven't overlooked that statement, Dave. You acknowledged that
you made a typo ONLY after lying about it for days - big difference.
Why did you choose to lie about something for days before admitting
it? Why do you think lying about something for days is the same as
making a typo?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

575. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 14:18:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CADB234.A84EF404@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39842

Dave Heil wrote:
> You are the only person I know who has tried to make issue over an
> obvious and acknowledged typo.

I am NOT making an issue over a typo. Everyone makes typos. I am making an issue over you lying for days saying that you didn't say "comparting" even after I reposted your posting multiple times proving that you said "comparting". If you are going to deny saying the word "comparting" for days, why not just deny it for life?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

576. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 14:43:23 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CADB80A.C9F877FB@psu.edu>
Source record: 39843

I know a lot of people feel that way. We have a few gated communities in our area. I find it chilling that these folk put themselves in jail, for all practical purposes.

My neck of the woods isn't a high-crime area either.

I think that this siege mentality from so many folk is more a symptom of something wrong with them - NOT the rest of the world.

I had to chuckle when a year or two ago, there was a domestic disturbance in one of these neighborhood bastions of gentility, and they had to call in the police, evacuate the neighbors, and.... there goes the neighborhood! "Sheesh, is there no place where I can have security and no annoyances and only the right people in my neighborhood?" In a word, no.

They are self made victims.

I like the old qoute "The best revenge is living well".

- mike - KB3EIA

Valentine Germann wrote:

> The world just isn't as nice a place these days as it was
> not so long ago, I guess. It all seems part of a general
> INsecurity that may not get better soon. It's truly sad.
>
> Val
> KC0MUB

577. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 16:35:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CADD25F.16F1E2CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39845

Dave Heil wrote:
> You are the only person I know who has tried to make issue over an
> obvious and acknowledged typo. You are still doing that. That makes
> you worse than a liar.

I didn't bring it up this time, Dave, you did. Why you would want to
face the reality of your lies yet once again is beyond belief. Here's
a compilation from Googal of what was said back in November. Read it
and tell me again who was/is lying.

Dave's original message.
****
> Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
> From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2001 00:43:24 GMT
>
> I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
^^^^^^^^^^
****
I objected to Dave saying that I comparted anything.

Dave responded:
> I said you were "comparing" not "comparting". (A lie)

> W5DXP said:
> > Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I. the definition of "compart"
> > is "to subdivide".

Dave responded:
> You have lost your few brain cells. I never used such a term. (A lie)

W5DXP said:
> > You mean like "comparting"? You apparently used a word for which
> > you were ignorant of the meaning.

Dave responded:
> You know better and that makes your continuation of the lie all the
> worse. (A lie)

W5DXP said:
> > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > you know what that makes you.

Dave responded:
> You have indeed. (A lie)

W5DXP said:
> > I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse
> > testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.

Dave responded:
> You'll get none from me. I never accused you of subdividing anything.
> (A lie because "comparting" means "subdividing")

From Kim:
> This is nothing more than a "Reply" to this original post from Dave Heil to
> submit to him evidence that he used the word c-o-m-p-a-r-t-i-n-g in that
> post, which he keeps denying. (Dave denied it for about five days)

> *GASP*!! OK, that's it. I am going
> to reply to the post in which Dave Heil used the word comparting. **THEN**
> I am going to completely ignore that this jerk even habitats the planet
> Earth.

> ROFLMAO....and Cecil even provides you with what you really said, Dave...oh
> good grief.

So you see, Dave, you denied making your typo for a good five days.
If you were going to deny it for that long, why not deny it forever?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

578. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 16:44:09 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CADD45A.1C8C4598@psu.edu>
Source record: 39846

Now this I gotta see!! ROFL!!

- mike KB3EIA -

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Buy, I bet Hans is just quacking in his boots.

579. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 16:54:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8kkru$3pr$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 39847

N2EY wrote:
>
>
> Show us where FISTS, as an organization, advocates mandatory code testing.

They don't, never have, and never will. The Gadfly has finally flown
the coop.

580. A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 17:41:32 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uarncn9nkpmj92@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39848

Hello, all!

I have in front of me the April 2002, issue of two magazines, the ARRL's QST and Sky Publishing's SKY AND TELESCOPE. Both of these efforts are specialty magazines with relatively small circulation, based in the eastern United States. QST has a higher page count, about 155 to about 135, and has more column inches of text than S&T, which has been "modernized" in recent years, cleaning up its look. As far as advertising percentage goes, QST has 37 full-page ads, S&T has 29, so any revenue difference is likely in QST's favor. I think that a comparison of these two magazines might be most useful to some on this newsgroup, considering that the ARRL is now embarking on a serious-minded attempt to re-vamp the image of amateur radio in the United States. Surely, QST is an important part of meeting this challenge.

Let's begin at the beginning, with the covers. For many years S&T has featured ONE big photo on the cover, with text superimposed, as QST was doing back in 1952! That is, if you have the April QST, repair to page 92 and note the old covers shown there. Look at how attractive that 1952 cover is, compared to the, let's fact it, cluttered and ugly cover of the 2002 edition. What a de-evolution!

The April, 2002 cover of S&T is very attractive, in spite of the numerous blurbs plumping for the articles inside. At the upper right is a thumbnail image that can be seen and understood, with a blurb explaining what it is. The QST cover, unfortunately, is pretty sad. The background is complicated and distracting, totally obscuring some of the blurbs. The colors used clash, to say the least.

Where S&T has ONE large photo on the cover, and a beautiful one at that, QST has one, two, three LITTLE photos, too small to truly be seen. And to make matters worse, the photos are (in keeping with "amateur radio"?) amateurish to the maximum. The largest one, of a guy sitting at a computer, is about as pedestrian as it can get AND has a huge area of washed-out-white in it! Very bad. The other two photos, also amateurish, show an ugly building with what must be antennas, and some blurry green stuff near what must be some water, somewhere. A garish red box at the bottom is combined with a very unattractive blue type to state that the (crude) display above concerns: "6-meter Dxing from the Galapagos." Folks, it doesn't get much worse.

Inside, the situation is similiar. S&T, the smaller magazine with what has to be similar or even less ad revenue, is MUCH cleaner, more attractive, and easier to read. The layout of S&T is relatively simple, the use of color effective, and the blurbs and bleeds not interfering with the text. S&T has several technical articles, a few reviews, plus star charts and other "institutional" material. It even has a "big project," having to do with light pollution in part arising from, ah, the screaming desire to be "safe"

through the use of megawatt lighting everywhere in the United States, or so it seems.

For QST, there is a lot of hard-to-read small type but much of it is necessary, so that's acceptable. The general layout is only "OK" but the articles are pretty well edited and quite readable. The slide begins with some of the illustrations and really goes down hill with many of the photos. It's true that the technical illustrations needed for amateur radio, most of them, are not going to have the pizzazz of astronomy. But it seems almost as if someone has gone out of their way to make the illustrations in QST less interesting than they could be. And there are a lot of amateurish photos, of guys standing around holding stuff, items that S&T banished a long time ago. QST has the look, in places, of the very small Astronomical League's REFLECTOR, which is moving up the food chain fast but still has too many photos of, ah, guys standing around holding stuff. As for photos of guys sitting at computers, indoors, with blown-out windows in the background, they should be PURGED from ANY magazine, and a new art director hired immediately. Or, more likely, it's time for QST to HIRE an art director!

In closing, if you're passing a newsstand over the next few days, take a look at S&T and see the way a specialty magazine SHOULD look. Then go to page 92 of the current QST and look at the way your QST * USED * to look! I think you'll be amazed!

Hmm, maybe the 1950s truly WERE the Golden Age of Ham Radio!

Val
KC0MUB

581. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 18:20:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8kq29far1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39901

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uarncn9nkpmj92@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> I have in front of me the April 2002, issue of two magazines, the ARRL's
QST
> and Sky Publishing's SKY AND TELESCOPE. Both of these efforts are
specialty
> magazines with relatively small circulation, based in the eastern United
> States. QST has a higher page count, about 155 to about 135, and has
more
> column inches of text than S&T, which has been "modernized" in recent
years,
> cleaning up its look. As far as advertising percentage goes, QST has 37
> full-page ads, S&T has 29, so any revenue difference is likely in QST's
> favor. I think that a comparison of these two magazines might be most
> useful to some on this newsgroup, considering that the ARRL is now
embarking
> on a serious-minded attempt to re-vamp the image of amateur radio in the
> United States. Surely, QST is an important part of meeting this
challenge.

OK so far.

> Let's begin at the beginning, with the covers. For many years S&T has
> featured ONE big photo on the cover, with text superimposed, as QST was
> doing back in 1952! That is, if you have the April QST, repair to page 92
> and note the old covers shown there. Look at how attractive that 1952
cover
> is, compared to the, let's fact it, cluttered and ugly cover of the 2002
> edition. What a de-evolution!

Do you really think any of us belong to ARRL only because of
the magazine cover? Do you think any of us care about the magazine
cover?

> The April, 2002 cover of S&T is very attractive, in spite of the numerous
> blurbs plumping for the articles inside. At the upper right is a
thumbnail
> image that can be seen and understood, with a blurb explaining what it is.
> The QST cover, unfortunately, is pretty sad. The background is
complicated
> and distracting, totally obscuring some of the blurbs. The colors used
> clash, to say the least.

And because you judge it so. Of what consequence is it to
the role of ARRL.

> Where S&T has ONE large photo on the cover, and a beautiful one at that,
QST
> has one, two, three LITTLE photos, too small to truly be seen. And to
make
> matters worse, the photos are (in keeping with "amateur radio"?)
amateurish
> to the maximum. The largest one, of a guy sitting at a computer, is
about
> as pedestrian as it can get AND has a huge area of washed-out-white in it!
> Very bad. The other two photos, also amateurish, show an ugly building
with
> what must be antennas, and some blurry green stuff near what must be some
> water, somewhere. A garish red box at the bottom is combined with a very
> unattractive blue type to state that the (crude) display above concerns:
> "6-meter Dxing from the Galapagos." Folks, it doesn't get much worse.

Tell us what the devil you think would change IF the cover fit
whatever "good/excellent" criteria you use to make your
judgements.

> Inside, the situation is similiar. S&T, the smaller magazine with what
has
> to be similar or even less ad revenue, is MUCH cleaner, more attractive,
and
> easier to read. The layout of S&T is relatively simple, the use of color
> effective, and the blurbs and bleeds not interfering with the text. S&T
has
> several technical articles, a few reviews, plus star charts and other
> "institutional" material. It even has a "big project," having to do with
> light pollution in part arising from, ah, the screaming desire to be
"safe"
> through the use of megawatt lighting everywhere in the United States, or
so
> it seems.

Sounds more like you want QST to take on the aspect of
some "glossy" newstand popular public magazine.

> For QST, there is a lot of hard-to-read small type but much of it is
> necessary, so that's acceptable.

How generous of you.

> The general layout is only "OK" but the
> articles are pretty well edited and quite readable. The slide begins with
> some of the illustrations and really goes down hill with many of the
photos.
> It's true that the technical illustrations needed for amateur radio, most
of
> them, are not going to have the pizzazz of astronomy. But it seems almost

> as if someone has gone out of their way to make the illustrations in QST
> less interesting than they could be.

Again, assuming QST were to embark on changes which would
satisfy your criteria of quality, just what do YOU thinkwould happen?

> And there are a lot of amateurish
> photos, of guys standing around holding stuff, items that S&T banished a
> long time ago.

Same old generalizations from Val. How about several
specific examples and why those items should be "banished"
from the pages of QST.

> QST has the look, in places, of the very small Astronomical
> League's REFLECTOR, which is moving up the food chain fast but still has
too
> many photos of, ah, guys standing around holding stuff. As for photos of
> guys sitting at computers, indoors, with blown-out windows in the
> background, they should be PURGED from ANY magazine, and a new art
director
> hired immediately. Or, more likely, it's time for QST to HIRE an art
> director!

Guess it must be me...I don't recall ever being concerned about
how "artsy" the pages of QST are or are not.

> In closing, if you're passing a newsstand over the next few days, take a
> look at S&T and see the way a specialty magazine SHOULD look.

Hey...no smiley and IMHO?

> Then go to
> page 92 of the current QST and look at the way your
> QST * USED * to look! I think you'll be amazed!
>
> Hmm, maybe the 1950s truly WERE the Golden Age of Ham Radio!

20/30/40 years ago is pretty commonly viewed as "the golden age of"
lots of things. Same old nostalgia about auto racing, antique cars,
model railroading, model airplanes, etc. Nothing new there. 20/30/40
years from now people will look at the 80/90s the same way.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

582. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 18:22:17 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CADEB59.2F9549FC@psu.edu>
Source record: 39850

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Hmm, maybe the 1950s truly WERE the Golden Age of Ham Radio!

Not during the 1950's though. Back then, it was some other time.

But for the main thrust of your post, I hate poor design, and unfortunately I agree with you.... Not unfortunate that I agree with you, but unfortunate that I have to agree with you..... oh heck, you know what I mean! 8^)

- Mike -

583. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 19:57:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAE01AD.65092442@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39902

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm now using your own tactic. Your statement was
> > obviously no typo. It must have been a lie.
>
> Nope Dave, I immediately admitted it was a typo. You denied for days
> that you had made a typo - big difference.
>
> > You have now overlooked twice my statement that I acknowledged a typo...
>
> I haven't overlooked that statement, Dave. You acknowledged that
> you made a typo ONLY after lying about it for days - big difference.
> Why did you choose to lie about something for days before admitting
> it? Why do you think lying about something for days is the same as
> making a typo?

I did not realize that I had made the typo. You know that.
You are, in effect, lying about what took place. It isn't new for you.
Stuff your game playing.

Dave K8MN

584. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 19:59:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAE020C.DEAF41B0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39903

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You are the only person I know who has tried to make issue over an
> > obvious and acknowledged typo.
>
> I am NOT making an issue over a typo. Everyone makes typos. I am
> making an issue over you lying for days saying that you didn't
> say "comparting" even after I reposted your posting multiple
> times proving that you said "comparting". If you are going to
> deny saying the word "comparting" for days, why not just deny
> it for life?

I did not write the word "comparting" for days. I wrote it one time in error. You are now lying about what took place. It must help fill your empty hours.

Dave K8MN

585. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 20:06:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAE03B1.ACE4FE70@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39904

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You are the only person I know who has tried to make issue over an
> > obvious and acknowledged typo. You are still doing that. That makes
> > you worse than a liar.
>
> I didn't bring it up this time, Dave, you did. Why you would want to
> face the reality of your lies yet once again is beyond belief. Here's
> a compilation from Googal of what was said back in November. Read it
> and tell me again who was/is lying.

I brought it up over your supposed "typo". A typo is a typo for you but
a lie for me by your definition.
>
> Dave's original message.
> **********
> > Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
> > From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> > Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2001 00:43:24 GMT
> >
> > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> ^^^^^^^^^^
> **********
> I objected to Dave saying that I comparted anything.
>
> Dave responded:
> > I said you were "comparing" not "comparting". (A lie)

So you plainly saw what I intended already at this point and knew I had
made a typo. Rather than accept it as a typo, you went on one of your
numerous diversions.

> > W5DXP said:
> > > Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I. the definition of "compart"
> > > is "to subdivide".
>
> Dave responded:
> > You have lost your few brain cells. I never used such a term. (A lie)

So, you, realizing that I'd made a typo, decided to ride it out. You
knew it wasn't a lie at all.

Sorry, Cecil. All of your typos will now have to be judged as lies.
Your misstatements and reverses (as in the recent exchanges with N2EY)
will have to be judged lies. Its obvious to me that everytime your
reverse yourself, you are lying.

Dave K8MN

586. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 20:31:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAE09BF.DD964D6E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39905

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I haven't overlooked that statement, Dave. You acknowledged that
> > you made a typo ONLY after lying about it for days - big difference.
> > Why did you choose to lie about something for days before admitting
> > it? Why do you think lying about something for days is the same as
> > making a typo?
>
> I did not realize that I had made the typo.

That's the biggest lie yet. Every posting I made, I pointed out
your typo. That was about a dozen postings over a five day period.
Nobody is that dense, not even you. Even Kim pointed out your
typo a couple of times and you kept denying that you had said
that I had "comparted" the items. That old excuse just won't fly.
Care to try another?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

587. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 20:36:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAE0AE1.B86FDC11@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39906

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You are the only person I know who has tried to make issue over an
> > > obvious and acknowledged typo.
> >
> > I am NOT making an issue over a typo. Everyone makes typos. I am
> > making an issue over you lying for days saying that you didn't
> > say "comparting" even after I reposted your posting multiple
> > times proving that you said "comparting". If you are going to
> > deny saying the word "comparting" for days, why not just deny
> > it for life?
>
> I did not write the word "comparting" for days. I wrote it one time in
> error. You are now lying about what took place. It must help fill your
> empty hours.

That's a double lie. I have never said you wrote it more than once.
You wrote it once and then denied that you had done so for five days.
I'm not lying, Dave. I pointed out your typo about a dozen times over
five days and you continued to deny ever saying "comparting". You even
denied it to Kim when she also pointed it out to you. The evidence is
there on Google for all the world to see. You simply could bring your
omniscient self to admit that you had made a typo.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

588. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 20:44:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAE0CB9.82523CF8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39907

Dave Heil wrote:
> I brought it up over your supposed "typo". A typo is a typo for you but
> a lie for me by your definition.

One more time. Everyone makes typos. You are the only person I have
ever known who lied for days denying that you had even made a typo
while it was being pointed out to you in every posting.

> So, you, realizing that I'd made a typo, decided to ride it out. You
> knew it wasn't a lie at all.

I pointed out your typo for days, Dave, while you continued to deny that
you had made a typo. You appeared to be such a perfect being that you
couldn't even admit making a typo.

> Sorry, Cecil. All of your typos will now have to be judged as lies.

I have never lied about my typos, Dave. I don't know anyone except you
who would even attempt to lie about a typo - and you lied about it for
five days while Kim and I were bringing your attention to it every
posting. What made you change your mind and tell the truth? Seems to
me, lying about it forever wouldn't be any worse than lying about it
for five days. Come to think about it, you are still lying about what
happened, trying to blame me for your denials of making a typo.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

589. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:00:14 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <yfor8.19852$ml2.1493584@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39909

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> The sad story is told in the mastheads of the two
> magazines. SKY AND TELESCOPE has a DESIGN
> AND PRODUCTION STAFF headed by an ART
> DIRECTOR and an ASSOCIATE ART DIRECTOR.
> The PRODUCTION staff is listed down the page.
>
> In QST's masthead, on page 4 of the current issue,
> one may observe that the PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR
> is listed FIRST, and there's no ART DIRECTOR in sight!
>
> And it SHOWS!

Your jeremiad ignores an important distinction between the
two magazines.

"Sky and Telescope" is primarily a commercial periodical.
"QST" is primarily a membership journal.

I'd much rather ARRL buy some lab equipment than use that money
to hire a couple of artists to make QST a work of art.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

590. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:03:56 UTC
From: Not ARRL <Justme@Justmeandthemz.net>
Message-ID: <a8l3b8eji0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 39910

The golden age of ham radio was indeed the 1950s and into
the early 60s. Anyone who tells you otherwise was not a ham
radio operator during this time period.

As for QST, that was the final straw that caused me to tell
ARRL to shove their whole organization. I was stationed in
Hawaii in the 80s, and we would received QST sometimes as
late as three months after the published cover month. Meaning
we might receive the May 1983 issue in August 1983! The reason
for this was that the ARRL would not bulk air mail QST to
Hawaii, something that was done by virtually every magazine
publisher in the U.S. I wrote ARRL, asking why they did not
bulk air mail QST to Hawaii and received a stupid off-topic reply
from some woman at ARRL HQ. She informed me for x number
of additional dollars per year, the league would air mail my copy of
QST to me! BULLSHIT! My question was never addressed, as
to why the ARRL was not bulk air mailing QST to ARRL members
in Hawaii. I finally telephoned ARRL HQ and was informed it was
just not league policy to bulk air mail QSL anywhere. So you know
what, I told that fucking idiot to shove QST, shove the ARRL, and
they would never see my name again on the membership roste of
the ARRL!!!!!!!!!!!! I left ARRL in 1984 and am dam glad of it!

591. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:05:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8l3nc$7n5$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39911

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uas3ctnd76ki08@corp.supernews.com...
>
> mike coslo wrote, about QST's problems:
>
> > , , , I hate poor design, and unfortunately I agree with you.
>
> The sad story is told in the mastheads of the two
> magazines. SKY AND TELESCOPE has a DESIGN
> AND PRODUCTION STAFF headed by an ART
> DIRECTOR and an ASSOCIATE ART DIRECTOR.
> The PRODUCTION staff is listed down the page.
>
> In QST's masthead, on page 4 of the current issue,
> one may observe that the PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR
> is listed FIRST, and there's no ART DIRECTOR in sight!
>
> And it SHOWS!

But it doesn't make a difference. I don't want my member
$$$ wasted on art direction. My ARRL membership is
far more than just a QST subscription... and, even if I
look only at QST, I get all I need.

> P.S. I'm going to be representing both amateur
> astronomy and amateur radio, at a rather large high
> school (1,500 enrollment) in a couple of weeks.
> Hundreds of students, parents and visitors will see
> our set up. It's going to be a joke when people see
> those two magazines on our table, side by side.

Why, are those people so narrow in their brains that
they can't see the technical aspects of either magazine
as being a membership joural as opposed to the latest
copy of some newstand glitz publication. Ever look at
other membership journals? IEEE, etc.

> Luckily, we're going to have a couple of big foamcore
> boards with material taken from the Web, allowing us
> to keep QST discreetly off to one side.

Yea, better not hang out the technical side too much I
guess.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

592. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:06:16 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uas3ctnd76ki08@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39908

mike coslo wrote, about QST's problems:

> , , , I hate poor design, and unfortunately I agree with you.

The sad story is told in the mastheads of the two
magazines. SKY AND TELESCOPE has a DESIGN
AND PRODUCTION STAFF headed by an ART
DIRECTOR and an ASSOCIATE ART DIRECTOR.
The PRODUCTION staff is listed down the page.

In QST's masthead, on page 4 of the current issue,
one may observe that the PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR
is listed FIRST, and there's no ART DIRECTOR in sight!

And it SHOWS!

Val

P.S. I'm going to be representing both amateur
astronomy and amateur radio, at a rather large high
school (1,500 enrollment) in a couple of weeks.
Hundreds of students, parents and visitors will see
our set up. It's going to be a joke when people see
those two magazines on our table, side by side.
Luckily, we're going to have a couple of big foamcore
boards with material taken from the Web, allowing us
to keep QST discreetly off to one side.

**

593. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:21:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8l4kvqqa1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39914

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in
message news:uas4sso2jsht6d@corp.supernews.com...

> And you can take your "cheers" and shove 'em!

Quite the class act aren't you.

Cheers anyway,
Bill K2UNK

594. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:27:26 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <2For8.19890$ml2.1498086@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39915

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> But then you don't like me so
> that sort of biases your view.

Val,

No need to personalize it! As far as I know, Bill and I have never met you. Why should we dislike you? Have we said we dislike you? We obviously don't agree on some issues, but that doesn't make you a bad person or someone to be disliked. My guess is that you are a genuinely fine person, albeit a bit full of yourself. Many of my best friends are like that too.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

595. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:32:07 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uas4sso2jsht6d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39912

Bill Sohl wrote in message ...
>
>"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
>news:uarncn9nkpmj92@corp.supernews.com...
>> Hello, all!
>>
>> I have in front of me the April 2002, issue of two magazines, the ARRL's
>QST
>> and Sky Publishing's SKY AND TELESCOPE. Both of these efforts are
>specialty
>> magazines with relatively small circulation, based in the eastern United
>> States. QST has a higher page count, about 155 to about 135, and has
>more
>> column inches of text than S&T, which has been "modernized" in recent
>years,
>> cleaning up its look. As far as advertising percentage goes, QST has 37
>> full-page ads, S&T has 29, so any revenue difference is likely in QST's
>> favor. I think that a comparison of these two magazines might be most
>> useful to some on this newsgroup, considering that the ARRL is now
>embarking
>> on a serious-minded attempt to re-vamp the image of amateur radio in the
>> United States. Surely, QST is an important part of meeting this
>challenge.
>
>OK so far.
>
>> Let's begin at the beginning, with the covers. For many years S&T has
>> featured ONE big photo on the cover, with text superimposed, as QST was
>> doing back in 1952! That is, if you have the April QST, repair to page
>92
>> and note the old covers shown there. Look at how attractive that 1952
>cover
>> is, compared to the, let's fact it, cluttered and ugly cover of the 2002
>> edition. What a de-evolution!
>
>Do you really think any of us belong to ARRL only because of
>the magazine cover? Do you think any of us care about the magazine
>cover?

Oh, boy, you got me LAUGHING now! NO, I don't think ANYONE
cares about that cover but me. That's because, if anyone DID really
care about it, well, it wouldn't look like sh*t, would it?

>> The April, 2002 cover of S&T is very attractive, in spite of the numerous
>> blurbs plumping for the articles inside. At the upper right is a

>thumbnail
>> image that can be seen and understood, with a blurb explaining what it
is.
>> The QST cover, unfortunately, is pretty sad. The background is
>complicated
>> and distracting, totally obscuring some of the blurbs. The colors used
>> clash, to say the least.
>
>And because you judge it so. Of what consequence is it to
>the role of ARRL.

Why none, of course, it's just the first thing a lot people are going
to see in a couple of weeks, when I try to show them the flagship
publication of amateur radio, is that awful cover, alongside the
afrorementioned SKY AND TELESCOPE magazine, which just
blows it away. So, no, that cover don't mean SQUAT!
What was I * THINKIN' *! It's PERECT!

>> Where S&T has ONE large photo on the cover, and a beautiful one at that,
>QST
>> has one, two, three LITTLE photos, too small to truly be seen. And to
>make
>> matters worse, the photos are (in keeping with "amateur radio"?)
>amateurish
>> to the maximum. The largest one, of a guy sitting at a computer, is
>about
>> as pedestrian as it can get AND has a huge area of washed-out-white in
it!
>> Very bad. The other two photos, also amateurish, show an ugly building
>with
>> what must be antennas, and some blurry green stuff near what must be some
>> water, somewhere. A garish red box at the bottom is combined with a very
>> unattractive blue type to state that the (crude) display above concerns:
>> "6-meter Dxing from the Galapagos." Folks, it doesn't get much worse.
>
>Tell us what the devil you think would change IF the cover fit
>whatever "good/excellent" criteria you use to make your
>judgements.

I think I'd leave it blank except for the "QST" part. That would help.
At least then you could actually READ everything ON the cover,
unlike the present situation, where you can read about half of it
without squinting, and some of it is illegible.

>> Inside, the situation is similiar. S&T, the smaller magazine with what
>has
>> to be similar or even less ad revenue, is MUCH cleaner, more attractive,
>and
>> easier to read. The layout of S&T is relatively simple, the use of color
>> effective, and the blurbs and bleeds not interfering with the text. S&T
>has

>> several technical articles, a few reviews, plus star charts and other
>> "institutional" material. It even has a "big project," having to do with
>> light pollution in part arising from, ah, the screaming desire to be
>"safe"
>> through the use of megawatt lighting everywhere in the United States, or
>so
>> it seems.
>
>Sounds more like you want QST to take on the aspect of
>some "glossy" newstand popular public magazine.

To YOU it might sound that way, yes. But then you don't like me so
that sort of biases your view. I'd just like to look at the cover without
flinching. That would be enough.

>
>> For QST, there is a lot of hard-to-read small type but much of it is
>> necessary, so that's acceptable.
>
>How generous of you.

I always give credit where credit is due!

>> The general layout is only "OK" but the
>> articles are pretty well edited and quite readable. The slide begins
with
>> some of the illustrations and really goes down hill with many of the
>photos.
>> It's true that the technical illustrations needed for amateur radio, most
>of
>> them, are not going to have the pizzazz of astronomy. But it seems
almost
>> as if someone has gone out of their way to make the illustrations in QST
>> less interesting than they could be.
>
>Again, assuming QST were to embark on changes which would
>satisfy your criteria of quality, just what do YOU thinkwould happen?

Gee, Einstein, I think I'd go buy a copy of SKY AND TELESCOPE, for
five bucks and the tax, and try to get closer to what they're doing. This
is NOT rocket, or even radio, science, and huge improvements could
be made for relatively little expense. Hire an intern with some skills is
ONE way to get a START! Where is Newington, on the north slope?

>
>> And there are a lot of amateurish
>> photos, of guys standing around holding stuff, items that S&T banished a
>> long time ago.
>
>Same old generalizations from Val. How about several
>specific examples and why those items should be "banished"
>from the pages of QST.

Get stuffed . . . and ditch the blurry grip-n-grin photos, and any fine print that's less important than the BoD's minutes. How much magazine will you have left to edit then, huh? Hell, QST could fire almost everybody and get those profits justa ROLLING in!

>> QST has the look, in places, of the very small Astronomical
>> League's REFLECTOR, which is moving up the food chain fast but still has
>too
>> many photos of, ah, guys standing around holding stuff. As for photos
of
>> guys sitting at computers, indoors, with blown-out windows in the
>> background, they should be PURGED from ANY magazine, and a new art
>director
>> hired immediately. Or, more likely, it's time for QST to HIRE an art
>> director!
>
>Guess it must be me...I don't recall ever being concerned about
>how "artsy" the pages of QST are or are not.

Gee, I'm SO surprised at this!

>> In closing, if you're passing a newsstand over the next few days, take a
>> look at S&T and see the way a specialty magazine SHOULD look.
>
>Hey...no smiley and IMHO?

No. Are you disappointed?

>> Then go to
>> page 92 of the current QST and look at the way your
>> QST * USED * to look! I think you'll be amazed!
>>
>> Hmm, maybe the 1950s truly WERE the Golden Age of Ham Radio!
>
>20/30/40 years ago is pretty commonly viewed as "the golden age of"
>lots of things. Same old nostalgia about auto racing, antique cars,
>model railroading, model airplanes, etc. Nothing new there. 20/30/40
>years from now people will look at the 80/90s the same way.

As far as the design of QST covers goes, the 1952 version stands as Old Kingdom art compared to the garish, blurry and jumbled covers of the present day. And you can take your "cheers" and shove 'em!

Val
KC0MUB

596. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:36:54 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CAE18F7.F2422D4@psu.edu>
Source record: 39917

hmmm, I work in that field. Maybe they could use me!

- Mike KB3EIA -

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote, about QST's problems:
>
> > , , , I hate poor design, and unfortunately I agree with you.
>
> The sad story is told in the mastheads of the two
> magazines. SKY AND TELESCOPE has a DESIGN
> AND PRODUCTION STAFF headed by an ART
> DIRECTOR and an ASSOCIATE ART DIRECTOR.
> The PRODUCTION staff is listed down the page.
>
> In QST's masthead, on page 4 of the current issue,
> one may observe that the PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR
> is listed FIRST, and there's no ART DIRECTOR in sight!

597. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:40:52 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uas5d9k6h1krd2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39913

K0HB wrote:

>I'd much rather ARRL buy some lab equipment than
>use that money to hire a couple of artists to make QST
>a work of art.

No wonder amateur radio seems to be tanking. Would
you trade a couple of VTVMs for a cover you could READ?

Val
KC0MUB

598. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:42:48 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CAE1A59.D9F5574E@psu.edu>
Source record: 39920

Well, technical or not, there is always a place for beauty in my book. I believe if you're going to do it, you might as well do it well, and you might as well do it pretty.

In my other hobby, ATM'ing, I decided if I was going to make a telescope, it would be asthetically pleasing. So I made a pretty art deco telescope that wonr first place in the only contest I entered it in. It works nicely as a scope also.

It takes as long to make an attractive designed cover as it does to make an ugly one.

- Mike - KB3EIA

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Why, are those people so narrow in their brains that
> they can't see the technical aspects of either magazine
> as being a membership joural as opposed to the latest
> copy of some newstand glitz publication. Ever look at
> other membership journals? IEEE, etc.

599. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:43:33 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <9Uor8.19929$ml2.1500747@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39918

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uas5d9k6h1krd2@corp.supernews.com...
>
> K0HB wrote:
>
> >I'd much rather ARRL buy some lab equipment than
> >use that money to hire a couple of artists to make QST
> >a work of art.
>
> No wonder amateur radio seems to be tanking. Would
> you trade a couple of VTVMs for a cover you could READ?

Your jeremiad suggests that QST ought to match S&T with
an Art Director and an Associate Art Director. The folks
I hire are engineers and such, so I'm not conversant with
salary scales for Art Directors, but let me take an uneducated
stab......

Art Director, annual salary $45,000
Associate Art Director salary $32,000
Benefits, payroll taxes, office space/heat-lights/equipment (43% in my
budget)

Total salaries $77,000
Loaded befits: $33,110

Grand total $110,110 per YEAR!

That'll buy a lot more than just a couple VTVM's every year!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

600. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:46:53 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uas5rf1db4luf8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39916

Bill Sohl wrote . . . a lot of off-point nonsense.

You know what, boy-oh, I got a feeling we'll be seeing
some changes in QST's appearnce, down the road,
as the re-imaging of amateur radio gains momentum.
Looking like dog poop is NOT good, for any magazine,
even a magazine about dog poop, should there be one.
There is, of course, a Website about dog poop, no doubt
addressed > www.doggiepoo.com < . And I will bet
you IT looks better, if it exists, than a QST cover.

BowWow, BowWow!
(That's "cheers" in doggie talk!)

Val
KC0MUB

601. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:46:55 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a8l60f$4bu$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 39923

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Bill Sohl wrote:
>> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>> > Bill Sohl wrote:
>> > The FCC can be challenged if it acts
>> > > in an arbitrary and capricious manner.
>> >
>> > Sure, ARRL sued the FCC over the 220 mhz giveaway to UPS. Did a lot of
>> > good too, didn't it??
>>
>> People sue over many things. The court decision was such
>> that they ruled the FCC did NOT act contrary to their
>> charter, and or in an arbitrary or capricious mmanner.
>
> When was the last time you ever knew of anyone winning a suit against
>the FCC for any reason at any time? Not in my memory. Courts simply
>defer to the FCC as the final authority in the field. No one says they
>have to be right.

Take a look at, e.g.

http://www.findlaw.com/casecode/courts/dc.html

and type "FCC" in the Party Name search field. They're in court
all the time.

As far as I can tell the FCC wins some and loses some. A quick
scan of the most recent 10 cases suggests a score of 6.5 wins
for the FCC to 3.5 losses. I have no idea if that is representative
or not, but it certainly isn't hard to find cases the FCC lost
in the rest of the list as well.

Dennis Ferguson

602. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:48:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8l67s$k87$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39919

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uas5d9k6h1krd2@corp.supernews.com...
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >I'd much rather ARRL buy some lab equipment than
> >use that money to hire a couple of artists to make QST
> >a work of art.
>
> No wonder amateur radio seems to be tanking. Would
> you trade a couple of VTVMs for a cover you could READ?
> Val KC0MUB

The reality of new hams is, based on all those I've encountered,
is that none happened to wonder into the hobby because of
a copy of QST...or for that matter, 73 and/or CQ magazine.
The sale of QST at newstands is relatively new to begin with
(a few years at most).

The almost universal means that new hams seem to come
to ham radio is via another ham, or after dabbling in the
non-licensed services. If anyone learned of ham radio
through a magazine, it was (back in the 50s/60s) via
general electronics magazines (e.g. Popular Electronics).
Today I don't even see those magazines anymore because the
nature of "do-it-yourself" electronics has pretty much been
passed by the high tech (low cost) microchips manufacturing.

As to you bringing ham radio direct to some high schoolers,
that's great...but I don't see any need to turn QST into an
over-the-counter media glitz show just on the chance
a handful of non-hams "might" gravitate to its cover. Far
better for the personal outreach effort.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

603. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:50:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8l6at$kg6$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39921

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uas5rf1db4luf8@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote . . . a lot of off-point nonsense.
>
> You know what, boy-oh, I got a feeling we'll be seeing
> some changes in QST's appearnce, down the road,
> as the re-imaging of amateur radio gains momentum.
> Looking like dog poop is NOT good, for any magazine,
> even a magazine about dog poop, should there be one.
> There is, of course, a Website about dog poop, no doubt
> addressed > www.doggiepoo.com < . And I will bet
> you IT looks better, if it exists, than a QST cover.
>
> BowWow, BowWow!
> (That's "cheers" in doggie talk!)

That's pathetic from a supposed adult. Worse
yet from a claimed academic.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

604. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 21:53:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8l6df$m3f$0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 39922

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
the R&O for NPRM 98-143 was more than
> > > > > adequately prepared to avoid any charge of it being
> > > > > arbitrary and/or capricious.
> > > > >
> > > > If that makes you feel good, believe what you want.
> > > >
> > > Works fine for me.
> > >
> > Doesn't mean its accurate.
>
> In you opinion anyway. My opinion is at least shared
> with the FCC ruling itself.

And you use that fact to prove the "rightness" of both your opinion and
the ruling. We see. You don't.

605. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:01:15 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <L8pr8.19955$ml2.1504089@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39924

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Well, technical or not, there is always a place for beauty in my book.
> I believe if you're going to do it, you might as well do it well, and
> you might as well do it pretty.

I don't think either Bill or I is arguing against beauty, but rather
against the *cost* of beauty. ARRL must allocate their (our!)
scarce resources to the things that are of most benefit to
members.

The minute the members see them hiring Art Directors/Associate
Art Directors for QST while cutting headcount in other member
benefit areas, there will be some major restructuring of the BoD!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

606. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:06:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405170604.04302.00000319@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 39926

In article <3CADA1CA.B17A6580@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>This was a statement about you and about nobody else. You spent
>a lot of time before you were licensed, telling us how things
>ought to be done within amateur radio. There's nothing wrong
>with doing that. But Steve's statement was false.

Can't be. Monkey boy never lies. He tells others they lie! :-)

607. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:06:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405170604.04302.00000318@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 39927

In article <20020404080954.27399.00000253@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>You
>>would think that certain combinations would be,
>>as Monty Python might say, "RIGHT OUT!" :-)
>>
>Is this the right newsgroup for an argument?

"Monty Python" phrases and expressions are neither in common American colloquial use nor do they pertain to amateur radio policy.

Phrases and expressions from the "Hitchhiker to the Center of the Galaxy" series of books is neither in common American colloquial use nor do they pertain to amateur radio policy.

N2EY has used both in here as if everyone is thoroughly familiar with them.

608. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:06:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405170604.04302.00000317@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 39931

In article <a8kq29far1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> The general layout is only "OK" but the
>> articles are pretty well edited and quite readable. The slide begins with
>> some of the illustrations and really goes down hill with many of the photos.
>> It's true that the technical illustrations needed for amateur radio, most of
>> them, are not going to have the pizzazz of astronomy. But it seems almost
>> as if someone has gone out of their way to make the illustrations in QST
>> less interesting than they could be.
>
>Again, assuming QST were to embark on changes which would
>satisfy your criteria of quality, just what do YOU thinkwould happen?

...I'm still working on "pizzazz of astronomy." :-)

Funny thing is, having just looked at a local HRO's magazine
rack this morning, I'd say that QST is a nice bit of periodical
construction-art-content. QST *is* an organization membership
magazine, says so up-front both inside and on the ARRL web page.

Less than 8% of all printed QSTs are sold over-the-counter.
QST can survive as a monetarily-independent branch within
the ARRL due to rather guaranteed demographics of reaching
about 170 thousand members.

>> And there are a lot of amateurish
>> photos, of guys standing around holding stuff, items that S&T banished a
>> long time ago.
>
>Same old generalizations from Val. How about several
>specific examples and why those items should be "banished"
>from the pages of QST.

Heh heh heh. "Amateurish photos" or amateurs...who sit around
in front of radios or hold stuff or pose in groups with the usual
smiles. Once in a while there's a picture of a tuna tin with some
electronic gizmos in it. I find no fault with any of that. :-)

>> QST has the look, in places, of the very small Astronomical
>> League's REFLECTOR, which is moving up the food chain fast but still has too
>> many photos of, ah, guys standing around holding stuff. As for photos of
>> guys sitting at computers, indoors, with blown-out windows in the
>> background, they should be PURGED from ANY magazine, and a new art director
>> hired immediately. Or, more likely, it's time for QST to HIRE an art
>> director!

>
>Guess it must be me...I don't recall ever being concerned about
>how "artsy" the pages of QST are or are not.

Most folks aren't concerned. Good periodical construction is
something that won't be noticed. Last I looked (this morning),
QST was still a membership magazine with good layout about
amateur radio on light but glossy stock. As far as I know, neither
the FCC nor the ITU-R has allocated anything of the spectrum
about 300 GHz...where optical astronomy is done. :-)

>> In closing, if you're passing a newsstand over the next few days, take a
>> look at S&T and see the way a specialty magazine SHOULD look.
>
>Hey...no smiley and IMHO?

:-)

>20/30/40 years ago is pretty commonly viewed as "the golden age of"
>lots of things. Same old nostalgia about auto racing, antique cars,
>model railroading, model airplanes, etc. Nothing new there. 20/30/40
>years from now people will look at the 80/90s the same way.

Heh heh heh. Bill, when I was a young'un we didn't BUY our
ICs in stores, we carved them usselves outa' wood! :-)

609. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:06:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405170605.04302.00000320@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 39928

In article <uaqpdka22shb56@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Oh, no, he's justa whomping up a GOOD ONE for ya!
>You'll see. He's justa pourin' over that rulebook, lookin'
>for clues. You'll find out! And when he finally finds that
>clue, well, he'll come justa ROARING after ya, yes he WILL!
>Wait and see, you'll find out!

Not really. I've encountered monkeys with clenched fists in
containers all my life. Most of the time I, like most others,
will simply ignore such types. Not worth the time to bother.

Since you are so into personal things, why don't you write
some more about your in-country days when you saved a
whole brigade with your trusty radio as sole support?
I just love those old war stories. :-)

610. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:06:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405170605.04302.00000321@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 39929

In article <uaqo2sf84rn5e1@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>K0HB wrote, about me:
>
>>Until a few short days ago you weren't a license holder
>>either. Are you suddenly some righteous elevated being,
>>and Lennie a child of a lesser God?
>
>Lennie is the b*stard child of . . . wait a minute. . . YOU'RE
>his DADDY!

Unlikely, long-timer. :-)

Hans Brakob is younger than I am. I was born in 1932.
We are not related.

It's a common practice in here for frustrated egoists to start
in with personal insults whenever they've been bested in any
messaging. Attempting to use "b*stard" or "bastard" in any
form is a personal insult to myself and to both of my late
parents. There's no cause for such things and certainly not
condoned in The Amateur's Code.

611. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:06:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405170606.04302.00000323@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 39925

In article <20020404231400.00386.00002370@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Still no answer. Nothing I didn't expect.

Petulance is not a virtue... :-)

612. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:06:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405170606.04302.00000322@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 39930

In article <3CAD265F.C6FA8906@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>
>> CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org wrote:
>> >Huh? That's exactly what he did before he took his Tech exam.
>> >I commented on it myself.
>>
>> I've seen him get a bit confused and MILDLY arrogant, but how can you
>> equate ANYthing he's written in the same bilgecrap as Lennie?
>
>Huh? Who said anything about Lennie? Here's what I responded to:
>
>> Val IS a licensee, and at NO TIME did he spend any of his pre-licensure
>> days "telling" us how to do things.
>
>Do you see Lennie mentioned anywhere in your sentence?

This sort of comment does no good, Cecil. The poor guy has
this terrible hang-up and can't let go of it. It's the classic
equivalent of the monkey with his hand inside a container who
can't unclench his fist long enough to withdraw the hand. :-)

613. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:46:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAE2960.2CC56A5C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39932

Dick Carroll wrote:
> And you use that fact to prove the "rightness" of both your opinion and
> the ruling. We see. You don't.

Haven't you heard might makes right, Dick? The Taliban believes they
are right just as much as you do. The U.S. Military has the might.
The FCC has the might concerning U.S. amateur radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

614. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:49:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405174917.27329.00000366@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 39934

In article <L8pr8.19955$ml2.1504089@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>> Well, technical or not, there is always a place for beauty in my book.
>> I believe if you're going to do it, you might as well do it well, and
>> you might as well do it pretty.
>
>I don't think either Bill or I is arguing against beauty, but rather
>against the *cost* of beauty. ARRL must allocate their (our!)
>scarce resources to the things that are of most benefit to
>members.
>
>The minute the members see them hiring Art Directors/Associate
>Art Directors for QST while cutting headcount in other member
>benefit areas, there will be some major restructuring of the BoD!

Speaking from some part-time experience in periodicals other than electronics hobby things, I find little fault with the general style/layout ("construction") of QST as a periodical. That's in esthetic values. Likewise the "cover art."

QST *is* a membership magazine. Based on their ad rate card, the ads placed, and some rough figuring, that periodical should be monetarily self-sustaining. CQ and 73 have managed to stay in the periodicals biz as independents without the demographic benefit of the entire organization membership.

On the extra cost to members, in terms of low NYC salaries, your previous budgetary example is about 20% low. There would also be an increase for other costs such as more color pages and commissioned art to bring up the whizzy part of it. I'd say offhand that $200K per year is more like the extra monetary burden of art whizzyness.

That $200K seems to approach the probable fees charged by a certain law firm in DC. Somehow I don't see Chris Imlay's firm being told to "get stuffed." :-)

With all kind regards,
Me

615. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:49:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405174918.27329.00000367@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 39933

In article <a8l3nc$7n5$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Why, are those people so narrow in their brains that
>they can't see the technical aspects of either magazine
>as being a membership joural as opposed to the latest
>copy of some newstand glitz publication. Ever look at
>other membership journals? IEEE, etc.

Ahem. :-)

The IEEE's SPECTRUM is the membership magazine of
the IEEE. I just got my April 2002 issue last week. It's
slimmed down to 82 pages but does have an art director,
assistant art director on the masthead (pg. 7). Of course,
the IEEE has several dozen other periodicals in regular
production and the Transactions (making up most of those)
can be dreadfully boring unless one is really into some
paper. :-) The SPECTRUM is rather whizzy in layout, has
a mixture of pro photos, commissioned art work, and some
very well done explanatory drawings. Ad rates are higher
than QST's and base membership fee is over $100/year.

>> Luckily, we're going to have a couple of big foamcore
>> boards with material taken from the Web, allowing us
>> to keep QST discreetly off to one side.
>
>Yea, better not hang out the technical side too much I
>guess.

Nu? Just glue some components in a (washed) tuna can or
an (improved state-of-the-art) anchovy tin. No problem... !

616. Re: Amateur Radio Astronomy and CC&Rs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 22:49:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAE29F0.7FCF2052@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39935

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Phrases and expressions from the "Hitchhiker to the Center of
> the Galaxy" series of books is neither in common American
> colloquial use nor do they pertain to amateur radio policy.
>
> N2EY has used both in here as if everyone is thoroughly
> familiar with them.

And then rags on me for using the expression, "the view
from 30,000 feet" which is a common American idiom.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

617. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 23:05:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <L4qr8.3355$at6.154904812@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39936

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204050517.568253af@posting.google.com...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<yt8r8.2386$wB5.101051556@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020404080953.27399.00000251@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > > In article <3CAB1BE2.182E550C@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
writes:
> > >
> > > >Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > >
> > > >> FISTS seems to be a classical "interest group" playing
> > > >> by standard rules of conduct. Against purely internal
> > > >> competition this can be effective. However, code testing
> > > >> has very strong EXTERNAL enemies and against THOSE,
> > > >> supra-interest-group tactics have to be used. If the
> > > >> FISTS organizers had become so upset with the ARRL's
> > > >> non-defense of code that they began to agitate nationally,
> > > >> and to make their single issse THE issue, (like NCI did)
> > > >> and thus make REAL trouble for The Newington Crowd,
> > > >> well, things might have been more interesting. However,
> > > >> it appears to me now that since there was serious desire
> > > >> to scuttle code within The Newington Crowd itself (!), FISTS,
> > > >> or any other similiar organization, had very little chance
> > > >> of success where code testing was/is concerned. Only
> > > >> a full-scale attack on the current ARRL leadership would
> > > >> have had even a prayer, and that not much.
> > > >
> > > > "enemies... agitate... scuttle... full scale attack.." Val, your
> > > >sounding pretty nasty here.
> > >
> > > No more so than the language used by many nocodetest folks. Such
language
> > > benefits no one.
> >
> > Are you saying that Val shouldn't use, "enemies... agitate... scuttle...
> > full scale attack... ?"
>
> I think there are much better choices of words than those terms. Just like
> there are better choices for Bruce Perens than "battle" and "fight" and
> "front" (as in "frontline"). And better choices for Carl Stevenson than
> "idiot", "twit", "olde fartz", "dinosaur dung encrusted". And better
choices
> ... well, you get the idea.

But are you actually admonishing Val?

> > > FISTS' purpose is to promote the USE of Morse. Mandatory testing is
only
> > one
> > > way to do that. FISTS focuses on other ways.
> >
> > FISTS advocates mandatory Morse tests.
>
> Where? I just visited the website. No mention of tests. FISTS did not
submit
> comments to the FCC on the issue and does not have an official position on
it.
> One can be a member of both FISTS and No-Code International without any
> contradiction of either organization's rules or requirements.

Yeh, I just revisited it too. The format has changed, and the call to
support code testing is missing.

> Of course it's probably true that most FISTS members favor mandatory code
> tests. But as far as I know FISTS as an organization has no official
> position on the issue. FISTS membership does not limit the freedom of its
> members to hold and express differing opinions on code testing.
>
> >It's a new focus.
>
> Show us where FISTS, as an organization, advocates mandatory code testing.

Sorry, no can do.

Brian

618. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 23:05:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <g5qr8.3358$AI6.155902212@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39937

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8kkru$3pr$0@208.206.142.91...

> They don't, never have, and never will. The Gadfly has finally flown
> the coop.

Dick hertz.

619. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 23:13:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Wcqr8.3362$ax6.155166865@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39938

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8cjp5$l2c$0@208.207.71.131...
>
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:

> I have no firsthand information on it, and it sure didn't make the ham
> radio publications, but the word is that Nancy Kott, WZ8C who is the
> head of FISTS, got into a wordfight at a forum at the Dayton Hamfest
> with Fred Maia, W5YI who was then the Director of NCI, (later he
> relinquished the post to Carl Stevenson) and Nancy was said to have
> given Fred a real trouncing, and made many points he couldn't refute.
> It's a shame the ham mags refuse to publish ALL the news.

Its enough that you spread the rumors. The truth is not what's important,
its the accusation.

> But FISTS decided early on to avoid a nasty fight over the CW test
> issue. I imagine they realized, as so many did, that the single ham at
> the FCC whose policymaking decisions are rubberstamped by the full
> Commission, would handle it however he wished regardless of what the
> majority of hams thought.

Luckily the single ham at the FCC was in touch with what the majority of
hams actually do on the air, and its not CW (rarely or never).

> > There has been, I think, a complete failure of marketing
> > within the ARRL and Ham Radio in general.
>
>
> I agree, and the evidence is in the implementation of the "Big Project"
> by ARRL.

Welp, they're offering continuing education credits so that some of you'se
guys would have more stuff to hang on the wall.

So we just don't count
> for much anymore. And our opinions sure don't matter.

Dick hertz.

620. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 23:15:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <eeqr8.3364$9c7.157843663@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39939

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CAA0BCA.3B5A882B@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > Val KC0MUB!
> >
> > Hey, Val, congrats and welcome aboard!
>
> Congratulations from me also, Val. I'm surprised Dick congratulated
> you. His modus operandi is to rag on nocode techs for being lazy
> whiners.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Yep, but I think they've got something special going on.

621. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 23:18:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4hqr8.3365$Kd7.157909038@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39940

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAD9F88.6CCED5D0@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CAD23F2.2950D87A@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > > > > It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the
United
> > > > > > > > > > States should become a radio amateur.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Why not? We even have non-citizens with US licenses.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Now we do. That was not formerly possible.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > How formerly?
> > > > >
> > > > > Look up the dates if you're curious. In the past, it was not even
> > > > > possible for a resident alien to obtain an amateur ticket in the U.S.
> > >
> > > Also in the past, there was no exam, there was no licensing, foreign
> > > national or not.
>
> Sorry, Brian. I thought you were really interested in knowing.
>
> Dave K8MN

All I know is that you play word games. Did you have a point? Half a
point? Try making it sometime soon.

622. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-05 23:52:32 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uasd431o94vq5e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39941

mike coslo wrote, concerning the lack of an ART DIRECTOR
on QST's masthead:

>hmmm, I work in that field. Maybe they could use me!

I know they could use you! A professional in there could
work wonders in a very short time, without offending the
readership, as I'm sure you know. Legible covers that are
clear and clean to the eye are always appreciated, as I'm
sure you're aware of as well!

Val
KC0MUB

P.S. Where did you enter your art deco telescope?
A friend of mine, from Ashland, Missouri, recently
finished a 10-inch, f/8.0 Newtonian/Dobsonian, the
wooden parts in really nice veneer plywood and
crafted in an "Art Deco" style. It's a show-stopper!
He had it at Okie-Tex last year and will likely have it
there next year, too. Have you seen Ikeya-Zhang?

**

623. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 00:39:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAE43C8.FF411FBF@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39942

But they must have *someone* designing the cover and layout!

I've heard the arguments for austerity. (which this is) But you don't
have to have a fresh from NYC art director to have attractive design.

- Mike - KB3EIA

K0HB wrote:
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> > Well, technical or not, there is always a place for beauty in my book.
> > I believe if you're going to do it, you might as well do it well, and
> > you might as well do it pretty.
>
> I don't think either Bill or I is arguing against beauty, but rather
> against the *cost* of beauty. ARRL must allocate their (our!)
> scarce resources to the things that are of most benefit to
> members.
>
> The minute the members see them hiring Art Directors/Associate
> Art Directors for QST while cutting headcount in other member
> benefit areas, there will be some major restructuring of the BoD!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

624. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 00:48:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAE45EB.260E5826@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39943

It was at Mason-Dixon star party. I mostly frequent the Mason-Dixon, the Astroblast in Franklin, and the Black Forest Star Party (which I founded BTW) There may be a few out there like mine now. A lot of people were taking pix, and one guy had a measuring tape.

The scope is a 12.5 f5.9 dob, tube style. The tube color is granite blue, in a texture style. The rocker box is a low cherry wood style, with the scope cradle of two circular rings around the tube and a discs for the alt bearings, which are Ebony star on teflon. It took several years to make, but it was kind of a magnum opus.

I haven't seen Ikeya-Zhang, but I'm curious.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote, concerning the lack of an ART DIRECTOR
> on QST's masthead:
>
> >hmmm, I work in that field. Maybe they could use me!
>
> I know they could use you! A professional in there could
> work wonders in a very short time, without offending the
> readership, as I'm sure you know. Legible covers that are
> clear and clean to the eye are always appreciated, as I'm
> sure you're aware of as well!
>
> Val
> KC0MUB
>
> P.S. Where did you enter your art deco telescope?
> A friend of mine, from Ashland, Missouri, recently
> finished a 10-inch, f/8.0 Newtonian/Dobsonian, the
> wooden parts in really nice veneer plywood and
> crafted in an "Art Deco" style. It's a show-stopper!
> He had it at Okie-Tex last year and will likely have it
> there next year, too. Have you seen Ikeya-Zhang?
>
> **

625. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 01:44:42 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <eqsr8.5983$QC1.557273@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39944

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a8l4kvqqa1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in
> message news:uas4sso2jsht6d@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > And you can take your "cheers" and shove 'em!
>
> Quite the class act aren't you.
>
> Cheers anyway,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill, you've been earning that one for a long time although I don't think much of the blast. If I thought you had the slightest clue why I would have done it myself a long time ago.

There are guys who sort of blast a trail thru the world and leave behind all sorts of uncompleted ideas for others to pick up on; you may have heard of Peter Drucker, and Einstein certainly qualifies. One of these guys was Carl Jung, a Swiss shrink who littered the psychological world with all sorts of insights and added I Ching and Synchronicity to the agenda. Jung opined that kids were born with different 'preferences' which describe valuable differences among normal, healthy adults that can be put to use or cause conflict and miscommunication for them.

By preference, think of being left-handed. One can and has to widen the preference and learn to do things off-handed but it is harder for them. I can write left-handed but it is not a lot of fun. This got picked up by a mother/daughter team appalled by the incredible misuse of talent in WW1. There are a lot of variations of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator around -- shrinks got to eat, too. But whether you buy their approach or not it makes for a good insight.

To drastically over-simplify there are four binary areas of normal human difference.

1. Where do you focus attention? Attuned to external or internal environment, prefer to talk or write, learn by argument or action or by reflection and mental practice, broad interest or deep interests, sociable or contained.

2. How do you take in Information? Real and actual versus big picture, practical vs imaginative, factual and concrete vs abstract and theoretical, remember in sequence or in pictures, present vs future orientation, Trust in experience or inspiration?

3. How do you decide? Analytic or sympathetic. Accept logic or impact on people. Fair or Accepting?

4. Orientation to the Outer World? Scheduled vs Spontaneous, Organized or Open-ended, Systematic or Casual, value method or flexibility, try to Plan or Adapt, go for Closure or like to keep things open to change, last minute changes stressful or energizing?

In their jargon, and that is what is important in shrink circles, the first items in each group describe one and the second its opposite. So in 1) they call it (with lots of room for confusion) Extraversion and Introversion, E and I. The second is Sensing vs iNtuitive, S and N. The third is Thinking vs Feeling, T and F, and 4) is Judging and Perceiving (also with great confusion space) J and P.

I will admit to being an ENTP. Like any generalization it can apply to all men, some men, or one man in any context. We will see ourselves in terms of of creative, imaginative, clever, theoretical, curious, conceptual, logical, assertive, and questioning. Others, primarily those of the SJ persuasion I suspect you of being, will see us as brash, rude, abrasive, rebellious, combative, scattered, untrustworthy with details, and generally a giant monkey wrench in a smooth-running machine.

The favor is returned and we see SJs as rigid, dogmatic, crummy listeners, picky and procedure-simple, and, as in the instant case, patronizing. So what an SJ intends as sociability more or less is taken as a pat on the head and smart people do not pat NPs on the head.

I know it is not intended as such but the Cheers is guaranteed to be a burr in the saddle of a good part of your audience.

Now Hans with the All Good Wishes is simply being a pain in the butt.

Dick N BK

626. Re: You will worship me

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 01:53:22 UTC
From: Mary Arthur <maryarthur@shaw.ca>
Message-ID: <3CAE550F.6BD2E2AB@shaw.ca>
Source record: 39945
Cross-posted to: alt.hentai.sailor-moon,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.travel.usa-canada

Don't know where this might belong but not figure skating.

Please don't cross post.

Ewan Grantham wrote:

> "TGOS" <tgos@spamcop.net> wrote in message
> news:a85o27cqgn@207.18.225.54...
> > I'm taking over all of Usenet!
>
> My, my. Seems that Kibo has put his position up for sale?
>
> FWIW,
> Ewan Grantham
> POTD - www.a1161.com

--
Mary Arthur
Thought of the month:
Ghoti was invented by George Bernard Shaw to demonstrate the absurdity
of English spelling. Richard Lederer has continued the game and found
eight other "correct" ways to spell "fish" in English: phusi, ffess,
ughyce, pfeechsi, pphiapsh, fuseo, ftaisch and ueiscio, all of which
help explain why I need a spell checker.

627. I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 02:55:52 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cae63c3$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39946

Calm down y'all ... I'm not talking about Morse testing :-)

For a LONG time, I'd always said "I'll never change my
callsign. I've had it for over 25 years, it's like my 2nd
name. (etc.)"

Well I got to thinking about it a few weeks ago and
the thought process went something like this:

Why?

Why not?

Supposed to be open-minded and flexible, right?

Are you sure?

What the hell ...

So I checked things out as to what might be interesting
and available, did some real soul-searching, and
finally went to the ULS and filed an application.

Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...

I like it ... it's going to take some getting used to,
but I like it :-)

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
<mailto:wk3c@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wk3c-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wk3c>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

628. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 03:19:09 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <NOtr8.20596$ml2.1555571@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39947

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote

>
> Now Hans with the All Good Wishes is simply being a pain in the butt.
>

It's *kind* wishes, Silly, *KIND* wishes,

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

629. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 03:35:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020405223542.00979.00002888@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 39948

>Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...
>

WHO CARES, YOUR STILL A CBer

630. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 03:57:35 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Pmur8.20681$ml2.1565152@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39949

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote

>
> Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...
>

Whoa -- a blast from the past! WK3C used to be Bob Oakley. Is he SK?

73, Hans

631. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 04:24:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8lt90$is1$0@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 39950

mike coslo wrote:
>
> Now this I gotta see!! ROFL!!
>
> - mike KB3EIA -
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > Buy, I bet Hans is just quacking in his boots.

If it walks and quacks like a duck,.....

632. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 04:24:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8lt97iua0@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 39851

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You are the only person I know who has tried to make issue over an
> > > obvious and acknowledged typo.
> >
> > I am NOT making an issue over a typo. Everyone makes typos. I am
> > making an issue over you lying for days saying that you didn't
> > say "comparting" even after I reposted your posting multiple
> > times proving that you said "comparting". If you are going to
> > deny saying the word "comparting" for days, why not just deny
> > it for life?
>
> I did not write the word "comparting" for days. I wrote it one time in
> error. You are now lying about what took place. It must help fill your
> empty hours.

Cecil's main interest in life is to piss off whoever it is that he has
as his target at a given time, as long as they are also a CW supporter.
Meanwhilhe professed to be one himself.

633. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 04:24:51 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <nMur8.6741$Rw2.558809@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39852

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3cae63c3$1_1@news7.fast.net...
> Calm down y'all ... I'm not talking about Morse testing :-)
>
> For a LONG time, I'd always said "I'll never change my
> callsign. I've had it for over 25 years, it's like my 2nd
> name. (etc.)"
>
> Well I got to thinking about it a few weeks ago and
> the thought process went something like this:
>
> Why?
>
> Why not?
>
> Supposed to be open-minded and flexible, right?
>
> Are you sure?
>
> What the hell ...
>
> So I checked things out as to what might be interesting
> and available, did some real soul-searching, and
> finally went to the ULS and filed an application.
>
> Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...
>
> I like it ... it's going to take some getting used to,
> but I like it :-)
>
> 73,
>
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c

You might be surprised. About a week after I got the present call I was working on the repeater and got a call using my old 1x3. The guys in the room had to say, "Dick, he's calling you."

It IS a nice call.

634. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 04:26:53 UTC
From: burnt umber <dipcrtyaniw@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <hOur8.19563$nt1.1604151@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39853

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uarncn9nkpmj92@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> I have in front of me the April 2002, issue of two magazines, the ARRL's QST
> and Sky Publishing's SKY AND TELESCOPE. Both of these efforts are specialty
> magazines with relatively small circulation, based in the eastern United
> States.

I also get both Val, via the local library
periodicals section because I can read em
and make copies for free as I'm a Contributing
Patron and Volunteer at the same.

Comparing QST to S&T however is akin to comparing
a McDonalds Big Mac Super special to a Dinner at the
local Mexican sit down resturant. Both will give you
gas, but the latter is much more preffered food and
atmosphere experience to the former.

For good reading I would suggest Smithsonian, Scientific
American, Stern (..if you can read German) and of course
Arizona Highways for stunning photography.

Cheers
Jack W2---

635. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 04:45:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae7fc9$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39855

Tucker Electronics in Garland, TX (the only remaining part is their testing eqpt division) used to have a little area in their store where you could sit and have coffee.

Kim W5TIT

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3CAA7597.D9E3AD74@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > BTW -- I've been in a lot of ham radio stores, past and present, and
> > don't recall a single one of them having a coffee pot to hang out at --
>
> HRO in Sunnyvale has (or had 2 years ago, when I last was there)
> a coffee pot and sometimes doughnuts free.
>

636. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 04:52:47 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae8195_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39857

"KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> wrote in
message news:rQuq8.12131$nt1.995164@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> >
> > However, back to the grounded statement that most of us who have regaled
> > against a pro-CW argument are reacting to the attitude of those pro-CW
> folks
> > who are just so miserable with life in general that the only thing they
> have
> > left is to hate.
> >
>
> I'm not sure what a "grounded statement" is, but the rest of your
statement
> is nonsense.
>

It means the basis.

>
> I am very pro-CW, and use the mode for more than half of my operating.
>
> I'm not the least bit miserable with life in general -- in fact quite the
> opposite,
> there's almost nothing about my life I'd change. I'm healthy, have a
great
> family, a great occupation, great hobbies, and great friends. You can use
> CW or not like CW -- I wouldn't hate you for either choice.
>

Then, you are not the type of person I am describing then, are you? If the
shoe fits, where it. If not, don't.

>
> BTW, K0CKB and I spent several days in DFW area in early Feb and
> again in early Mar. Called and listened for you on many different
repeaters,
> and asked around if anyone knew your operating habits. Just got a lot
> of "don't know who that is". Can't remember any specific freqs, but we
> were in Denton and Sanger vicinity, and areas south of there along I35W
> to I20/I30.
>
> With all kind wishes,

>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Only a couple/few people up that way would know of or who I am. I don't know how many times I have stated here in this newsgroup that I am barely ever on the air any more...however, the only repeater I really am and ever was on is 145.190 (PL 110.9). Probably in the last six months I have been on the air a total of .... oh, maybe an hour? Used to be a member of DARC and their repeater is 146.880. However, it's turned into a road traffic and "how's the weather" repeater over the past year so I don't much even listen there any more.

Doubt I'll even be listening, you should have let me know you'd be in the area and I would have made a point to listen up and let you know what repeater I'd be on. Next time, get in touch...*if* I just happen to be on, the only real time would be between 7:00A-8:00A and then 4:00P-5:00P.

Kim W5TIT

637. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 04:54:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8lv2h$n50$0@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 39854

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> The favor is returned and we see SJs as rigid, dogmatic, crummy listeners,
> picky and procedure-simple, and, as in the instant case, patronizing. So
> what an SJ intends as sociability more or less is taken as a pat on the
> head and smart people do not pat NPs on the head.
>
> I know it is not intended as such but the Cheers is guaranteed to be a
> burr in the saddle of a good part of your audience.
>
> Now Hans with the All Good Wishes is simply being a pain in the butt.

NAILED! on the head, as usual! On BOTH counts! (Good, Kind or whatever)

638. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 04:55:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae822e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39858

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8e03i$pn0$2@208.207.71.141...
>
>
> KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO wrote:
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
> >
> > > Well, it's a wonder Larry hasn't jumped all over the callsign Hans had
in
> > a
> > > post; I guess it must be his YL, K0CKB....whoa, I had to take a double
> > look
> > > at that one. Guess my mind is straight where Larry's is...in the
gutter.
> >
> > K0CKB is an astronomer, and she thinks I'm a real star. Gutter?
> >
>
>
> Don't waste attention on the TIT twit. She keeps looking at other
> callsigns, hoping against hope that she'll find someone else as stoopid
> as she is.

Hey, I found that a long time ago, Dick. You and Larry pretty much fill the
bill...

Kim W5TIT

639. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:01:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae83ad_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39863

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CAAA61A.D88D6BFE@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > At the same time, and keeping everything said above in mind,
> > I wish to belatedly congratulate Kim Walker, W5TIT, for passing
> > her ham radio tests and becoming a ham! I feel that this is a
> > remarkable achievement for her, and that she must feel very
> > proud of having accomplished what must have been, for her, an
> > extremely challenging and difficult task! It is unfortunate that
> > you will never progress any further than Technician, Kim, but
> > at least you got that far, and can at least call yourself a ham
> > radio operator! Congratulations, Kim -- I'm sure very few people
> > would have guessed that you had it in you!
>
> Kim, you'll just have to study for and get your extra.....
>

I have no idea what Larry's post is in reference to, but he needs to learn
that I am a Tech+, having passed a 5wpm CW test. And, I don't have much
intention of going any further...the few times I've been on HF is pretty
much more irritation than it's been worth. I guess I am an FMer at
heart...nice and quiet... :)

Kim W5TIT
Oh and Larry, stuff your congrats up your hole family.

640. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:03:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cae81b4_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39856

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:Pmur8.20681$ml2.1565152@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...
> >
>
> Whoa -- a blast from the past! WK3C used to be Bob Oakley. Is he SK?
>
> 73, Hans

Hans,

Don't know ... hope not ... but I think someone else had the
call before me, but changed to another one ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

641. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:05:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae849c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39864

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020403053741.01951.00001651@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> > But, I hardly feel it worth the effort to get all
> >upset about *all* the spectrum when lots of it is little used.
>
> The 2 M band was little used when I was first licensed in 1963.
>
> >Indeed, I'd "be willing" to let the Gigs go to keep 2M, ya know
> >what I mean?
>
> How about 2400 MHz? How about 70 cm? How about HF? The latter is under
> indirect pressure by those who want to do various types of high-speed
> networking over residential telephone and electrical wiring.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, I don't mean this in any kind of contraire way at all. I think that if the powers that be cannot see the value in ham radio public service, then that's their shortcoming. I highlight as often as I can, have been involved with it, etc. But, to get much more involved in "saving" ham radio spectrum that I don't use would pretty much be nothing more than obligatory of me to do so...which I will.

We share our spectrum. It's bound to happen that we'll lose lots of it here in the near future--technology makes it so. Am I going to stand in the way when it may mean my job, my livelihood, etc.? Nope...sorry.

Kim W5TIT

642. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:08:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae852d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39865

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8fb1v$6u4$0@208.207.71.136...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > > So beginning right now,
> > >you are in the PLONK filter where you've belonged all along, right
there
> > >with Loose Lennie, The TIT and B.Burke AKA The Gadfly.
> >
> > Can you tell me how I can make the list?
> >
>
> So far you haven't turned into a raving lunatic. Your're stuck with me
> reading your stuff. Sorry, that's the breaks.

heh heh heh. I think I predicted this, Ed. You're the last bastion of his
lunacy...
He's, uh, *ignoring* (LOL) the rest of us.

Kim W5TIT

643. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:10:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406001010.13101.00000431@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 39860

In article <3CADAD4D.20D20C6D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >It means getting the top-down. I'm amazed you haven't heard of it.
>>
>> I don't care what it means. Plain English works better.
>
>Plain English is boring.

To you, maybe. Others think differently.

>I see I left out a word. The "view from
>30,000 ft." means getting the objective top-down view (rather than
>the subjective bottom-up view).

"Top down" is not necessarily more objective than "bottom up".
>
>> I know LEXX is a fictional character on a cable TV scifi chow. I have no
>> idea who Edell and Boortz are.
>
>LEXX is a science fiction version of Monty Python type humor.

Not from what I've seen. I saw LEXX on cable while away on business. OK
but not classic. Your humorous mlieage may vary.

> Edell
>and Boortz are radio talk show hosts. Edell puts me to sleep at
>night and Boortz wakes me up in the morning. If you're interested:
>http://www.healthcentral.com/drdean/aboutdrdean/aboutdrdean.cfm
>hppt://www.boortz.com

Edell looks OK but Boortz is just a Rush Limbaugh wannabe.
>
>> Your protests are kind of hollow, Cecil, considering how you described
>yourself
>> as a "CW expert" some time back but you had no knowledge of Ten Tec.
>
>I obtained my CW expertise before Ten Tec even existed. Does that
>mean there were not CW experts before Ten Tec existed?

Nope.

Part of being an "expert" is knowing the current trends in what one is
supposedly
an expert at. Thus to be a CW expert, one must at least be familiar with

current trends in CW. Such as new training methods and new equipment. Ten Tec started in 1968.

>> > But the elimination of the code test for
>> >techs certainly did give us a whole bunch of new emergency operators.
>>
>> How many?
>
>Don't know exactly. That's why I said a "whole bunch". How many Techs
>are there? 200,000? It would naturally be some percentage of the number
>of Techs.

Only if none of them would have been licensed otherwise.
>
>> >A
>> >lot of those guys would be willing to transfer their talents to HF if
>> >it were not for the Morse code test.
>> >
>> So there is no emergency communication on VHF/UHF?
>
>Did I say that? Nope, I didn't.

You implied it, as if one must be on HF to be useful in emergency comms.

>My statement doesn't need interpreting.
>I could ask you: Does that mean that you think HF emergency comms
>are unimportant? I could but I won't.

You just did.
>
>> >> >1.17% is negligible.
>> >>
>> >> Would you eat food that was 1.17% poison?
>> >
>> >I probably do it every day.
>>
>> You'd be dead if that were true.
>
>What percentage poison is scotch?

All depends what kind. Nice single-malt stuff is 0% poison.
>
>> >Huh? There was a flood after 1991. That's what kept ham radio afloat.
>>
>> Nope. There was growth in the years leading up to 1991, and more growth
>after
>> 1991. Then the growth slowed down.
>
>The growth in the Tech class didn't slow down.

Yes, it did. Note that since the restructuring the FCC has been renewing
Tech Pluses as Techs.

>Subtract out the Techs and
>ham radio would have been going downhill fast. The flood of Techs was the
>only thing that kept the ARS membership at a reasonable level.

Untrue.

Jon Bloom (not Ed Hare, as I mistakenly reported earlier) posted some
growth figures some time back. Here's the bottom line:

From 1980 to 1990, the number of US hams rose 30%
From 1990 to 2000, the number of US hams rose 34%

So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.

>> And you avoid the real question: Will you and others admit it wasn't a
>barrier?
>
>It was and is a barrier, Jim.

In other words, even if proven wrong, you won't admit it.

>The Morse code exam is the only thing that
>keeps me from QSOing with my friend in Colorado.

Why?

>He has promised to upgrade
>to General and get on HF just as soon as the Morse code requirement is
>dropped.
>There are many other Techs just like him.

Is it not possible to use VHF/UHF for that purpose? I thought you and your
friends were all high-tech types. Does it really come down to HF ionospheric
propagation being your only option? Sure sounds like it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

644. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:10:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406001011.13101.00000432@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 39859

In article <L4qr8.3355$at6.154904812@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> > Are you saying that Val shouldn't use, "enemies... agitate... scuttle...
>> > full scale attack... ?"
>>
>> I think there are much better choices of words than those terms. Just like
>> there are better choices for Bruce Perens than "battle" and "fight" and
>> "front" (as in "frontline"). And better choices for Carl Stevenson than
>> "idiot", "twit", "olde fartz", "dinosaur dung encrusted". And better
>choices
>> ... well, you get the idea.
>
>But are you actually admonishing Val?

I'm saying there are better choices of words. Val is not alone in making
less-than-optimum
choices.
>
>> > > FISTS' purpose is to promote the USE of Morse. Mandatory testing is
>only
>> > one
>> > > way to do that. FISTS focuses on other ways.
>> >
>> > FISTS advocates mandatory Morse tests.
>>
>> Where? I just visited the website. No mention of tests. FISTS did not
>submit
>> comments to the FCC on the issue and does not have an official position on
>it.
>> One can be a member of both FISTS and No-Code International without any
>> contradiction of either organization's rules or requirements.
>
>Yeh, I just revisited it too. The format has changed, and the call to
>support code testing is missing.

I do not recall ever seeing such a "call". Not in any of my FISTS bulletins.
There may
be encouragement for FISTS members to make their voices heard, but there is NO
official FISTS position on the issue other than "let your governments know what
you
think".
>
>> Of course it's probably true that most FISTS members favor mandatory code
>> tests. But as far as I know FISTS as an organization has no official

>> position on the issue. FISTS membership does not limit the freedom of its
>> members to hold and express differing opinions on code testing.
>>
>> >It's a new focus.
>>
>> Show us where FISTS, as an organization, advocates mandatory code testing.
>
>Sorry, no can do.

Yet you say "it's a new focus" as if the policy had changed. It hasn't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

645. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:10:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406001013.13101.00000433@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 39861

In article <uarncn9nkpmj92@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>I have in front of me the April 2002, issue of two magazines, the ARRL's QST
>and Sky Publishing's SKY AND TELESCOPE. Both of these efforts are specialty
>magazines with relatively small circulation, based in the eastern United
>States. QST has a higher page count, about 155 to about 135, and has more
>column inches of text than S&T, which has been "modernized" in recent years,
>cleaning up its look. As far as advertising percentage goes, QST has 37
>full-page ads, S&T has 29, so any revenue difference is likely in QST's
>favor.

Let's do some math......

S&T has 29/135 = 21.5% full page ads.
QST has 37/155 = 23.8% full page ads

A little more, but not much.

>I think that a comparison of these two magazines might be most
>useful to some on this newsgroup, considering that the ARRL is now embarking
>on a serious-minded attempt to re-vamp the image of amateur radio in the
>United States. Surely, QST is an important part of meeting this challenge.

Agreed in part.

One BIG difference between astronomy and ham radio is that astronomers don't
need licenses
to use a limited public resource that others also want to use. Interference
between astronomers
is also all but nonexistent - my use of a telescope in my back yard doesn't
affect your
use of one a few houses away.
>
>Let's begin at the beginning, with the covers. For many years S&T has
>featured ONE big photo on the cover, with text superimposed, as QST was
>doing back in 1952! That is, if you have the April QST, repair to page 92
>and note the old covers shown there. Look at how attractive that 1952 cover
>is, compared to the, let's fact it, cluttered and ugly cover of the 2002
>edition. What a de-evolution!

I have every QST from November 1927 to the present, and most of the earlier
issues back to 1923
or so. I'm not an expert but I have read the dern things and gathered a few
impressions over the
years, while collecting them. (The ones from 1968 onwards I got as a member,
the rest I collected).

The cover design has evolved over time, and one of the most recent changes has been to
use the cover to announce seveal of the articles inside, rather than have a single photo. There were
also some covers in years gone by that were very "busy".
>
>The April, 2002 cover of S&T is very attractive, in spite of the numerous
>blurbs plumping for the articles inside. At the upper right is a thumbnail
>image that can be seen and understood, with a blurb explaining what it is.
>The QST cover, unfortunately, is pretty sad. The background is complicated
>and distracting, totally obscuring some of the blurbs. The colors used
>clash, to say the least.

OK
>
>Where S&T has ONE large photo on the cover, and a beautiful one at that, QST
>has one, two, three LITTLE photos, too small to truly be seen. And to make
>matters worse, the photos are (in keeping with "amateur radio"?) amateurish
>to the maximum. The largest one, of a guy sitting at a computer, is about
>as pedestrian as it can get AND has a huge area of washed-out-white in it!
>Very bad. The other two photos, also amateurish, show an ugly building with
>what must be antennas, and some blurry green stuff near what must be some
>water, somewhere. A garish red box at the bottom is combined with a very
>unattractive blue type to state that the (crude) display above concerns:
>"6-meter Dxing from the Galapagos." Folks, it doesn't get much worse.
>
>Inside, the situation is similiar. S&T, the smaller magazine with what has
>to be similar or even less ad revenue, is MUCH cleaner, more attractive, and
>easier to read. The layout of S&T is relatively simple, the use of color
>effective, and the blurbs and bleeds not interfering with the text. S&T has
>several technical articles, a few reviews, plus star charts and other
>"institutional" material. It even has a "big project," having to do with
>light pollution in part arising from, ah, the screaming desire to be "safe"
>through the use of megawatt lighting everywhere in the United States, or so
>it seems.

Interesting points all.
>
>For QST, there is a lot of hard-to-read small type but much of it is
>necessary, so that's acceptable.

I find the small type easy to read. In the old days the type was smaller still.

>The general layout is only "OK" but the
>articles are pretty well edited and quite readable. The slide begins with
>some of the illustrations and really goes down hill with many of the photos.
>It's true that the technical illustrations needed for amateur radio, most of
>them, are not going to have the pizzazz of astronomy. But it seems almost
>as if someone has gone out of their way to make the illustrations in QST
>less interesting than they could be. And there are a lot of amateurish
>photos, of guys standing around holding stuff, items that S&T banished a
>long time ago. QST has the look, in places, of the very small Astronomical

>League's REFLECTOR, which is moving up the food chain fast but still has too
>many photos of, ah, guys standing around holding stuff. As for photos of
>guys sitting at computers, indoors, with blown-out windows in the
>background, they should be PURGED from ANY magazine, and a new art director
>hired immediately. Or, more likely, it's time for QST to HIRE an art
>director!

I don't think art direction is the real problem.

Most of the photos published in QST are contributed by hams who are, well,
amateur
photographers. The results are actually pretty good considering equipment used
and
experience/skill.talent of those snapping the shutter. Astronomy is, after all,
mostly a
visual endeavor while ham radio is mostly and aural one.
>
>In closing, if you're passing a newsstand over the next few days, take a
>look at S&T and see the way a specialty magazine SHOULD look. Then go to
>page 92 of the current QST and look at the way your QST * USED * to look! I
>think you'll be amazed!

You are comparing one issue of each mag.
>
>Hmm, maybe the 1950s truly WERE the Golden Age of Ham Radio!

I dunno. I wasn't a ham then, but here are some factoids about that era of ham
radio:

- There were about 100,000 US hams in 1950 and about 230,000 in 1960
- Ham equipment was mostly big, heavy, and expensive by today's standards.
- TVI was a real problem, particularly in fringe areas.
- Most of the classic rigs of the era appeared halfway through the decade or
later.
- Mobile operation was a real challenge. No repeaters or small rigs. Most cars
had
6 volt electrical systems and the ham gear of the day needed lots of power.
- Homebrewing was common but if the parts were bought new it could be very
expensive.
- Generals and above had all operating privileges after February of 1953 but
they also required 13 wpm code (send and receive) and a "secret" written
test.
- Manufactured SSB transceivers as we know them did not exist until the late
1950s,
when Cosmos and Collins introduced them.
- Prices seem low (a Handbook was three bucks!) but so were wages. Adjust for
inflation and things look very different.

73 de Jim, N2EY

646. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:14:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cae842a$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39862

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:nMur8.6741$Rw2.558809@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:3cae63c3$1_1@news7.fast.net...
> > Calm down y'all ... I'm not talking about Morse testing :-)
[snip]
> >
> > Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...
> >
> > I like it ... it's going to take some getting used to,
> > but I like it :-)
> >
> > 73,
> >
> > --
> > Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
>
> You might be surprised. About a week after I got the present call I was
> working on the repeater and got a call using my old 1x3. The guys in the
> room had to say, "Dick, he's calling you."
>
> It IS a nice call.

Yea ... I thought so ... I picked 5 "just in case" but this
was my 1st choice by far ... I figure it's an "all American"
call ... with both W and K in the prefix ... I was really
encouraged when the website that tracks what's
available (and predicts what will be granted) showed
it as "probable to be granted" the day after I filed ...
with the others all as "on someone's list of choices."

73,
Carl - wk3c

647. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:18:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae87a3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39866

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAC4651.7F00AC91@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >Actually, Kim obtained that callsign on a dare.
> > >
> > > Really? Well, all that shows is that she cannot refrain from acting
> > > impulsively on something as immature as a dare.
> >
> > Uhhhhhhh Larry, it was a group of hams who dared her to do it.
>
> Do you do something just because someone dares you to do it?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

I wouldn't have achieved many of the things I have if I hadn't met a dare,
from teachers, clergy, friends, bosses, co-workers, etc. To dare and be
dared is to live.

Kim W5TIT

648. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:19:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae87dd$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39867

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CAC7317.BA11EA33@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
> > restructuring is working perfectly?
>
> Yep, I begin to worry when the ham population starts to decrease.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

THAT'S when we'd better start noting that we may lose some spectrum! Here
here.

Kim W5TIT

649. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:20:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae881b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39868

Must be Larry's got nuttin' to do again...

Kim W5TIT

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CAC9053.D30BBA18@ix.netcom.com...
>
> Re: W5TIT
>
> Jesus, Mary and Joseph!
>
> When are you bunch of cranky, dilapidated, fossilized old farts
> going to stop beating you chest over that friggin' call sign?
> You sound like a bunch of old biddies gossiping
> after church about someone wearing a "shameless" dress or something.
> Christalmighty! Go play shuffle board, or poker,
> or with yourself, for pity's sake!
> What would Jesus do?
> He's turn you 70 year old children over his knee
> and spank the crap out of you, that's what.
>
> You guys don't have much to do.
> Leave her the hell alone and GET OVER IT!
>
> Dave S.

650. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:21:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae885e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39869

Ya got so many on ignore you're just about to burst, aren't ya Little Dickie...ROFLMAO

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:a8i8r6$4p4$0@208.206.142.65...
>
>
> David Stinson wrote:
> >
> >
> > Re: W5TIT
>
> > What would Jesus do?
>
>
>
> What DID he do? He would tell her, "Go, and sin no more".

651. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:23:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae88d3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39870

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRIC_SMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:oW3r8.16715$ml2.1292989@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote
>
> > Oh, wait, he's not likely working on his rig since HE'S
> > NOT A LICENSE HOLDER in the service relative to
> > this group!
>
> Until a few short days ago you weren't a license holder
> either. Are you suddenly some righteous elevated being,
> and Lennie a child of a lesser God?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

I know you're not just beginning to realize that, Hans...I know you're
not...

Kim W5TIT

652. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:28:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae89e4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39871

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020404222200.00944.00000887@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3CAD0642.DF55C00@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com>
> writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> >> > What would Jesus do?
> >>
> >> What DID he do? He would tell her, "Go, and sin no more".
> >
> >He also said "he who is without sin, cast the first stone."
> >I sure wish some people would run out of rocks.
>
> Dave:
>
> I can't speak for anyone but myself, but I sure didn't deliberately select
> a sexually-suggestive call sign (allegedly on a dare) for the purpose of
> being a voluntary object of controversy in a family-oriented radio
service.
> That was Kim's own doing. Now, she is simply being held accountable
> for her actions.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Nah, Larry...I'm not. Where you get an idea like that?

Kim W5TIT

653. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 05:29:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cae8a34_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39872

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8j5ja$12p$0@208.207.71.175...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <a8gri7$47j$0@208.206.142.95>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@townsqr.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> >Kim, you'll just have to study for and get your extra.....
> > > >>
> > >>
> > >> Naaa -- never happen!
> > >
> > >
> > > Why is it any more unlikely than her getting a Tech?
> >
> > Dick:
> >
> > Well, I guess I shouldn't say "never," in fact, I'm sure Kim is just
> > as capable as anyone of getting her Extra. Perhaps, in my own
> > way, I'm providing the encouragement she needs to do so. In
> > which case, if she does, it will have been because of me! I have
> > no problem with her getting her Nickle Extra. It will just prove
> > that anyone can do it.
>
>
> My point exactly.

Yeah, you guys did it, so surely anyone can...

Kim W5TIT

654. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 06:05:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAE9031.EFC91BD9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39873

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I haven't overlooked that statement, Dave. You acknowledged that
> > > you made a typo ONLY after lying about it for days - big difference.
> > > Why did you choose to lie about something for days before admitting
> > > it? Why do you think lying about something for days is the same as
> > > making a typo?
> >
> > I did not realize that I had made the typo.
>
> That's the biggest lie yet. Every posting I made, I pointed out
> your typo. That was about a dozen postings over a five day period.
> Nobody is that dense, not even you. Even Kim pointed out your
> typo a couple of times and you kept denying that you had said
> that I had "comparted" the items. That old excuse just won't fly.
> Care to try another?

I don't read everything Kim posts, Cecil, so using her as your backup is a non-starter. I just told you that I did not realize that I'd made the typo. If you don't like the response and would prefer to continue your two standards--one for you and another for everybody else, simply print this response and I'll send you instructions on how to fold it before you stuff it.

Dave K8MN

655. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 06:10:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAE9162.E6E69B7A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39874

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > You are the only person I know who has tried to make issue over an
> > > > obvious and acknowledged typo.
> > >
> > > I am NOT making an issue over a typo. Everyone makes typos. I am
> > > making an issue over you lying for days saying that you didn't
> > > say "comparting" even after I reposted your posting multiple
> > > times proving that you said "comparting". If you are going to
> > > deny saying the word "comparting" for days, why not just deny
> > > it for life?
> >
> > I did not write the word "comparting" for days. I wrote it one time in
> > error. You are now lying about what took place. It must help fill your
> > empty hours.
>
> That's a double lie. I have never said you wrote it more than once.

A quote from you:

"If you are going to deny saying the word 'comparting' for days..."

I didn't say the word "comparting" for days. I never said it. I wrote
it in error once.

> You wrote it once and then denied that you had done so for five days.
> I'm not lying, Dave. I pointed out your typo about a dozen times over
> five days and you continued to deny ever saying "comparting". You even
> denied it to Kim when she also pointed it out to you. The evidence is
> there on Google for all the world to see. You simply could bring your
> omniscient self to admit that you had made a typo.

You are full of it. I did state that it was a typo. You already knew
that when you began your word play. You continue it now. Shall we make
a game of your typo in your last sentence above? We have one standard
for Cecil and another for others.

Dave K8MN

656. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 06:18:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAE9313.F6B67F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39875

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I brought it up over your supposed "typo". A typo is a typo for you but
> > a lie for me by your definition.
>
> One more time. Everyone makes typos. You are the only person I have
> ever known who lied for days denying that you had even made a typo
> while it was being pointed out to you in every posting.

You knew then that I meant "comparing", not "comparting". In every response to you, I used the words "comparing", "compare" or "compared". I did not lie about anything. For you to continue your silly accusations makes you look small.

> > So, you, realizing that I'd made a typo, decided to ride it out. You
> > knew it wasn't a lie at all.
>
> I pointed out your typo for days, Dave, while you continued to deny that
> you had made a typo. You appeared to be such a perfect being that you
> couldn't even admit making a typo.

That is not the case. That you know it also makes you look small.

> > Sorry, Cecil. All of your typos will now have to be judged as lies.
>
> I have never lied about my typos, Dave. I don't know anyone except you
> who would even attempt to lie about a typo - and you lied about it for
> five days while Kim and I were bringing your attention to it every
> posting. What made you change your mind and tell the truth? Seems to
> me, lying about it forever wouldn't be any worse than lying about it
> for five days. Come to think about it, you are still lying about what
> happened, trying to blame me for your denials of making a typo.

I don't believe there was any time at which you commented anything like, "Dave, you made a typo". You just went on playing word games and began the ridiculous accusation of lying. You are still doing that.

Your back pedalling on the items N2EY just called you on are much closer to whoppers than what of which you continue to accuse me. You're a humbug.

Dave K8MN

657. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 06:28:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8m4io$5c6$0@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 39876

Dave Heil wrote:

If you don't like the response and would prefer to continue your
> two standards--one for you and another for everybody else, simply print
> this response and I'll send you instructions on how to fold it before
> you stuff it.
>

Make sure it has *lots* of sharp corners.

658. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 06:37:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAE97B2.8F071C42@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39877

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAC4651.7F00AC91@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > > >Actually, Kim obtained that callsign on a dare.
> > > >
> > > > Really? Well, all that shows is that she cannot refrain from acting
> > > > impulsively on something as immature as a dare.
> > >
> > > Uhhhhhhh Larry, it was a group of hams who dared her to do it.
> >
> > Do you do something just because someone dares you to do it?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> I wouldn't have achieved many of the things I have if I hadn't met a dare,
> from teachers, clergy, friends, bosses, co-workers, etc. To dare and be
> dared is to live.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Izzat right? I've never had a teacher, clergyman or boss dare me to do anything. "Friends" and co-workers will often dare one to do something stupid while keeping a safe distance. They can often be heard saying afterward, "I can't believe he was stupid enough to do that". Sorry, I can't buy into your Rod McKuen-ism.

Dave K8MN

659. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 06:37:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406013759.10628.00000845@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39880

In article <a8l3b8eji0@dosa.alt.net>, "Not ARRL" <Justme@Justmeandthemz.net>
writes:

>So you know
>what, I told that fucking idiot to shove QST, shove the ARRL, and
>they would never see my name again on the membership roste of
>the ARRL!!!!!!!!!!!! I left ARRL in 1984 and am dam glad of it!

The way I see it, if you're not an ARRL member, you have no right
to complain about what they are or are not doing. I certainly have
my "problems" with the ARRL -- issues of a highly personal nature
which could easily influence me to take the same action you did
in '84. However, I like ham radio more than I dislike the ARRL -- and
I realize that as the National Organization for Amateur Radio, they
are in the position to do a lot more to secure the future of this hobby.
Or, at least, they could be. But, as an outsider, I realize that my
own influence would be what yours is -- zero!

73 de Larry, K3LT

660. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 06:38:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406013800.10628.00000846@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39879

In article <yfor8.19852$ml2.1493584@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>> In QST's masthead, on page 4 of the current issue,
>> one may observe that the PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR
>> is listed FIRST, and there's no ART DIRECTOR in sight!
>>
>> And it SHOWS!
>
>Your jeremiad ignores an important distinction between the
>two magazines.
>
>"Sky and Telescope" is primarily a commercial periodical.
>"QST" is primarily a membership journal.
>
>I'd much rather ARRL buy some lab equipment than use that money
>to hire a couple of artists to make QST a work of art.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

I'll go one better than that. I think that QST needs to be printed on
recycled newsprint with strictly black&white photos -- and the money
spent on producing the slick, full-color mag spent on something the
ARS needs a lot more -- like some public service announcements
and the airtime to get them on people's TV screens. The person
who originally made me aware of ham radio was Dick Van Dyke.
With all the so-called celebrity hams we have in our ranks, there
should be two million eager, appliance-operating, CC&R defeating,
spectrum-protecting, dumbed-down, politically-correct, code hazing
ritual-free hams in this country. What are Patty Loveless, Jon Bon
Jovi, and Ronnie Milsap (to name three of dozens) doing for the ARS
besides absolutely nothing? How many hams are there out there
who aren't national celebrities, but are well known in their local
circles, and able to exert a great deal of practical (financial) influence --
the type which could get ARRL-produced PSA's played on local cable
TV systems and large print ads in local newspapers and magazines?

If I were the ARRL, I'd seek out these celebrity hams and ask them
what they've done for me lately. With the right people asking them in
the right way, I think they'd be more than willing to put their talent,
industry connections, and personal influence to work for the ARS.

Does anyone know if this is/was ever considered by the ARRL?
It must have been at one time. They got Dick Van Dyke to sit down
in front of a KWM-2 at one time, and that had more to do with getting
me to become a ham than a dozen "Elmers" trying to "sell" me on
the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

661. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 06:38:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406013801.10628.00000847@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39878

In article <3cae63c3$1_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c-shack@fast.net> writes:

>
>Calm down y'all ... I'm not talking about Morse testing :-)
>
>For a LONG time, I'd always said "I'll never change my
>callsign. I've had it for over 25 years, it's like my 2nd
>name. (etc.)"
>
>Well I got to thinking about it a few weeks ago and
>the thought process went something like this:
>
>Why?
>
>Why not?
>
>Supposed to be open-minded and flexible, right?
>
>Are you sure?
>
>What the hell ...
>
>So I checked things out as to what might be interesting
>and available, did some real soul-searching, and
>finally went to the ULS and filed an application.
>
>Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...
>
>I like it ... it's going to take some getting used to,
>but I like it :-)
>

Nice call sign, Carl -- sure would sound great in CW! You ought to
give it a try sometime...

73 de Larry, K3LT

662. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 07:45:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8m922$h8c$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 39881

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...
>
> I like it ... it's going to take some getting used to,
> but I like it :-)

Yeah, Carl, congrats on getting a new callsign. And yes, there'll be a "period of adjustment". But it gets familiar pretty quick, and you'll like it.

I won't even rag on you about using it on CW. But hey, try it out on PSK31 or Hellschrieber, willya? :^

663. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 07:48:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8m983$h8c$1@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 39882

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <a8l3b8eji0@dosa.alt.net>, "Not ARRL" <Justme@Justmeandthemz.net>
> writes:
>
> >So you know
> >what, I told that fucking idiot to shove QST, shove the ARRL, and
> >they would never see my name again on the membership roste of
> >the ARRL!!!!!!!!!!!! I left ARRL in 1984 and am dam glad of it!
>
> The way I see it, if you're not an ARRL member, you have no right
> to complain about what they are or are not doing. I certainly have
> my "problems" with the ARRL -- issues of a highly personal nature
> which could easily influence me to take the same action you did
> in '84. However, I like ham radio more than I dislike the ARRL -- and
> I realize that as the National Organization for Amateur Radio, they
> are in the position to do a lot more to secure the future of this hobby.
> Or, at least, they could be. But, as an outsider, I realize that my
> own influence would be what yours is -- zero!
>

I agree, Larry. For as long as I'm interested in ham radio I'll be
helping hold their toes to the fire.

664. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 08:00:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3caeab3e_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39883

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406013801.10628.00000847@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3cae63c3$1_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3c-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Calm down y'all ... I'm not talking about Morse testing :-)
> >
> >For a LONG time, I'd always said "I'll never change my
> >callsign. I've had it for over 25 years, it's like my 2nd
> >name. (etc.)"
> >
> >Well I got to thinking about it a few weeks ago and
> >the thought process went something like this:
> >
> >Why?
> >
> >Why not?
> >
> >Supposed to be open-minded and flexible, right?
> >
> >Are you sure?
> >
> >What the hell ...
> >
> >So I checked things out as to what might be interesting
> >and available, did some real soul-searching, and
> >finally went to the ULS and filed an application.
> >
> >Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...
> >
> >I like it ... it's going to take some getting used to,
> >but I like it :-)
> >
>
> Nice call sign, Carl -- sure would sound great in CW! You ought to
> give it a try sometime...
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I've sounded it out ... I still remember the code.

As far as using it on the air ... "You should live so long."

Carl - wk3c

665. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 12:03:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <buBr8.6521$QC1.623090@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39884

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8m983$h8c$1@208.206.142.103...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <a8l3b8eji0@dosa.alt.net>, "Not ARRL"
<Justme@Justmeandthemz.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >So you know
> > >what, I told that fucking idiot to shove QST, shove the ARRL, and
> > >they would never see my name again on the membership roste of
> > >the ARRL!!!!!!!!!!!! I left ARRL in 1984 and am dam glad of it!
> >
> > The way I see it, if you're not an ARRL member, you have no right
> > to complain about what they are or are not doing. I certainly have
> > my "problems" with the ARRL -- issues of a highly personal nature
> > which could easily influence me to take the same action you did
> > in '84. However, I like ham radio more than I dislike the ARRL -- and
> > I realize that as the National Organization for Amateur Radio, they
> > are in the position to do a lot more to secure the future of this
hobby.
> > Or, at least, they could be. But, as an outsider, I realize that my
> > own influence would be what yours is -- zero!
> >
>
> I agree, Larry. For as long as I'm interested in ham radio I'll be
> helping hold their toes to the fire.

I re-upped after a long absence. The whole atmosphere has changed in
Newington and in fact it needs the support whether I agree politically or
not. And it has become, more because the competition has folded, the best
of a bad lot of magazines.

I will never forget a hamfest in Washington MO some years ago where the
meetings were held in a park pavilion with shutters on the windows. After
the speech we came to hear the MC introduced the section rep and people
were literally diving out the windows to clear the room.

666. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 12:43:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAEED83.CE7563E3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39885

N2EY wrote:
> Part of being an "expert" is knowing the current trends in what one is
> supposedly
> an expert at. Thus to be a CW expert, one must at least be familiar with
> current trends in CW. Such as new training methods and new equipment. Ten Tec
> started in 1968.
>
> >> >A
> >> >lot of those guys would be willing to transfer their talents to HF if
> >> >it were not for the Morse code test.
> >> >
> >> So there is no emergency communication on VHF/UHF?
> >
> >Did I say that? Nope, I didn't.
>
> You implied it, as if one must be on HF to be useful in emergency comms.

The subject was Techs being able to transfer their emergency talents to HF.
(see above) The fact that Techs have emergency talents to transfer implies
that there is emergency communication on VHF/UHF.

> From 1980 to 1990, the number of US hams rose 30%
> From 1990 to 2000, the number of US hams rose 34%
>
> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.

That's not a valid conclusion. What percentage of hams were nocode techs at
the end of 2000? 20%? Whatever it was means the coded part of the ham population
fell off rather rapidly. -16%? Like I said, ham radio would be in decline if
it were not for the adoption of the nocode tech license.

> Is it not possible to use VHF/UHF for that purpose? I thought you and your
> friends were all high-tech types. Does it really come down to HF ionospheric
> propagation being your only option? Sure sounds like it.

I don't do satellite stuff. Neither does he.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

667. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 12:51:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAEEF47.3F1C1AA2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39887

Dave Heil wrote:
> I just told you that I did not realize that I'd made the typo.

That could not possibly be true, Dave. I told you about your typo
and reposted your typo a dozen times over a period of five days.
You would have to be blind not to be perfectly aware that you
had made that typo. Yet you continued to deny making it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

668. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:02:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAEF1EF.D58CEC53@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39886

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I have never said you wrote it more than once.
>
> A quote from you:
>
> "If you are going to deny saying the word 'comparting' for days..."

You denied saying 'comparting' for days. You didn't say 'comparting' for days.
I suppose that, "If you are going for days to deny saying the word 'comparting'..."
would have been a better choice of words.

> I didn't say the word "comparting" for days. I never said it. I wrote
> it in error once.

I repeat. I have never said you wrote it more than once.

> > You simply could bring your omniscient self to admit that you had made a typo.
>
> You are full of it. I did state that it was a typo.

After denying for days that you had even made a typo in the face
of your typo being reposted as evidence. I ask again. If you are going
to deny for 5 days making the typo, why not just deny it forever?

Why didn't you admit making the typo the first time I pointed it out to
you? the second time? ... the tenth time? ...
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

669. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:25:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAEF739.8EF77E36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39888

Dave Heil wrote:
> You knew then that I meant "comparing", not "comparting".

How would I know that? "Comparting" is a valid word. Am I supposed to
assume that all of your posted words are typos?

> I don't believe there was any time at which you commented anything like,
> "Dave, you made a typo".

"Comparting" is a valid word. It wasn't apparent to me that it was a
typo so I simply denied comparting anything. You came back and said that
I indeed had done that. Here's the actual interchange:

W5DXP said:
> > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > you know what that makes you.

Dave responded:
> You have indeed.

That was a lie. Long after that, you denied posting the word
"comparting". You continued to deny it after I repeatedly proved
that you had used the word. You continued to deny it over a period of
five days with the evidence that you had used the word staring you
in the face from a dozen of my postings.

> Your back pedalling on the items N2EY just called you on are much closer
> to whoppers than what of which you continue to accuse me.

I haven't back pedaled. The things that N2EY "called" me on simply means
he has on his blinders and is not seeing the big picture. If you have two
investments the sum of which increases by 4%, you are not going to be
happy with both if one investment yields 20% while the other yields -16%.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

670. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:26:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8mto7$n4s$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39893

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406013800.10628.00000846@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <yfor8.19852$ml2.1493584@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> Hans wrote:
> >I'd much rather ARRL buy some lab equipment than use that money
> >to hire a couple of artists to make QST a work of art.
>
> Hansl:
>
> I'll go one better than that. I think that QST needs to be printed on
> recycled newsprint with strictly black&white photos -- and the money
> spent on producing the slick, full-color mag spent on something the
> ARS needs a lot more -- like some public service announcements
> and the airtime to get them on people's TV screens. The person
> who originally made me aware of ham radio was Dick Van Dyke.
> With all the so-called celebrity hams we have in our ranks, there
> should be two million eager, appliance-operating, CC&R defeating,
> spectrum-protecting, dumbed-down, politically-correct, code hazing
> ritual-free hams in this country. What are Patty Loveless, Jon Bon
> Jovi, and Ronnie Milsap (to name three of dozens) doing for the ARS
> besides absolutely nothing? How many hams are there out there
> who aren't national celebrities, but are well known in their local
> circles, and able to exert a great deal of practical (financial)
influence --
> the type which could get ARRL-produced PSA's played on local cable
> TV systems and large print ads in local newspapers and magazines?
>
> If I were the ARRL, I'd seek out these celebrity hams and ask them
> what they've done for me lately. With the right people asking them in
> the right way, I think they'd be more than willing to put their talent,
> industry connections, and personal influence to work for the ARS.
> Does anyone know if this is/was ever considered by the ARRL?
> It must have been at one time. They got Dick Van Dyke to sit down
> in front of a KWM-2 at one time, and that had more to do with getting
> me to become a ham than a dozen "Elmers" trying to "sell" me on
> the ARS.

Not sure that some of your comments above weren't a bit
"tongue-in-cheek", but never-the-less Larry, well said!
Another of the 50s/60s celebrity hams was
Arthur Godfrey. Also we had Barry Goldwater carrying our

message. If celebrity endorsements work for the vast variety of stuff sold, why not amateur radio too.

Cheers (hope that cheers doesn't offend you :-)
Bill K2UNK

671. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:29:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8mto8$n4s$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39892

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406013759.10628.00000845@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <a8l3b8eji0@dosa.alt.net>, "Not ARRL"
<Justme@Justmeandthemz.net>
> writes:
>
> >So you know
> >what, I told that fucking idiot to shove QST, shove the ARRL, and
> >they would never see my name again on the membership roste of
> >the ARRL!!!!!!!!!!!! I left ARRL in 1984 and am dam glad of it!
>
> The way I see it, if you're not an ARRL member, you have no right
> to complain about what they are or are not doing.

Larry...Oh my gosh, I agree with you twice in one day :-)

> I certainly have
> my "problems" with the ARRL -- issues of a highly personal nature
> which could easily influence me to take the same action you did
> in '84. However, I like ham radio more than I dislike the ARRL -- and
> I realize that as the National Organization for Amateur Radio, they
> are in the position to do a lot more to secure the future of this hobby.
> Or, at least, they could be. But, as an outsider, I realize that my
> own influence would be what yours is -- zero!

Mega dittos!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

672. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:30:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <vLCr8.3973$is2.190376081@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39889

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020402231730.00472.00000077@mb-mq.aol.com...

> Val:
>
> I do not usually "congratulate" people for passing their No-code
> Tech test and getting a license; I feel that to do so is insulting to
> the intelligence of someone who is capable of achieving far more
> challenging and important things.

So why make this exception?

I will, however, welcome you
> to the ranks of Amateur Radio Operators, knowing full well that
> you have the attitude which will permit you to achieve Amateur
> Extra Class with ease and without complaint, and that you will
> embrace a wide range of modes.

Nope, that's not it. You welcome him because you have his undying admiration. Val may never get beyond 5wpm, if he gets there at all. He may never actually use a key or paddles. Doesn't matter. He's saying the "right" things, and therin lies the difference between the above welcome, and the below left-handed compliment. Larry needs to have his life verified by the few remaining "Vals" in the world.

> At the same time, and keeping everything said above in mind,
> I wish to belatedly congratulate Kim Walker, W5TIT, for passing
> her ham radio tests and becoming a ham! I feel that this is a
> remarkable achievement for her, and that she must feel very
> proud of having accomplished what must have been, for her, an
> extremely challenging and difficult task! It is unfortunate that
> you will never progress any further than Technician, Kim, but
> at least you got that far, and can at least call yourself a ham
> radio operator! Congratulations, Kim -- I'm sure very few people
> would have guessed that you had it in you!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

673. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:32:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ZNCr8.3974$ju2.190444931@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39891

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message

> Dick:
>
> Well, I guess I shouldn't say "never," in fact, I'm sure Kim is just
> as capable as anyone of getting her Extra. Perhaps, in my own
> way, I'm providing the encouragement she needs to do so. In
> which case, if she does, it will have been because of me! I have
> no problem with her getting her Nickle Extra. It will just prove
> that anyone can do it.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You're just a two-bit Extra.

674. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:40:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <EVCr8.3976$Cw2.190521595@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39894

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020406001011.13101.00000432@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <L4qr8.3355$at6.154904812@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> > Are you saying that Val shouldn't use, "enemies... agitate...
scuttle...
> >> > full scale attack... ?"
> >>
> >> I think there are much better choices of words than those terms. Just
like
> >> there are better choices for Bruce Perens than "battle" and "fight" and
> >> "front" (as in "frontline"). And better choices for Carl Stevenson than
> >> "idiot", "twit", "olde fartz", "dinosaur dung encrusted". And better
> >choices
> >> ... well, you get the idea.
> >
> >But are you actually admonishing Val?
>
> I'm saying there are better choices of words. Val is not alone in making
> less-than-optimum
> choices.

Why are all you'se guys giving Val a free pass? Let me guess.

> >> > > FISTS' purpose is to promote the USE of Morse. Mandatory testing is
> >only
> >> > one
> >> > > way to do that. FISTS focuses on other ways.
> >> >
> >> > FISTS advocates mandatory Morse tests.
> >>
> >> Where? I just visited the website. No mention of tests. FISTS did not
> >submit
> >> comments to the FCC on the issue and does not have an official position
on
> >it.
> >> One can be a member of both FISTS and No-Code International without any
> >> contradiction of either organization's rules or requirements.
> >
> >Yeh, I just revisited it too. The format has changed, and the call to
> >support code testing is missing.
>
> I do not recall ever seeing such a "call". Not in any of my FISTS
bulletins.

> There may
> be encouragement for FISTS members to make their voices heard, but there
is NO
> official FISTS position on the issue other than "let your governments know
what
> you
> think".

Are there more than one FISTS site? It definitely looked different than the
last time I looked.

> >> Of course it's probably true that most FISTS members favor mandatory
code
> >> tests. But as far as I know FISTS as an organization has no official
> >> position on the issue. FISTS membership does not limit the freedom of
its
> >> members to hold and express differing opinions on code testing.
> >>
> >> >It's a new focus.
> >>
> >> Show us where FISTS, as an organization, advocates mandatory code
testing.
> >
> >Sorry, no can do.
>
> Yet you say "it's a new focus" as if the policy had changed. It hasn't.

Well, that may be true but I'm not ready to agree with it - yet. I've been
there plenty of times before, clipping and pasting the "accuracy transcends
speed" slogan when Dick was doing the banana boat swing jive. I know what I
saw then, and the format of the site is different, and the "support" code
testing button is gone.

Brian

675. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:42:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <IWCr8.3977$Ww2.190533907@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39895

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CAB6541.85005E2@IEEE.org...
> Carl Zager wrote:
> > What Val is doing just confuses the heck outta me. First, he was
> > attributing everything backward, and then he was attributing comments
> > without the mailer's ID line.
> >
> > I really, calmly object.
>
> I have told him twice that he is violating the net news attribution
> guidelines. He doesn't seem to care. Just what the ARS needs -
> another rule-breaking troublemaker.

Steve, Larry, Dick, Bruce and Jim seem to like him. That's all that
matters.

676. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:42:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8mu3uvdh1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39898

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uatu7pikciuc3c@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Quite the class act aren't you.
>
> Yes, I am. And YOU have no effective response
> to my message because YOU are NOT!

ROTFLMAO!

> Get USED to it, cheery one!

It's been my "signing" mode since the day this
newsgroup was started. As for "lack of class" from
you, you're not the first and you certainly aren't
likly to be the last around here...so there's no need
for me to get used to it from you. Indeed, the
non-class type of comment you spouted states much
about your attitudes.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

677. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:43:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <KXCr8.3979$Gy2.190602466@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39896

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020403212458.00506.00001805@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 04/03/02 15:25 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3CAB6541.85005E2@IEEE.org>
>
> >I have told him twice that he is violating the net news attribution
> >guidelines.
>
> Can you show us the specifications on net news attributions, Cecil?

It will be made available when you can produce the specifications for Morse
Code in the appropriate government docs.

678. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:44:47 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <jZCr8.3982$VB2.190748692@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39897

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uanmu89if61i13@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Can you show us the specifications on net
> >news attributions, Cecil?
>
> I have to plead guilty to screwing up several
> messages by trying to "clean them up." If you're
> going to do something different, it helps to do
> it properly. However, it IS only UseNet, after all,
> and the world has continued to spin!
>
> I was humorous, though, being lectured on
> ANY kind of "etiquette" by our ol' buddy CAM!

Wait till you get on HF/CW!!!

679. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:46:14 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <G_Cr8.6592$QC1.632751@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 39899

Quod Erod Demonstratum, Bill

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uatu7pikciuc3c@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Quite the class act aren't you.
>
> Yes, I am. And YOU have no effective response
> to my message because YOU are NOT!
>
> Get USED to it, cheery one!
>
> Val
> KC0MUB
>
>
>
>

680. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:50:47 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uatu7pikciuc3c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39890

Bill Sohl wrote:

>Quite the class act aren't you.

Yes, I am. And YOU have no effective response
to my message because YOU are NOT!

Get USED to it, cheery one!

Val
KC0MUB

681. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 13:53:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <y5Dr8.3987$th2.189975773@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39900

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a8etfm8mi3@enews3.newsguy.com...
> What about people who weren't aware of ham radio until (what we need as a
> hobby need to do more of) someone introduced it to him? In order for the
> test to be considered dumbed down or the person lazy, they would have had
to
> have had prior knowledge of what was going on before he jumped into the
> boat. What about an 18 year old that gets licensed right now?

Doesn't matter. Larry and Dick have spoken. Get used to it.

682. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 14:12:07 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uatvg4a3o0160@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40001

Hello, N2EY!

SKY AND TELESCOPE has significant competition, from
ASTRONOMY, which was founded in 1975 to be "the world's
most beautiful astronomy magazine," and for a while succeeded.
It took S&T quite a while to upgrade their "look," to get into the
same ballpark with ASTRONOMY, but they finally got it done.

QST has no effective competition, isn't that right? I think so.

However, the covers and general appearance of QST are
truly sub-standard and should be upgraded, especially if the
goal is to attract newcomers. This month's cover is just
flat UGLY and does Ham Radio NO service at ALL! The
fact that covers FIFTY years ago looked BETTER simply
helps point up what should have been obvious.

I bet something done here within a year or two, just because
of the concern over the future expressed at ARRL.

Thanks for your reply.

Val

683. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 14:18:15 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uatvrbjkq39d48@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40002

Hello, KB3EIA, Mike!

>It was at Mason-Dixon star party. I mostly frequent the
>Mason-Dixon, the Astroblast in Franklin, and the Black
>Forest Star Party (which I founded BTW)

Congratulations on being the "founder" of a Star Party!
I have several times strongly considered the Black Forest
affair but have not yet made it there. I have been either
chair or co-chair of two Astronomical League regional
conventions and so have some idea of how much work
running such a star party can be! Again, congratulations!

> The scope is a 12.5 f5.9 dob, tube style. The tube color
>s granite blue, in a texture style. The rocker box is a low
>cherry wood style, with the scope cradle of two circular
>rings around the tube and a discs for the alt bearings,
>which are Ebony star on teflon. It took several years to
>make, but it was kind of a magnum opus.

It sounds very nice. My friend's 10-inch is all in Apple-
Ply, with a natural finish, and with all rounded corners
and flying buttresses and what-not. This guy's brother
is into Art Deco radio, really neat stuff, and the telescope
was an "homage" to that design type.

Finally, try to get a look at this comet, which has just
passed over M-31 headed north. It's easily visible in
binoculars and has a fine tail!

More later!

Val
KC0MUB

684. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 14:30:12 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uau0hu801v44a0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40003

Richard McCollum wrote:

>Quod Erod Demonstratum, Bill

And it's going to get even MORE "Demonstratum" pretty
soon, by the looks of things.

You know, I considered the "SJ" designation when I was
in school . . . but they won't let the Pope's shock troops
carry guns anymore, and just wipe out the opposition like
they used to do.

The result of this dismarmament: Child abuse!

Mea Culpa, Mea Culpa, Mea Maximia Culpa!

Val
KC0MUB

P.S. Thanks for picking up on two of my expressions, namely
"instant case" and, oh, I forget the other one just now! Yes,
folks, there's a new sheriff on this newsgroup, for about four
or five more days. It's going to be FUN! Wait until you see
my NEXT message on Ham Radio. Owweeeee!

**

685. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 14:38:48 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uau125mqtkjrc5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40004

Bill Sohl wrote:

>ROTFLMAO!

Not even a GOOD try from you. Sad, really.

>It's been my "signing" mode since the day this
>newsgroup was started. As for "lack of class" from
>you, you're not the first and you certainly aren't
>likly to be the last around here...so there's no need
>for me to get used to it from you. Indeed, the
>non-class type of comment you spouted states much
>about your attitudes.

Well, gee, whiz, I'm really impressed -- NOT. And, no,
I don't think I'm the first, or the last, to see BS and hot
air for what it is. There are exactly TWO people on
this list who are currently producing messages that
might have some value and interest. Guess what,
YOU ain't either one of 'em. Let's see something
from you of VALUE, or INSIGHT, or even WIT! See
that pedal on the floor, the clutch to the transmission
of what's left of your brain? Depress it, engage the
mechanism, PRODUCE some THOUGHT that might
be of some value to somebody, or even to HAM RADIO,
and then WRITE it BELOW!

Your long-valued avocation seems to be IN TROUBLE
and I'm trying to HELP OUT, even if it means pissing
off guys like you, who seem to have very little clue as to
exactly, or even fuzzily, what's wrong!

Clutch, transmission, BRAIN? Go!

Val
KC0MUB

686. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 14:57:48 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CAF0CEC.FF85E4CF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40005

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> I can't speak for anyone but myself, but I sure didn't deliberately select
> a sexually-suggestive call sign (allegedly on a dare) for the purpose of
> being a voluntary object of controversy in a family-oriented radio service....

You made your point long, long, LONG ago, Larry.
The callsign is an "object of controversy" only as long
as people continue to obsess and beat their chests about it.
As long as people gripe about it, she continues to be
the center of attention. Giving this attention is
contrary to what you want.
73 Dave S.

687. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 15:15:10 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1fa7k7r.18nl53x1idtjf6N%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 40006

Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:

> mike coslo wrote, about QST's problems:
>
> > , , , I hate poor design, and unfortunately I agree with you.
>
> The sad story is told in the mastheads of the two
> magazines. SKY AND TELESCOPE has a DESIGN
> AND PRODUCTION STAFF headed by an ART
> DIRECTOR and an ASSOCIATE ART DIRECTOR.
> The PRODUCTION staff is listed down the page.
>
> In QST's masthead, on page 4 of the current issue,
> one may observe that the PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR
> is listed FIRST, and there's no ART DIRECTOR in sight!
>
> And it SHOWS!
>
> Val

(snip)

Astronomy is a VERY visual subject, much more so than Ham radio.
They are going to be better at producing a more visually appealing
magazine because of that fact. Ham radio is not a real visual hobby,
I've been to enough ham fests to verify THAT fact!

--
If people from Poland are called Poles, why
aren't people from Holland called Holes?
- George Carlin

688. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 15:25:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caf15f9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40008

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAE9313.F6B67F7@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I brought it up over your supposed "typo". A typo is a typo for you
but
> > > a lie for me by your definition.
> >
> > One more time. Everyone makes typos. You are the only person I have
> > ever known who lied for days denying that you had even made a typo
> > while it was being pointed out to you in every posting.
>
> You knew then that I meant "comparing", not "comparting". In every
> response to you, I used the words "comparing", "compare" or "compared".
> I did not lie about anything. For you to continue your silly
> accusations makes you look small.
>

I don't know about Cecil looking small. However, you look pretty ridiculous
to keep responding.

Kim W5TIT

689. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 15:27:52 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caf1670_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40009

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAE97B2.8F071C42@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> >
> > I wouldn't have achieved many of the things I have if I hadn't met a
dare,
> > from teachers, clergy, friends, bosses, co-workers, etc. To dare and be
> > dared is to live.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Izzat right? I've never had a teacher, clergyman or boss dare me to do
> anything. "Friends" and co-workers will often dare one to do something
> stupid while keeping a safe distance. They can often be heard saying
> afterward, "I can't believe he was stupid enough to do that". Sorry, I
> can't buy into your Rod McKuen-ism.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you don't strike me at all as a person who does much thinking outside the box at all...so it doesn't surprise that you've never been dared, or challenged. You're probably quite predictable. If the outcome is already known, why would anyone waste their time or effort with you?

Kim W5TIT

690. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 15:33:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caf17d5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40010

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406013759.10628.00000845@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <a8l3b8eji0@dosa.alt.net>, "Not ARRL"
<Justme@Justmeandthemz.net>
> writes:
>
> >So you know
> >what, I told that fucking idiot to shove QST, shove the ARRL, and
> >they would never see my name again on the membership roste of
> >the ARRL!!!!!!!!!!!! I left ARRL in 1984 and am dam glad of it!
>
> The way I see it, if you're not an ARRL member, you have no right
> to complain about what they are or are not doing.
>

Who died and made you the ruler? Anyone has a right to complain, Larry.

>
> I certainly have
> my "problems" with the ARRL -- issues of a highly personal nature
>

Wow, surprise surprise. Larry with an issue of a highly personal nature.
Who woulda thunk?!

>
> which could easily influence me to take the same action you did
> in '84.
>

You're a follower, so you'll not do anything of the sort. It's more popular
to be a member of the ARRL. You go with that popular kind of stuff, don't
you? :o

>
> However, I like ham radio more than I dislike the ARRL -- and
> I realize that as the National Organization for Amateur Radio, they
> are in the position to do a lot more to secure the future of this hobby.
>

What a farce! You should read some of your alter-ego's posts, Larry. You
know...the other Larry who thinks it's a pretty good idea to sell of
spectrum since it's being wasted anyway.

>
> Or, at least, they could be. But, as an outsider, I realize that my
> own influence would be what yours is -- zero!

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Kim W5TIT

691. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 15:36:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8n4ml$q1u$0@208.206.142.87>
Source record: 40007

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> I re-upped after a long absence. The whole atmosphere has changed in
> Newington and in fact it needs the support whether I agree politically or
> not. And it has become, more because the competition has folded, the best
> of a bad lot of magazines.

Yup

> I will never forget a hamfest in Washington MO some years ago where the
> meetings were held in a park pavilion with shutters on the windows. After
> the speech we came to hear the MC introduced the section rep and people
> were literally diving out the windows to clear the room.

Washington is my favorite of hamfests. I don't need Dayton, I just look
forward to Washington. Missed that SM deal though, :-), was too busy
with the excellent flea mkt. I know Dayton's a lot bigger but I doubt
much better.

692. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 15:39:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caf1944_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40011

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406013800.10628.00000846@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <yfor8.19852$ml2.1493584@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >> In QST's masthead, on page 4 of the current issue,
> >> one may observe that the PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR
> >> is listed FIRST, and there's no ART DIRECTOR in sight!
> >>
> >> And it SHOWS!
> >
> >Your jeremiad ignores an important distinction between the
> >two magazines.
> >
> >"Sky and Telescope" is primarily a commercial periodical.
> >"QST" is primarily a membership journal.
> >
> >I'd much rather ARRL buy some lab equipment than use that money
> >to hire a couple of artists to make QST a work of art.
> >
> >With all kind wishes,
> >
> >de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hansl:
>
> I'll go one better than that. I think that QST needs to be printed on
> recycled newsprint with strictly black&white photos -- and the money
> spent on producing the slick, full-color mag spent on something the
> ARS needs a lot more -- like some public service announcements
> and the airtime to get them on people's TV screens. The person
> who originally made me aware of ham radio was Dick Van Dyke.
> With all the so-called celebrity hams we have in our ranks, there
> should be two million eager, appliance-operating, CC&R defeating,
> spectrum-protecting, dumbed-down, politically-correct, code hazing
> ritual-free hams in this country. What are Patty Loveless, Jon Bon
> Jovi, and Ronnie Milsap (to name three of dozens) doing for the ARS
> besides absolutely nothing?
>

Why do you figure they owe more to the ARS than you, Larry?

>
> How many hams are there out there

> who aren't national celebrities, but are well known in their local
> circles, and able to exert a great deal of practical (financial)
influence --
> the type which could get ARRL-produced PSA's played on local cable
> TV systems and large print ads in local newspapers and magazines?
>

I'd pretty much guarantee myself that you sure aren't one of them. You're
too busy looking for other people to do it. You sure are lazy, dumbed down
ARRL member, Larry.

>
> If I were the ARRL, I'd seek out these celebrity hams and ask them
> what they've done for me lately.
>

Oh, good grief. You're a jackass, Larry.

>
> With the right people asking them in
> the right way, I think they'd be more than willing to put their talent,
> industry connections, and personal influence to work for the ARS.
>

Why should those people be any more looked up to than anyone else, Larry?!
WHAT makes you think they will have more inlfuence than anyone else?!
That's ludicrous. And, haven't you spited the idolatry given to sports
heroes? You ask for this and you'd be the first to spit in the face of an
actor if such a campaign were anywhere near successful. I think you're
probably just looking for more people to put down anyway--you couldn't care
less if anyone joins the hobby.

>
> Does anyone know if this is/was ever considered by the ARRL?
> It must have been at one time. They got Dick Van Dyke to sit down
> in front of a KWM-2 at one time, and that had more to do with getting
> me to become a ham than a dozen "Elmers" trying to "sell" me on
> the ARS.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

That's because you're such a jackass follower.

Kim W5TIT

693. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 15:47:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3caf1af7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40012

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a8mto7$n4s$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> Not sure that some of your comments above weren't a bit
> "tongue-in-cheek", but never-the-less Larry, well said!
> Another of the 50s/60s celebrity hams was
> Arthur Godfrey. Also we had Barry Goldwater carrying our
> message. If celebrity endorsements work for the vast
> variety of stuff sold, why not amateur radio too.
>
> Cheers (hope that cheers doesn't offend you :-)
> Bill K2UNK
>

You folks gripe and complain about the ARS "going away," about spectrum "disappearing," and so on to ad nauseum. Yet, what have any of you done lately to get the word out about the service? OH GOSH...I FORGOT...that's the job of the ARRL and of the actors and politicians in this world. GOSH, no way no how could you get a spot on the council meetings of your city and speak up for ham radio...no way could you mention ham radio every chance you get at work, now way could you get hold of scouting and church youth organizations and show off ham radio, no way could you go to local stores and see if you can hand out some brochures on ham radio...

No way could any of you come up with anything else TO DO, other than sit around and wait for the next *famous* person to do it. You know what? If you guys are so impressed with these famous people, then learn from them--do what you think they should do for the ARS. YOURSELVES!!

Kim W5TIT

694. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 16:27:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAF21E9.D523063B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40013

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I just told you that I did not realize that I'd made the typo.
>
> That could not possibly be true, Dave. I told you about your typo
> and reposted your typo a dozen times over a period of five days.
> You would have to be blind not to be perfectly aware that you
> had made that typo. Yet you continued to deny making it.

That's interesting, Cecil. Please point me to the post where you told me about the typo to help sort things out. I don't recall that taking place.

Dave K8MN

695. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 16:34:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAF2399.7124E13E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40014

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I have never said you wrote it more than once.
> >
> > A quote from you:
> >
> > "If you are going to deny saying the word 'comparting' for days..."
>
> You denied saying 'comparting' for days. You didn't say 'comparting' for days.
> I suppose that, "If you are going for days to deny saying the word 'comparting'..."
> would have been a better choice of words.

How about, "For days you denied using the term 'comparting'"? I never
"said" it and have never made deliberate use of the word in my life.
>
> > I didn't say the word "comparting" for days. I never said it. I wrote
> > it in error once.
>
> I repeat. I have never said you wrote it more than once.

For a self-proclaimed wordsmith, your sentence construction can be poor
at times.

> > > You simply could bring your omniscient self to admit that you had made a typo.
> >
> > You are full of it. I did state that it was a typo.
>
> After denying for days that you had even made a typo in the face
> of your typo being reposted as evidence. I ask again. If you are going
> to deny for 5 days making the typo, why not just deny it forever?

It is obvious to all but you that I did not realize I'd made a typo.
Get over it.

> Why didn't you admit making the typo the first time I pointed it out to
> you? the second time? ... the tenth time? ...

Again, for the sake of clarity, please point to the post where you said
anything like, "Dave, you've made a typo" or anything closely resembling
the statement. I certainly don't recall seeing such a statement. You
knew my intent when YOU used the term in response since I was quick to
point out that you'd "compared".

Dave K8MN

696. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 16:40:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406114027.27399.00000330@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40015

In article <3cae87dd$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CAC7317.BA11EA33@IEEE.org...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> > Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
>> > restructuring is working perfectly?
>>
>> Yep, I begin to worry when the ham population starts to decrease.
>
>*THAT'S* when we'd better start noting that we may lose some spectrum!

Then start noting.

From

http://www.AH0A.org:

Total US hams, end-of-month:

September 1998 (the minimum in recent history, 20 months before restructuring):
672,678

March 2000 (last full month before restructuring):
677,784

April 2000 (transition month):
678,539

May 2000 (first full month after restructuring):
677,349

March 2001 (the maximum in recent history):
684,359

November 2001: (minimum in past year):
682,512

March 2002(most recent full month):
683,180

For those who say the Tech has somehow "kept ham radio afloat", note
that the number of Techs/Tech Pluses peaked at 338,334 in March 2000
and has since declined to 319,880. Note also that in April of 2000 the FCC
began renewing Tech Pluses as Techs, so the number of Techs is growing from
three sources (new licenses, Tech Plus renewals, and Novice upgrades) not
just new licenses.

73 de Jim, N2EY

697. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 17:03:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAF2A58.FA8EBCEC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40016

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You knew then that I meant "comparing", not "comparting".
>
> How would I know that? "Comparting" is a valid word. Am I supposed to
> assume that all of your posted words are typos?

You'd certainly have realized it in context. My subsequent posts did
not include that word but used the terms "compare" and "comparing".

> > I don't believe there was any time at which you commented anything like,
> > "Dave, you made a typo".
>
> "Comparting" is a valid word. It wasn't apparent to me that it was a
> typo so I simply denied comparting anything. You came back and said that
> I indeed had done that. Here's the actual interchange:
>
> W5DXP said:
> > > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > > you know what that makes you.
>
> Dave responded:
> > You have indeed.
>
> That was a lie. Long after that, you denied posting the word
> "comparting". You continued to deny it after I repeatedly proved
> that you had used the word. You continued to deny it over a period of
> five days with the evidence that you had used the word staring you
> in the face from a dozen of my postings.

That is certainly a part of what was posted and you'd have to be a fool
to believe that "comparted" is what I meant after my repeated use of
"compared" afterward. Yes, "comparted" is a word. It does not make any
sense at all in terms of what was being discussed. Again, you'd have to
be a fool not to know that. I'll assume that you are not a fool and
that this is yet another feeble attempt by you at entertaining yourself.
I'd advise caution in calling another a liar.
>
> > Your back pedalling on the items N2EY just called you on are much closer
> > to whoppers than what of which you continue to accuse me.
>
> I haven't back pedaled. The things that N2EY "called" me on simply means
> he has on his blinders and is not seeing the big picture. If you have two
> investments the sum of which increases by 4%, you are not going to be

> happy with both if one investment yields 20% while the other yields -16%.

Whoops! You mean you really didn't mean what you stated in the exchange quoted below?

QUOTE

N2EY: Did the reduction in code test requirements to the bare minimum two years ago, or the elimination of the code test for Technicians 11 years ago give us twice the number of emergency operators?

CAM: "Twice" was just a talking point.

N2EY: You said we'd have twice as many. Now you backpedal." END QUOTE

It would appear that you are a liar.

Dave K8MN

698. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 17:07:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAF2B58.F086928D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40017

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAE9313.F6B67F7@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I brought it up over your supposed "typo". A typo is a typo for you
> but
> > > > a lie for me by your definition.
> > >
> > > One more time. Everyone makes typos. You are the only person I have
> > > ever known who lied for days denying that you had even made a typo
> > > while it was being pointed out to you in every posting.
> >
> > You knew then that I meant "comparing", not "comparting". In every
> > response to you, I used the words "comparing", "compare" or "compared".
> > I did not lie about anything. For you to continue your silly
> > accusations makes you look small.
> >
>
> I don't know about Cecil looking small. However, you look pretty ridiculous
> to keep responding.

Oh, I don't know, Tugboat. I think you take top honors since you aren't
involved.

Dave K8MN

699. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 17:11:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAF2C48.B4E81A48@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40018

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAE97B2.8F071C42@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > I wouldn't have achieved many of the things I have if I hadn't met a
> dare,
> > > from teachers, clergy, friends, bosses, co-workers, etc. To dare and be
> > > dared is to live.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Izzat right? I've never had a teacher, clergyman or boss dare me to do
> > anything. "Friends" and co-workers will often dare one to do something
> > stupid while keeping a safe distance. They can often be heard saying
> > afterward, "I can't believe he was stupid enough to do that". Sorry, I
> > can't buy into your Rod McKuen-ism.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, you don't strike me at all as a person who does much thinking outside
> the box at all...so it doesn't surprise that you've never been dared, or
> challenged. You're probably quite predictable. If the outcome is already
> known, why would anyone waste their time or effort with you?

Kim, I don't even use such moronic phrases as, "thinking outside the box". To do something on a dare does not mean that you are doing any "thinking outside the box". I did not say that I had never been issued a dare. I stated that I'd never been dared by a teacher, a clergyman or a boss. I am quite predictable in that I don't do something because some fool dares me to do it. Fools have plenty of time to waste.

Dave K8MN

700. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 17:30:10 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3caf30ad_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 40019

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:IWCr8.3977$Ww2.190533907@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CAB6541.85005E2@IEEE.org...
> > Carl Zager wrote:
> > > What Val is doing just confuses the heck outta me. First, he was
> > > attributing everything backward, and then he was attributing comments
> > > without the mailer's ID line.
> > >
> > > I really, calmly object.
> >
> > I have told him twice that he is violating the net news attribution
> > guidelines. He doesn't seem to care. Just what the ARS needs -
> > another rule-breaking troublemaker.
>
> Steve, Larry, Dick, Bruce and Jim seem to like him. That's all that
> matters.

While Val's poor attribution is annoying, what bothers me more
is twofold:

1) the idea of a smart-ass, newly-licensed, not even dry behind
the ears newbie proclaiming him/her self an expert on anything
and everything about ham radio (clearly the implication from
the tone of Val's posts) ....

2) Val's "re-positioning amateur radio" sounds a LOT like
some bad, retro, time-warp, "back to the future" theme ...

Carl - wk3c

701. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 17:30:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406123057.21592.00000318@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 40021

In article <3cae63c3$1_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c-shack@fast.net> writes:

>So I checked things out as to what might be interesting
>and available, did some real soul-searching, and
>finally went to the ULS and filed an application.
>
>Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...
>
>I like it ... it's going to take some getting used to,
>but I like it :-)

Hey, great, Carl! Enjoy!

Wow, think of it...you can put that 2x1 on a resume and get
your pick of high-paying industry jobs! I hear that managers
are really looking for 1x2 and 2x1 ham callsign holders! :-)

<nudge, nudge, wink, wink> :-)

702. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 17:30:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406123058.21592.00000319@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 40020

In article <3cae7fc9$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Tucker Electronics in Garland, TX (the only remaining part is their testing
>eqpt division) used to have a little area in their store where you could sit
>and have coffee.

The HRO in Burbank, CA, mini-mall at corner of Buena Vista and
Victory, has a coffee machine, cups, fixins, on one of the
counters. Problem is that it's so full of racks and displays on
the little floor that there's no place to sit down...:-)

Oh, and the tie to "policy" must be that HRO's policy is to
sell as much as they can... :-) :-) :-)

703. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 17:33:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3caf3159_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 40022

Steve,

Actually I believe that somewhere there is a FAQ on the subject.
(there's a FAQ on damned near anything you can think of).

The (self-appointed) "keeper of the rec.radio.amateur proper
behavior guidelines" was, if I recall correcly, an ex Coastie
Morse op named Jeff something, who I believe had a Guam
call, though he lived in Hawaii ...

Carl - wk3c

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:KXCr8.3979$Gy2.190602466@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020403212458.00506.00001805@mb-mj.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio
> > >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> > >Date: 04/03/02 15:25 Eastern Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <3CAB6541.85005E2@IEEE.org>
> >
> > >I have told him twice that he is violating the net news attribution
> > >guidelines.
> >
> > Can you show us the specifications on net news attributions, Cecil?
>
> It will be made available when you can produce the specifications for
Morse
> Code in the appropriate government docs.
>
>

704. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 17:40:08 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3caf3303$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 40023

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAF2C48.B4E81A48@earthlink.net...
>
> Kim, I don't even use such moronic phrases as, "thinking outside the
> box".

Dave,

Calling a common phrase such as "thinking outside the box" "moronic"
illustrates an inability to process abstract concepts ... thus, I guess you
probalby can't "think outside the box" ... your thought process would appear
to be constrained to the mundane, familiar, predictable, and uncreative.

>Fools have plenty of time to waste.

I/m sure you would know, Dave ... BTW, how DO you waste all of your time?

Carl - wk3c

705. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 17:54:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406125446.04302.00000339@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40024

In article <uatvrbjkq39d48@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Congratulations on being the "founder" of a Star Party!
>I have several times strongly considered the Black Forest
>affair but have not yet made it there. I have been either
>chair or co-chair of two Astronomical League regional
>conventions and so have some idea of how much work
>running such a star party can be! Again, congratulations!

Ahem...this newsgroup is about amateur radio policy.

Neither the FCC nor the ITU-R allocate anything above
300 GHz and optical telescopy is done well above those
frequencies.

Quit sipping mead and get with Meade. Merde!

706. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 18:14:03 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <LVGr8.7046$QC1.671592@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40025

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uau0hu801v44a0@corp.supernews.com...
> Val
> KC0MUB
>
> P.S. Thanks for picking up on two of my expressions, namely
> "instant case" and, oh, I forget the other one just now! Yes,
> folks, there's a new sheriff on this newsgroup, for about four
> or five more days. It's going to be FUN! Wait until you see
> my NEXT message on Ham Radio. Owweeeee!
>

Don't overestimate your importance

707. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 19:22:53 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <hWHr8.20937$nt1.1717821@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40026

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote

>
> As far as using it on the air ... "You should live so long."
>

And here we thought it was all about *testing* -- silly us!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

708. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 19:45:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406144555.13148.00002078@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 40028

>Subject: Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/05/02 17:06 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020405170606.04302.00000323@mb-bh.aol.com>

>Petulance is not a virtue

Neither is cowardice or stupidity.

Where's the answer to the original question? Or are you not MAN enough to say "I was wrong"...???

Steve

709. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 19:48:17 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uauj645v1i5t84@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40027

Richard McCollum:

>Don't overestimate your importance

I'm not important; I'm an irritant, an irritant
combined with an agitator. That's "A-I".

Man, what a third-rate newsgroup this is
about 90 percent of the time. But then, I
guess they ALL are, aren't they?

Val
KC0MUB

P.S. Care to pat me on the head?

**

710. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 19:50:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406145013.13148.00002080@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 40029

>Subject: Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/06/02 12:30 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020406123057.21592.00000318@mb-fa.aol.com>

>In article <3cae63c3$1_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3c-shack@fast.net> writes:

>>Now I'm WK3C ... Whiskey Kilo Three Charlie ...

>Hey, great, Carl! Enjoy

Something Len and I can agree on completely!

Great call, Carl!

73

Steve, K4YZ

711. About Propriety...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 20:00:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406150019.13148.00002083@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 40030

From time to time I get comments, both in e mail and on the NG about my frequent jabs at His Putziness, Lennie the Creep. (Ooooops...Did it again!...!) Many have made comments about "civility" and good manners, etc.

A week ago I started a thread to congratulate a new Ham on his achievement. However, like most other threads in r.r.a.p., it has degenerated into name calling, harrassment, and completely disassociated "topics" of conversation...yet they perpetuate the thread under the "congratulations" theme.

Below are some of the comments.

Moral of the story?....Those in glass houses should not cast stones......

>Wouldn't that be Pole Poles?

>Don't waste attention on the TIT twit.

>Oh and Larry, stuff your congrats up your hole family

73

Steve, K4YZ

712. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 20:13:07 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <nFIr8.7899$Rw2.665947@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40031

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uauj645v1i5t84@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Richard McCollum:
>
> >Don't overestimate your importance
>
> I'm not important; I'm an irritant, an irritant
> combined with an agitator. That's "A-I".
>
> Man, what a third-rate newsgroup this is
> about 90 percent of the time. But then, I
> guess they ALL are, aren't they?
>
> Val
> KC0MUB
>
> P.S. Care to pat me on the head?
>
> **

No, being an NP I know better. You, I suspect, are about to become another player in the NPs run academia and flunk out the SJs game. SJs start businesses and end up firing us. A giant zero-sum game that all revolves about who is normal.

If you are into some speculation, I would suspect that this is one more item coming out of the human being being the only mammal where the Y chromosome gets involved in brain wiring. Ever seen a left-handed orang? Most apes can eat a banana left, right, hand, foot interchangeably and with zero extra effort.

Besides I approach this newsgroup like a Pentecostal revival: I don't have to believe a word of it to enjoy the show.

Dick NBK

713. Re: About Propriety...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 20:42:08 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <A4Jr8.22379$ml2.1715179@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40032

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

>
> Below are some of the comments.
>
> Moral of the story?....Those in glass houses should not cast
stones......
>
> >Wouldn't that be Pole Poles?
>
> >Don't waste attention on the TIT twit.
>
> >Oh and Larry, stuff your congrats up your hole family
>

That's OK, Steve. If others are doing it, that makes it OK for you too.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

714. Re: About Propriety...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 20:49:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406154911.20757.00001661@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 40033

>Subject: Re: About Propriety...
>From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 04/06/02 15:42 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <A4Jr8.22379$ml2.1715179@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>That's OK, Steve. If others are doing it, that makes it OK for you too.

And what's YOUR excuse, Master Grief?

Steve

715. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 20:51:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406155150.20757.00001663@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 40034

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/06/02 12:30 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020406123058.21592.00000319@mb-fa.aol.com>

>The HRO in Burbank, CA, mini-mall at corner of Buena Vista and
>Victory, has a coffee machine, cups, fixins, on one of the
>counters.

Spend a lot of time there wishing "Gee...wish >I< could do that too...???

Steve

716. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 20:58:13 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <FjJr8.22394$ml2.1715616@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40035

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> I'll go one better than that. I think that QST needs to be printed on
> recycled newsprint with strictly black&white photos -- and the money
> spent on producing the slick, full-color mag spent on something the
> ARS needs a lot more -- like some public service announcements
> and the airtime to get them on people's TV screens.

Good idea, Larry, but I'd do it in a different fashion.

The problem with PSA is that they generally get aired at zero-dark-thirty
between info-mercials for kitchen slicers and boob-building equipment.

I'd like to see ARRL (and yes, FISTS and NCI) fund the filming/production
of the ads, and local clubs FUND the airtime on local 5-o'clock news
programs.
The PSA-charity just will not get you any quality airtime.

And oh, by the way, the ads shouldn't be recruiting ads, but rather
ads which market the PICON value of amateur radio to the general
public. Maybe then we won't need to fight the CC&R battle in our
current house-to-house fashion.

73, Hans, K0HB

717. Re: About Propriety...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 21:05:18 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <iqJr8.22406$ml2.1718941@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40036

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote >
>
> >That's OK, Steve. If others are doing it, that makes it OK for you too.
>
> And what's YOUR excuse, Master Grief?

Unlike you, I don't call people names. I may criticize their actions, but
I don't criticize people.

My guess is that you, Val, Len, and all my other friends here on rrap
are all fine upstanding citizens.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

718. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-06 23:55:15 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <oa2vaukhrt1daltbrf9guucmob7k3ahrom@4ax.com>
Source record: 40037

On 03 Apr 2002 04:17:28 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <iUaq8.9418$ml2.741051@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"KAY-ZERO-HOTEL-BRAVO" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ENDOFTHETRAIL.ORG> writes:
>
>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>>
>>> BTW -- I've been in a lot of ham radio stores, past and present, and
>>> don't recall a single one of them having a coffee pot to hang out at --
>>> but they usually did have a manager who didn't want you taking
>>> up his valuable floor space unless you had your credit card in hand!
>>
>>Next time you're in Mounds View, MN stop in at "Radio City",
>>or the next time you're in Watertown, SD stop in at Burghardts.
>>Both stores will brew you up a fresh pot if the current one is
>>too stale for your refined Eastern taste buds.
>>
>>With all kind wishes,
>>
>>de Hans, K0HB
>
>Hansl:
>
>I can only hope that some day I will have the opportunity to drop
>in for a visit at Radio City and Burghardt's. I will greatly appreciate
>whatever hospitality they offer -- it will be a welcome change from
>my usual experiences.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Well Larry you live quite close to an HRO store where I often stop on
my way from business to visit my daughter in N.J.

I don't recall coffee but I surely felt welcome they had some radios
to play with.

When I asked about a DC power supply for my HT they pointed out one
I had left over from an old HT would do just fine. I go back regularly
and it doesn't matter if I buy something or not I still feel welcome.

If you display the hostility you display here I could see how you
might not be as well treated.

719. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 00:23:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <fkMr8.4384$SA3.216900888@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40038

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3caf30ad_1@news7.fast.net...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:IWCr8.3977$Ww2.190533907@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CAB6541.85005E2@IEEE.org...
> > > Carl Zager wrote:
> > > > What Val is doing just confuses the heck outta me. First, he was
> > > > attributing everything backward, and then he was attributing
comments
> > > > without the mailer's ID line.
> > > >
> > > > I really, calmly object.
> > >
> > > I have told him twice that he is violating the net news attribution
> > > guidelines. He doesn't seem to care. Just what the ARS needs -
> > > another rule-breaking troublemaker.
> >
> > Steve, Larry, Dick, Bruce and Jim seem to like him. That's all that
> > matters.
>
> While Val's poor attribution is annoying, what bothers me more
> is twofold:
>
> 1) the idea of a smart-ass, newly-licensed, not even dry behind
> the ears newbie proclaiming him/her self an expert on anything
> and everything about ham radio (clearly the implication from
> the tone of Val's posts) ....
>
> 2) Val's "re-positioning amateur radio" sounds a LOT like
> some bad, retro, time-warp, "back to the future" theme ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

They love him because he worships them.
```

720. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 00:35:49 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <FvMr8.22758$ml2.1752826@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40039

"Gerald Schmitt" <KK5YY@arrl.net> wrote

>
> If you display the hostility you display here I could see how you
> might not be as well treated.
>

Hostility? Larry certainly expresses his thoughts openly and
with a sense of conviction, but I don't ever recall any personal
hostility in his writing.

While such personalization is not uncommon on rrap, I don't
recall K3LT being party to it.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

721. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 00:36:55 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CAF948F.C364B57A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40040

Hi Val,
better be careful about showing any QST / ARRL copied or
related material in public. The Newington bunch might send
one of their legal attack dogs after you for violating their
copyright, trademark, etc. ;-0

73,
Clay N4AOX

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote, about QST's problems:
>
> > , , , I hate poor design, and unfortunately I agree with you.
>
> The sad story is told in the mastheads of the two
> magazines. SKY AND TELESCOPE has a DESIGN
> AND PRODUCTION STAFF headed by an ART
> DIRECTOR and an ASSOCIATE ART DIRECTOR.
> The PRODUCTION staff is listed down the page.
>
> In QST's masthead, on page 4 of the current issue,
> one may observe that the PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR
> is listed FIRST, and there's no ART DIRECTOR in sight!
>
> And it SHOWS!
>
> Val
>
> P.S. I'm going to be representing both amateur
> astronomy and amateur radio, at a rather large high
> school (1,500 enrollment) in a couple of weeks.
> Hundreds of students, parents and visitors will see
> our set up. It's going to be a joke when people see
> those two magazines on our table, side by side.
> Luckily, we're going to have a couple of big foamcore
> boards with material taken from the Web, allowing us
> to keep QST discreetly off to one side.
>
> **

722. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 00:43:02 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CAF95FE.9D71855C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40041

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>
>
> Do you really think any of us belong to ARRL only because of
> the magazine cover? Do you think any of us care about the magazine
> cover?
>
>
>
> Sounds more like you want QST to take on the aspect of
> some "glossy" newstand popular public magazine.
>
>

IMHO, the Newington bunch, the "League", and the BoD would
like very much for those passing the newsstand to be
attracted to and buy their rag. Otherwise, why do you think
they bother to put their mag. on the newsstand?

73,
Clay N4AOX

723. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 00:51:03 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CAF97DE.D2565CD9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40042

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:uas5d9k6h1krd2@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> > >I'd much rather ARRL buy some lab equipment than
> > >use that money to hire a couple of artists to make QST
> > >a work of art.
> >
> >
The question may be, "is the ARRL making money or losing money be putting the QST on the newsstand?". If they are losing money, then stop putting it on the shelves and revert to mailing to membership only. If they are making money, then make more money by investing in some good layout and art work. $100,000 /yr is a drop in the bucket compared to the overall Newington / Washington salaries.

73,
Clay N4AOX

724. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 01:16:22 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CAF9DCE.7DCF64B8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40043

You mean all of that crap for years was just so he could get
a 2x1 call!!!!????!???

73,
Clay N4AOX

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote
>
> >
> > As far as using it on the air ... "You should live so long."
> >
>
> And here we thought it was all about *testing* -- silly us!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

725. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 01:29:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAFA11B.9F3236E8@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40044

Are you quacking in your boots again Hans? 8^)

- Mike -

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Now Hans with the All Good Wishes is simply being a pain in the butt.
> >
>
> It's *kind* wishes, Silly, *KIND* wishes,
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

726. Re: About Propriety...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 01:49:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406204937.29963.00001445@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40045

>Subject: Re: About Propriety...
>From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 04/06/02 16:05 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <iqJr8.22406$ml2.1718941@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Unlike you, I don't call people names. I may criticize their actions, but
>I don't criticize people.

HUH!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!

>My guess is that you, Val, Len, and all my other friends here on rrap
>are all fine upstanding citizens.

I imagine you are right.

73

Steve, K4YZ

727. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 01:51:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406205151.29963.00001447@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40046

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>Date: 04/06/02 18:55 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <oa2vaukhrt1daltbrf9guucmob7k3ahrom@4ax.com>

>Well Larry you live quite close to an HRO store where I often stop on
>my way from business to visit my daughter in N.J.

By any chance is this the old "Delaware Amateur Supply"?...I used to make the run from Willow Grove, PA to Delaware to get "stuff"...Bought several radios there and NEVER regretted a dime spent.

73

Stevem K4YZ

728. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 01:54:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAFA707.1E0FC88E@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39954

BINGO!! Clay, you got it! Its good to see Val and I aren't the only ones who think this is important. It is not unusual for a magazine to have attributes that need improvement, nor is is a sin for Val to point them out. But if they go to the trouble of printing it, they might as well print it right.

I'm amazed in this thread that we have actually had people stand up for poor design as if it were a mark of superior content, via the "if they spend time on design, they take it away from content!!! Or "if they pay an art director" (or apparently an illustrator) "they steal from" (pick your choice) "which is much more important."

Lets have a little think session on how QST can be more cost effective:

First, eliminate spell checking. It is a waste of time and money, and Hams are pretty good at figuring out a word from context since they do it when operating CW.

Second, lets dump the color, and go to exclusively B&W. If you want a shocker, check out the difference between color printing and monotone.

Third, while we are at it, skip the printing and make it double sided Xerox copies. Lets try to get the type size as small as possible so it takes less pages.

Fourth, do we really need pictures? Hams listen to most things, and pictures of hams at their rigs is just ego boosting stuff anyhow.

Fifth, why have illustrations any way? Fire the illustrator, and if a ham has an article in QST, let the other hams who are interested in what he or she is writing about just get in touch with them. Whay wast ink on some subject I'm not interested in. Hams are used to doing QSL cards, so they should adapt to this pretty well. "Schematics via the Bureau" is a great idea.

Sixth, lets just forget about it, and quit producing the magazine. It was a big hassle anyhow.

See, I just saved ARRL a whole bunch of money.

Clay N4AOX wrote:

> IMHO, the Newington bunch, the "League", and the BoD would
> like very much for those passing the newsstand to be
> attracted to and buy their rag. Otherwise, why do you think
> they bother to put their mag. on the newsstand?

729. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 02:49:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAFB3BC.732D113A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40047

Brian P Burke wrote:
> Are there more than one FISTS site? It definitely looked different than the
> last time I looked.

There's an American page and a European page if I remember right.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

730. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 02:53:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAFB4A9.66D12D87@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40048

Valentine Germann wrote:
> However, the covers and general appearance of QST are
> truly sub-standard and should be upgraded, ...

How long have you been licensed, Val? Any other nocode tech
who uttered such blasphemy would be tarred and feathered by
the PCTA folk.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

731. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:03:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAFB706.4A22E560@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40049

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I just told you that I did not realize that I'd made the typo.
> >
> > That could not possibly be true, Dave. I told you about your typo
> > and reposted your typo a dozen times over a period of five days.
> > You would have to be blind not to be perfectly aware that you
> > had made that typo. Yet you continued to deny making it.
>
> That's interesting, Cecil. Please point me to the post where you told
> me about the typo to help sort things out. I don't recall that taking
> place.

I told you that you had posted "comparting". You denied it. That was
a lie. Here's the proof.

Dave originally posted:
> I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.

> W5DXP said:
> > Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I.

Dave responded:
> I never used such a term. (a lie - see above)

W5DXP said:
> > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > you know what that makes you.

Dave responded:
> You have indeed. (A lie since I never subdivided the two items)

W5DXP said:
> > I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse
> > testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.

Dave responded:
> You'll get none from me. I never accused you of subdividing anything.
> (A lie because "comparting" means "subdividing")

From Websters: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or may
not be believed true by the speaker" You lied, Dave!
--

cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

732. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:09:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAFB85D.3AD15013@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40050

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> How about, "For days you denied using the term 'comparting'"? I never
> "said" it and have never made deliberate use of the word in my life.

Posting it here is the same thing as saying it, Dave. You continue to lie.
Here's your original statement.

> I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.

> For a self-proclaimed wordsmith, your sentence construction can be poor
> at times.

I'm an engineer, not an English major.

> It is obvious to all but you that I did not realize I'd made a typo.

It doesn't matter if you realized it or not. You were still lying. From
Webster's: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or may not
be believed true by the speaker"

> Again, for the sake of clarity, please point to the post where you said
> anything like, "Dave, you've made a typo" ...

I didn't know it was a typo since it is a valid word. Should I question
every valid word that you post? I told you for days that you had accused
me of comparting, which you did (see above), and you denied it. You were
lying.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

733. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:10:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAFB8B5.EA480416@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39951

N2EY wrote:
> For those who say the Tech has somehow "kept ham radio afloat", note
> that the number of Techs/Tech Pluses peaked at 338,334 in March 2000
> and has since declined to 319,880. Note also that in April of 2000 the FCC
> began renewing Tech Pluses as Techs, so the number of Techs is growing from
> three sources (new licenses, Tech Plus renewals, and Novice upgrades) not
> just new licenses.

Jim, how many coded hams were there in 1990? How many coded hams were there
in 2000? Was there an increase or decrease?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

734. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:19:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAFBADA.2C492CD0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39952

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You knew then that I meant "comparing", not "comparting".
> >
> > How would I know that? "Comparting" is a valid word. Am I supposed to
> > assume that all of your posted words are typos?
>
> You'd certainly have realized it in context. My subsequent posts did
> not include that word but used the terms "compare" and "comparing".

So on top of everything else, you want me to be a mindreader? I told you
that you had posted the word "comparting" and that accused me of comparting.
You denied it. You lied.

> That is certainly a part of what was posted and you'd have to be a fool
> to believe that "comparted" is what I meant after my repeated use of
> "compared" afterward. Yes, "comparted" is a word. It does not make any
> sense at all in terms of what was being discussed. Again, you'd have to
> be a fool not to know that. I'll assume that you are not a fool and
> that this is yet another feeble attempt by you at entertaining yourself.
> I'd advise caution in calling another a liar.

I can prove that you are a liar in a court of law, Dave. From Websters:
"lie 1 b: an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or may not be believed
true by the speaker" This is the second definition from _Webster's_Ninth_New
Collegiate Dictionary. You said you didn't use the word comparting. You did.
You lied. If you deny meeting the above definition of lying, you are lying.

> > > Your back pedalling on the items N2EY just called you on are much closer
> > > to whoppers than what of which you continue to accuse me.
> >
> > I haven't back pedaled. The things that N2EY "called" me on simply means
> > he has on his blinders and is not seeing the big picture. If you have two
> > investments the sum of which increases by 4%, you are not going to be
> > happy with both if one investment yields 20% while the other yields -16%.
>
> Whoops! You mean you really didn't mean what you stated in the exchange
> quoted below?

Two was the next natural number up from one. One was false. Thus the "twice".
I didn't backpedal. "Twice" wasn't never meant to be exact.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

735. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:22:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CAFBB6B.6CFC3963@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39953

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> 2) Val's "re-positioning amateur radio" sounds a LOT like
> some bad, retro, time-warp, "back to the future" theme ...

Close, but I believe it to be the result of an abortive Vulcan
mind meld with Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

736. Re: About Propriety...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:57:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406225715.21793.00000969@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 39955

In article <iqJr8.22406$ml2.1718941@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>
>My guess is that you, Val, Len, and all my other friends here on rrap
>are all fine upstanding citizens.

Oooops -- looks like I didn't make the list! I just hope I'm one of Hansl's "other" friends, because I certainly consider him to be one of mine!

73 de Larry, K3LT

737. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:57:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406225715.21793.00000968@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 39960

In article <3caf1944_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>What are Patty Loveless, Jon Bon
>> Jovi, and Ronnie Milsap (to name three of dozens) doing for the ARS
>> besides absolutely nothing?
>>
>
>Why do you figure they owe more to the ARS than you, Larry?

Kim:

They may not "owe" the ARS any more than I do, but they're certainly
much better positioned than I am to give something back to the service.
And that's all I am suggesting.

>> How many hams are there out there
>> who aren't national celebrities, but are well known in their local
>> circles, and able to exert a great deal of practical (financial)
>influence --
>> the type which could get ARRL-produced PSA's played on local cable
>> TV systems and large print ads in local newspapers and magazines?
>>
>
>I'd pretty much guarantee myself that you sure aren't one of them. You're
>too busy looking for other people to do it. You sure are lazy, dumbed down
>ARRL member, Larry.

Perhaps, in a way I am, Kim -- but I am no possessed of a great,
commercially-viable talent such as the well-known celebrity hams are;
therefore, I cannot provide the same kind of tangible support to the ARS
that they are capable of giving. Were I in their position, I would not
hesitate to do anything possible to help secure the future of my hobby.
And I am sure that if they are approached in the right way, that they
would be more than happy to do so as well.

>> If I were the ARRL, I'd seek out these celebrity hams and ask them
>> what they've done for me lately.

>Oh, good grief. You're a jackass, Larry.

How charming of you to say so, Oh one who is bringing the ARS
"...one step closer to extinction!"

>> With the right people asking them in
>> the right way, I think they'd be more than willing to put their talent,
>> industry connections, and personal influence to work for the ARS.

>>
>
>Why should those people be any more looked up to than anyone else, Larry?!

Because they are legitimate celebrities, who have the talent and
industry connections that could be very useful in publicizing the ARS.

>WHAT makes you think they will have more inlfuence than anyone else?!
>That's ludicrous. And, haven't you spited the idolatry given to sports
>heroes? You ask for this and you'd be the first to spit in the face of an
>actor if such a campaign were anywhere near successful.

I don't recall ever "spitting in the face" of Dick Van Dyke. I think he
is a very talented actor and comedian -- and the PSA he did for the
ARRL a couple of decades ago is still fresh in my memory as one
of the influences that brought me into the hobby. I recognize the
value of celebrities and their ability to popularize activities to which
ordinary citizens can have ready access.

>I think you're
>probably just looking for more people to put down anyway--you couldn't care
>less if anyone joins the hobby.

Well, Kim, if that's what you want to think of me, all I can say is that
you're absolutely incorrect. I have a very deep concern for the future
of the ARS -- one which you have not demonstrated so far.

>> Does anyone know if this is/was ever considered by the ARRL?
>> It must have been at one time. They got Dick Van Dyke to sit down
>> in front of a KWM-2 at one time, and that had more to do with getting
>> me to become a ham than a dozen "Elmers" trying to "sell" me on
>> the ARS.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>That's because you're such a jackass follower.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Another charming comment from Miss Congeniality herself.

73 de Larry, K3LT

738. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:57:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406225716.21793.00000970@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 39959

In article <FjJr8.22394$ml2.1715616@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>
>I'd like to see ARRL (and yes, FISTS and NCI) fund the filming/production
>of the ads, and local clubs FUND the airtime on local 5-o'clock news
>programs.
>The PSA-charity just will not get you any quality airtime.
>
>And oh, by the way, the ads shouldn't be recruiting ads, but rather
>ads which market the PICON value of amateur radio to the general
>public. Maybe then we won't need to fight the CC&R battle in our
>current house-to-house fashion.
>
>73, Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

These are all good points, and I don't disagree whatsoever. However,
I would take whatever "airtime" I could get, zero-dark-thirty or not,
because there are potential hams who may just be out there watching
the infomercials for the "Ab Blaster" and the miracle rotissarie oven,
or whatever.

73 de Larry, K3LT

739. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:57:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406225717.21793.00000973@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 39956

In article <3caf30ad_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c-shack@fast.net> writes:

>
>While Val's poor attribution is annoying, what bothers me more
>is twofold:
>
>1) the idea of a smart-ass, newly-licensed, not even dry behind
>the ears newbie proclaiming him/her self an expert on anything
>and everything about ham radio (clearly the implication from
>the tone of Val's posts) ....
>
>2) Val's "re-positioning amateur radio" sounds a LOT like
>some bad, retro, time-warp, "back to the future" theme ...
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

I must respectfully disagree. Val's comments are refreshingly
honest, well thought-out, and sincere. Just as yours are, from
time-to-time. And, unlike Mr. Burke, I don't think Val likes me
because he "worships" me or any such thing.

73 de Larry, K3LT

740. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:57:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406225717.21793.00000972@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 39957

In article <3CAF0CEC.FF85E4CF@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> I can't speak for anyone but myself, but I sure didn't deliberately select
>> a sexually-suggestive call sign (allegedly on a dare) for the purpose of
>> being a voluntary object of controversy in a family-oriented radio
>service....
>
>You made your point long, long, LONG ago, Larry.
>The callsign is an "object of controversy" only as long
>as people continue to obsess and beat their chests about it.
>As long as people gripe about it, she continues to be
>the center of attention. Giving this attention is
>contrary to what you want.
>73 Dave S.

Dave:

Incorrect. This attention is exactly what *Kim* wants. She's
just getting her wish. If she didn't want this attention, she should
have selected a less controversial Vanity call sign.

73 de Larry, K3LT

741. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:57:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406225717.21793.00000971@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 39961

In article <20020406205151.29963.00001447@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
>>Well Larry you live quite close to an HRO store where I often stop on
>>my way from business to visit my daughter in N.J.
>
> By any chance is this the old "Delaware Amateur Supply"?...I used to
>make
>the run from Willow Grove, PA to Delaware to get "stuff"...Bought several
>radios there and NEVER regretted a dime spent.
>
>73
>
>Stevem K4YZ

Stevem:

The "old" Delaware Amateur Supply has gone belly-up (that's tits-up to you, Kim!) and, AFAIC, good riddance! That was the dirtiest, grimiest, grungiest, most disgustingly unkempt ham radio store it has ever been my displeasure to set foot into! Plus, I experienced very poor service from that lot after the purchase of a Yaesu HT from them at the 1984 Dayton Hamvention. I do live within less than an hour's drive to the HRO store in New Castle, Delaware, and I patronize that store regularly. It is professionally run by experienced and businesslike hams, and is a refreshing change from Delaware Amateur Supply.

73 de Larry, K3LT

742. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 03:57:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020406225718.21793.00000974@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 39958

In article <3cae8a34_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> > > Why is it any more unlikely than her getting a Tech?
>> >
>> > Dick:
>> >
>> > Well, I guess I shouldn't say "never," in fact, I'm sure Kim is just
>> > as capable as anyone of getting her Extra. Perhaps, in my own
>> > way, I'm providing the encouragement she needs to do so. In
>> > which case, if she does, it will have been because of me! I have
>> > no problem with her getting her Nickle Extra. It will just prove
>> > that anyone can do it.
>>
>>
>> My point exactly.
>
>
>Yeah, you guys did it, so surely anyone can...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Don't look now, but Dick and I are *not* "Nickle Extras." We achieved
legitimate Amateur Extra-class status under the much more comprehensive
and challenging Pre-Restructuring licensing requirements, including
the 13- and/or 20-WPM code tests. Now that the licensing requirements
have been significantly reduced, what is *your* excuse for not getting
your "Nickle Extra?" I'm not saying that it is in any way mandatory or
even expected, but it is certainly within your abilities -- as it was even
in the Pre-Restructuring Era. Just a thought...

73 de Larry, K3LT

743. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 04:09:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8ogpd$i40$0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 39962

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:IWCr8.3977$Ww2.190533907@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CAB6541.85005E2@IEEE.org...
> > > Carl Zager wrote:
> > > > What Val is doing just confuses the heck outta me. First, he was
> > > > attributing everything backward, and then he was attributing comments
> > > > without the mailer's ID line.
> > > >
> > > > I really, calmly object.
> > >
> > > I have told him twice that he is violating the net news attribution
> > > guidelines. He doesn't seem to care. Just what the ARS needs -
> > > another rule-breaking troublemaker.
> >
> > Steve, Larry, Dick, Bruce and Jim seem to like him. That's all that
> > matters.
>
> While Val's poor attribution is annoying, what bothers me more
> is twofold:
>
> 1) the idea of a smart-ass, newly-licensed, not even dry behind
> the ears newbie proclaiming him/her self an expert on anything
> and everything about ham radio (clearly the implication from
> the tone of Val's posts) ....
>
> 2) Val's "re-positioning amateur radio" sounds a LOT like
> some bad, retro, time-warp, "back to the future" theme ...
>

Well, so much for you clowns and your thirst for "new blood" into the
ARS.
While you warmly welcome the most shifty-eyed denizen of the nether
regions above 27 MhZ with open arms, when comes a newbie with some
actual knowledge and even a bit of experience from looking over his ham
neighbors shoulder for years, and who espouses some novel ideas for
improving the Service not heard before, you set the hounds to him.
Whatta bunch of lightweights.

744. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 04:11:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8ogtq$i40$1@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 39963

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote
>
> >
> > As far as using it on the air ... "You should live so long."
> >
>
> And here we thought it was all about *testing* -- silly us!
>

Mayge YOU thought that. Some of us know better.

745. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 04:34:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406233402.00376.00000550@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39966

In article <3CACBDF1.994BB835@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3CAB1BE2.182E550C@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>> > Okay, give some ideas on how we increase the quality of the
>Amateur?
>> >Will we have character tests? Who decides?
>>
>> It's a matter of projecting a positive, "quality" image to everyone. A big
>> part of this is setting a good example.
>
>Hard to argue with that, Jim. But we have to be careful.

Careful about setting a good example? ;-)

>> >One thing I see that flies in
>> >the face of all this is that many of the people who I hear on the air
>> >that are misbehaving appear to be long term hams. Certainly a look at
>> >the enforcement pages shows some interesting info:
>> >
>> >March 2002
>> >
>> >Advanced - last license issuance 1995
>> >Tech + - 1995
>> >Tech 1998 Repeater interference
>> >General-1993 obscenities
>> >Tech (was novice) 1999 deliberate interference
>> >Extra - 1996 uncoordinated interfering repeater
>> >Extra - 1997 same
>> >General - 1999 Same
>> >Extra - 1993 Same
>> >Extra - 2001 Same
>> >General -couldn't get date no longer in database-retake license
>> >Extra 1998 Poor repeater operation, no control op interference
>> >Technician 1997 Unlicensed equipment, giving equipment to unlicensed minor
>> >
>> >1 advanced
>> >3 techs one who was a novice
>> >1 tech +
>> >3 Generals
>> >5 extras
>> >
>> > Does the Morse test keep the riffraff out? There were only 2 out of

>13
>> >people on this list who were *not* tested for Morse code operations.
>>
>> Some points, Mike:
>>
>> - the enforcement letters on the ARRL and other websites are not
>> comprehensive. They are only a sample.
>
> Very true, but I wanted to use that sample to just get an idea of who's
>doing the bad stuff.

But what you get is an incomplete picture, unless you look at lots of those
letters and correlate
them over time. Often one "bad apple" generates a stream of letters.

And what you see is what the FCC is acting on, which is not necessarily a
complete picture.
FCC enforcement is a perfect example of squeaky wheel greasing.
>>
>> - most US hams have taken code tests. Those who haven't are not allowed to
>> use the bands where they can be easily heard over large areas.
>> - it takes time to build up a case to the point where an enforcement
>> letter is issued.
>> In almost all cases, there have to be substantial complaints against a
>> person, which are then verified before any enforcement action is taken
>> - all of the above also took written exams which dealt directly with the
>> regs, yet they misbehaved anyway.
>> - "one sparrow doesn't make a spring" - look at a year's worth, not just
>> one month.
>
> I'll start here. I'm not out to prove any particular thing, here. But
>In the context of the thread, I'm very skeptical that the ARS is going
>to hell in a handbasket

I agree 100%.

> and that dropping the morse Code testing is
>allowing the less desirable elements into the hobby.

We'll know in a few years.

> Even so, I am pro-morse code. Perhaps it sounds like a contradiction,
>but I just don't believe the apocolyptic visions. I know that dropping
>it to 5wpm for general got me involved, and I'm just the sweetest guy on
>the block! 8^)

There ya go! Meet me on 7040 or 3540 some time.
>
> Regards the small sample size, you are right, but I didn't have much
>time to do my research. Had to get to work and all. But if the bad boys
>and girls are being let in by the new dumbed down testing, I would have
>expected a split much different than 87% to 13%.

It's just one data point. If, on a different month, the ratio were 50-50, would that
be proof that code testing must stay? Of course not!

>> - for many years there was very little FCC enforcement at all. Much of the
>> enforcement being done is catch-up work on the worst offenders who have
>> been at it for quite a while. And how many big fines and/or license
>> revocations does the FCC do in a year?
>
> This is all indicitive of something good though. If the FCC is finally
>starting to crack down on the baddies, it can only improve the quality
>of the service

I agree 100%. But it will take time. Riley & Co. can only do so much at any one time.

>> How long from initial complaint to final action?

> This I note as a problem. It will probably never be fast enough. Just
>verification that the complaint is not bogus will take plenty of time. I
>note that many complaints have been filed where the FCC ends up
>admonishing the complainant!

Exactly! At each step of the way, FCC must allow a reasonable amount of time for
all parties to reply.

I'll give you a local example:

Few years back, before Riley, a trio of new guys showed up on one of the local repeaters.
No big deal, all are welcome. They even joined the club that supports the repeater.

However, their operating left much to be desired. Common courtesies like acknowledging a
"call, please" were not their style. Worse, their conversations were definitely not "G-rated"
and often became sexist and racist.

Being told that such behavior was not acceptable on this repeater had no effect. The machine
was often shut down because of them. Control codes were changed because they found out
how to restart the machine.

All of this was reported to the FCC, with tapes, but little was done in those pre-Riley days. They
laughed at our efforts, saying "FCC didn't care when we did the same thing on 11 meters and
they don't care about your stupid repeater either". They finally got tired of having the machine
shut down and moved on to another repeater.

Worst part of all this is that an extended family of scanner enthusiasts who were thinking of
becoming hams were turned off to ham radio. Those three "bad apples" probably turned away
at least a dozen potential hams by their antics.

You get one guess what license those three bad apples held.
>
>> Biggest point:
>>
>> How many of those cited were using Morse code on the air to commit their
>> alleged violations? Maybe it's not the test but the use of the mode that
>> is important.
>
> Well, I can't particularly agree with this one.

Why not? Were ANY of them using Morse code? If not, that says something
about the USE of the mode, does it not?

>If we start to include
>the mode, it takes the discussion in a different direction. The number
>of possible violations decrease when confining activity to a single mode.

I don't understand.

It seems to me that most of the violations cited occur using voice modes. That's to be
expected, since voice modes are the most popular. But Morse is a close second to
SSB in popularity on HF/MF, yet we rarely if ever see an NAL issued to a ham
actually using Morse. (When was the last one?).

Watch the enforcement letters for a few months and see how many are issued to hams
actually using Morse code.

Of course the test does not guarantee use of the mode.
>
> But my overall point was that if the present day testing is allowing
>riffraff on the bands, we should be able to see that in the enforcement
>actions, not unlike how you can go through a police logs in a newspaper
>and see that a large percentage of automobile accidents are caused by
>teenage males, that most drug offenses are by young people - that sort
>of thing.

That's true only if the police logs show all of the violations, and the police
aren't "profiling".

>
>> > But what I draw from this one month look is that it looks like
>there is
>> >not much correlation between the knowledge and testing of Morse code and
>> >the character of the ham at *best*. This is a small sample, but 87
>> >percent of these people were tested and passed a Morse code test!

>>
>> See above. ALL of them passed written tests, too - shall we dispense with
>> written tests because some hams break the rules?
>
> I hope you don't think I was trying to suggest anything of the sort,
>Jim!!!! It's all in how I was trying to see a correlation as noted above.

Of course. Point is, no test is perfect. And the other factors can hide a
correlation.

Most of all, though, look at the mode used for the violation, not the test
passed.
>
><Snippage>
>
>> > This one made me grin a bit! It's aside from the discussion at
>hand,
>> >but there is an old stereotype of a lot of hams, especially the ones who
>> >frequent hamfests - that many of them don't pay proper attention to
>> >hygiene, and they do indeed acquire a cachet of de-stink-tivness! 8^)
>>
>> HAW! But there's a serious point to be made there, Mike. It's VERY
>> important that we present a positive, attractive, "quality" image at all
>> times. "Distinctiveness" needs to be positive!
>
> One of the things on this line that I think is important is to not
>project the stereotype of the "nerd ham". Not that there is anything
>wrong with being a nerd - I am one - part time. But I think it is
>important that a cross-section of types need to be presented. What else
>do we do? I saw a web page from a ham who combines his ATV ham interests
>with his other interest Motocross racing, I play ice hockey and go
>4wd'ing.

COOL!

I run and ride a bike. Used to do marathons, half marathons, ten milers and
such,
now it's more like a few miles each day.

>The potential ham needs to know that we are not all just
>sitting behind our radios in our underwear all night long.
>
AMEN!!
>>
>> The truly amazing thing is that most hams are so well behaved
>> given the lack of adequate enforcement for so long.
>
> Most of us are pretty good people.
>
That's the truth! But it's the bad apples that stick out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

746. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 04:34:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406233403.00376.00000552@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39964

In article <a8mto7$n4s$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Another of the 50s/60s celebrity hams was
>Arthur Godfrey. Also we had Barry Goldwater carrying our
>message.

Let us also remember Jean Shepard, K2ORS ("You'll shoot your
eye out, kid!!")

>If celebrity endorsements work for the vast
>variety of stuff sold, why not amateur radio too.

Excellent idea! We have entertainers such as Patty Loveless and Joe Walsh,
to name just two.

73 de Jim, N2EY

747. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 04:34:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020406233403.00376.00000551@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39965

In article <uatvg4a3o0160@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Hello, N2EY!

Greetings
>
>SKY AND TELESCOPE has significant competition, from
>ASTRONOMY, which was founded in 1975 to be "the world's
>most beautiful astronomy magazine," and for a while succeeded.
>It took S&T quite a while to upgrade their "look," to get into the
>same ballpark with ASTRONOMY, but they finally got it done.

So the look of the mag is an important consideration to them. Amateurs
are more concerned with content, I think. Personally, I would rather have
fewer color pages in QST and more articles. But that's just me.

Do S&T or Astronomy do "Consumer Reports" style Product Reviews like QST?
Those QST Product Reviews are worth the whole price of membership if one
of 'em keeps ya from making an expensive mistake.
>
>QST has no effective competition, isn't that right? I think so.

There's "CQ", which I see on newstands and buy occasionally. "Worldradio" is
also out there. There are also specialty mags like "Electric Radio".
>
>However, the covers and general appearance of QST are
>truly sub-standard and should be upgraded, especially if the
>goal is to attract newcomers.

I disagree!

You are basing your impressions on a single issue. Subscribe for a few years
and then tell us what you think.

>This month's cover is just
>flat UGLY and does Ham Radio NO service at ALL! The
>fact that covers FIFTY years ago looked BETTER simply
>helps point up what should have been obvious.

I have both issues. Arguing the esthetics is a subjective game. They
didn't have any art direction 50 years ago, either.
>
>I bet something done here within a year or two, just because
>of the concern over the future expressed at ARRL.

That's part of their job. They do it well.

Have you joined the League?

73 de Jim, N2EY

748. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 04:55:37 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <djQr8.22290$nt1.1796629@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39967

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Watch the enforcement letters for a few months and see how many are issued
to
> hams actually using Morse code.
>

With all due regard, that's a red-herring, Jim.

The same can be said for those "actually using" RTTY, SSTV, ATV, PSK31, or
whatever.

If a person wants to be a bad actor, they want the largest possible
audience. That audience is most conveniently and broadly available on voice
modes, and has no relation to what other modes the operator might be
trained, equipped, and capable in.

Check out some of the cesspool-QRG's on 80M and 20M -- all those clowns are
Morse tested.

73, Hans, K0HB

749. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 05:09:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CAFD48B.51DA760A@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39969

Had to do some major trimming to get this one in, Jim.

N2EY wrote:

> But what you get is an incomplete picture, unless you look at lots of those
> letters and correlate
> them over time. Often one "bad apple" generates a stream of letters.
>
> And what you see is what the FCC is acting on, which is not necessarily a
> complete picture.
> FCC enforcement is a perfect example of squeaky wheel greasing.

True, but we have to start somewhere. Otherwise we end up with "gut
feelings, which I always trust, but can never use to prove the point.

> > and that dropping the morse Code testing is
> >allowing the less desirable elements into the hobby.
>
> We'll know in a few years.

Perhaps. I could be a exception, getting interested in amateur radio,
then going for the advanced licenses after the one part which hindered
me was reduced to the point where I could hope to pass it. I know a
pretty fair amount about everything else.

> > Even so, I am pro-morse code. Perhaps it sounds like a contradiction,
> >but I just don't believe the apocolyptic visions. I know that dropping
> >it to 5wpm for general got me involved, and I'm just the sweetest guy on
> >the block! 8^)
>
> There ya go! Meet me on 7040 or 3540 some time.

I might try that. Let me brush up a bit.

> > Regards the small sample size, you are right, but I didn't have much
> >time to do my research. Had to get to work and all. But if the bad boys
> >and girls are being let in by the new dumbed down testing, I would have
> >expected a split much different than 87% to 13%.
>
> It's just one data point. If, on a different month, the ratio were 50-50, would
> that be proof that code testing must stay? Of course not!

Of course not. If I get the chance, I'll go back as far as I can. But I
suspect it won't be a lot different. That's one that will have to wait
until I get some more free time. Work is pressing, and the XYL has a
honeydew list that is keeping me mighty busy.

> Being told that such behavior was not acceptable on this repeater had no
> effect. The machine
> was often shut down because of them. Control codes were changed because they
> found out
> how to restart the machine.
>
> All of this was reported to the FCC, with tapes, but little was done in those
> pre-Riley days. They
> laughed at our efforts, saying "FCC didn't care when we did the same thing on
> 11 meters and
> they don't care about your stupid repeater either". They finally got tired of
> having the machine
> shut down and moved on to another repeater.
>
> Worst part of all this is that an extended family of scanner enthusiasts who
> were thinking of
> becoming hams were turned off to ham radio. Those three "bad apples" probably
> turned away
> at least a dozen potential hams by their antics.
>
> You get one guess what license those three bad apples held.

I was not involved in the ARS in those days, but those sort of
incidents (in this case nightmare might be more appropriate) lend some
understanding to a lot of peoples frustrations.

> > One of the things on this line that I think is important is to not
> >project the stereotype of the "nerd ham". Not that there is anything
> >wrong with being a nerd - I am one - part time. But I think it is
> >important that a cross-section of types need to be presented. What else
> >do we do? I saw a web page from a ham who combines his ATV ham interests
> >with his other interest Motocross racing, I play ice hockey and go
> >4wd'ing.
>
> COOL!
>
> I run and ride a bike. Used to do marathons, half marathons, ten milers and
> such, now it's more like a few miles each day.
>
> >The potential ham needs to know that we are not all just
> >sitting behind our radios in our underwear all night long.
> >
> AMEN!!

Well, this is the sort of thing that needs to be propagated. Yet I
wouldn't want to exclude the more sedate or reclusive members of the
ARS. It's also a great hobby for older people, not being strenous. (
I'll try to remember that next time I'm up a tree trying to fix my
antenna)

- Mike - KB3EIA

750. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 05:09:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407000941.00376.00000554@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39970

In article <3CAFB8B5.EA480416@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> For those who say the Tech has somehow "kept ham radio afloat", note
>> that the number of Techs/Tech Pluses peaked at 338,334 in March 2000
>> and has since declined to 319,880. Note also that in April of 2000 the FCC
>> began renewing Tech Pluses as Techs, so the number of Techs is growing from
>> three sources (new licenses, Tech Plus renewals, and Novice upgrades) not
>> just new licenses.
>
>Jim, how many coded hams were there in 1990?

All of them.

>How many coded hams were there in 2000?

Impossible to say.

FCC did not begin issuing Tech Pluses until some time
after February of 1991 - it took some doing to make them see that there was
a difference between a Tech with code test and one without. Throughout the
'90s many hams whose licenses read "Technician" had passed code tests

After April 15, 2000, FCC began to renew Tech pluses as Technicians. Novices
who passed new Element 2 got Technicians even though they retain HF privs.
Also, Techs who pass Element 1 ("Tech-with-HF") are code-tested and get HF
privs even though FCC isn't issuing new Tech Plus licenses.

End result is that at least some Techs are code tested.

>Was there an increase or decrease?

I dunno. Do some research and present your findings here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

751. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 05:19:45 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a8okth$1gph$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 39973

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
>>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>>news:3CAC7317.BA11EA33@IEEE.org...
>>> N2EY wrote:
>>> > Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
>>> > restructuring is working perfectly?
>>>
>>> Yep, I begin to worry when the ham population starts to decrease.
>>
>>*THAT'S* when we'd better start noting that we may lose some spectrum!
>
>Then start noting.
>
>From
>
>http://www.AH0A.org:
>
>Total US hams, end-of-month:
>
>September 1998 (the minimum in recent history, 20 months before restructuring):
>672,678
>
>March 2000 (last full month before restructuring):
>677,784
>
>April 2000 (transition month):
>678,539
>
>May 2000 (first full month after restructuring):
>677,349
>
>March 2001 (the maximum in recent history):
>684,359
>
>November 2001: (minimum in past year):
>682,512
>
>March 2002(most recent full month):
>683,180
>
>For those who say the Tech has somehow "kept ham radio afloat", note
>that the number of Techs/Tech Pluses peaked at 338,334 in March 2000

>and has since declined to 319,880.

That's a carefully worded sentence if I ever saw one. To be specific
Tech/Tech+ numbers declined from 338,334 in March 2000 to 319,831
in July 200, a 4 month period, and has been pretty much stable since
then. Given the timing and the fact that it happened all at once, it
is probably the case that most of those hams didn't disappear from the
service but rather upgraded after the removal of the 1b and 1c requirements.
How does Tech upgrading after restructuring relate in any way to the issue
of whether the Tech license "kept ham radio afloat" or not? I don't see
it.

> Note also that in April of 2000 the FCC
>began renewing Tech Pluses as Techs, so the number of Techs is growing from
>three sources (new licenses, Tech Plus renewals, and Novice upgrades) not
>just new licenses.

But we also know that the growth rate of the ARS from 1989 through
March 2001 was effected by two "statistical anomalies" that made the
license expiry rate artificially low (we know this because you said it
a few years ago, though you no longer mention it now), and since
then we've entered a period with an anomalously high rate of license
expiry as the Tech 10-year bubble moves through.

The fact is that the rate of new license issues increased by about
40%, or about 600 new hams per month, since restructuring, and this
has just about balanced the rate at which Tech's let their licenses
expire starting in March 2001. While this has resulted in a small
decline in the numbers I've got to believe it has actually been a net
good for the service. At least some of the hams that got their license
in the last year or two are likely to still be active, while Techs who
let their 10-year-old licenses lapse were probably long gone anyway.

So you'll have to forgive me for thinking that the numbers actually
indicate that restructuring was a modest success, at least initially.
It has apparently attracted new interest in the service at a time
when there are a whole lot of other things to be interested in. The
ARS is no longer the best place for an individual to blab their opinions
to a big audience, there are other places where you can get a far bigger
audience with less investment. It is no longer a cheap replacement for
(mobile) telephone service since the real thing has gotten cheap as dirt.
There's enough other stuff to play with that it isn't surprising that
ARS growth has gone negative. There are fewer and fewer advantages
to the ARS other than the primary one, that it is still one of the best
places to go if what you want to do is build or assemble equipment that
produces RF and put that on the air for the sheer pleasure of doing that,
but if the higher speed code tests really were discouraging 600 new hams
a month with this interest from entering the service, as apparently may
have been the case, it was probably time for the code tests to go. I
do admit the jury's still out over the longer term, however. The codefree
Tech initially had a novelty factor that wore off after a few years.

Not that the numbers game matters all that much. The FCC probably wasn't worried about numbers when they made these changes, and I've never seen anyone from the FCC mention that the future of the ARS depends on it getting larger. What they do keep mentioning is that what hams do matters, so shrinkage due to 10-year-old, novelty Tech licenses lapsing probably doesn't change anything at all since they weren't doing anything anyway. It is up to the people who remain to keep the service healthy by doing stuff to ensure the service continues to be viewed as valuable.

Dennis Ferguson

752. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 05:21:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAFD715.714AB992@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39971

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAF2C48.B4E81A48@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Kim, I don't even use such moronic phrases as, "thinking outside the
> > box".
>
> Dave,
>
> Calling a common phrase such as "thinking outside the box" "moronic"
> illustrates an inability to process abstract concepts ... thus, I guess you
> probalby can't "think outside the box" ... your thought process would appear
> to be constrained to the mundane, familiar, predictable, and uncreative.

I'm certain that you subscribe to and have adopted all the correct buzz words and phrases--witness your frequent references to "legacy modes" as an example. You can "paradigm shift", "impact on" and be "proactive" all you like. Just don't expect that I'll think you extra bright or deep for your use of the terms. There are no new ways of thinking. There is no thinking outside any box. There is only thinking. Thinking may be abstract without building an imaginary box.

You describe the term as "common". Perhaps it is where you live. Many things which are common are also moronic. I've most often heard "thinking outside the box" used by people trying to impress others by hinting that they have somehow learned a new way of putting together thoughts--one without boundaries.

If ever I decide to look for a critique of my thinking processes, you'd be near the bottom of my list of those from whom I'd seek advice. It'd be folly to call upon an individual who thinks he can analyze someone's ability to process abstract concepts based upon a single sentence. My abstract conceptualization is fine.I can improvise a guitar solo to a jazz tune I've heard once. Can you?
>
> >Fools have plenty of time to waste.
>
> I/m sure you would know, Dave ... BTW, how DO you waste all of your time?

I do know, Carl. I've run into a number of fools over the course of 53 years on the planet. I don't waste much of my time other than to respond to you or Leonardo da Andiron on occasion. We know how you've wasted at least some of your time. It only took you a couple of decades to upgrade. Good luck getting your brain back in that box.

Dave K8MN

753. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 05:29:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAFD941.6445E75@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39972

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I just told you that I did not realize that I'd made the typo.
> > >
> > > That could not possibly be true, Dave. I told you about your typo
> > > and reposted your typo a dozen times over a period of five days.
> > > You would have to be blind not to be perfectly aware that you
> > > had made that typo. Yet you continued to deny making it.
> >
> > That's interesting, Cecil. Please point me to the post where you told
> > me about the typo to help sort things out. I don't recall that taking
> > place.
>
> I told you that you had posted "comparting". You denied it. That was
> a lie. Here's the proof.
>
> Dave originally posted:
> > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
>
> > W5DXP said:
> > > Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I.
>
> Dave responded:
> > I never used such a term. (a lie - see above)
>
> W5DXP said:
> > > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > > you know what that makes you.
>
> Dave responded:
> > You have indeed. (A lie since I never subdivided the two items)
>
> W5DXP said:
> > > I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse
> > > testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.
>
> Dave responded:
> > You'll get none from me. I never accused you of subdividing anything.

> > (A lie because "comparting" means "subdividing")
>
> From Websters: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or may
> not be believed true by the speaker" You lied, Dave!

From Dave: He who attempts to play word games as an excuse to call
another a liar is a man with no character.

Dave K8MN

754. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 05:38:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAFDB63.65472DEF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39974

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > How about, "For days you denied using the term 'comparting'"? I never
> > "said" it and have never made deliberate use of the word in my life.
>
> Posting it here is the same thing as saying it, Dave. You continue to lie.
> Here's your original statement.
>
> > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
>
> > For a self-proclaimed wordsmith, your sentence construction can be poor
> > at times.
>
> I'm an engineer, not an English major.

You've boasted of your wordsmithing talents on occasion, have you not?
I also seem to recall you stating that you were a teacher at some point.

> > It is obvious to all but you that I did not realize I'd made a typo.
>
> It doesn't matter if you realized it or not. You were still lying.

1500 miles closer and you'd be walking around with a sore snot bag.

> From
> Webster's: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or may not
> be believed true by the speaker"

See my earlier comment on my view of your character.

> > Again, for the sake of clarity, please point to the post where you said
> > anything like, "Dave, you've made a typo" ...
>
> I didn't know it was a typo since it is a valid word. Should I question
> every valid word that you post? I told you for days that you had accused
> me of comparting, which you did (see above), and you denied it. You were
> lying.

I've already stated that the word "comparting" did not make contextual
sense. I've already stated that each subsequent post used "compare",
"comparing" or "comparison". You knew. To state otherwise it
simply...a lie.

Dave K8MN

755. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 05:45:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CAFDD00.48C6B2DC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39975

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > You knew then that I meant "comparing", not "comparting".
> > >
> > > How would I know that? "Comparting" is a valid word. Am I supposed to
> > > assume that all of your posted words are typos?
> >
> > You'd certainly have realized it in context. My subsequent posts did
> > not include that word but used the terms "compare" and "comparing".
>
> So on top of everything else, you want me to be a mindreader? I told you
> that you had posted the word "comparting" and that accused me of comparting.
> You denied it. You lied.

When did I ask you to become a mindreader? You knew it to be a typo.
To state otherwise now is a lie on your part.
>
> > That is certainly a part of what was posted and you'd have to be a fool
> > to believe that "comparted" is what I meant after my repeated use of
> > "compared" afterward. Yes, "comparted" is a word. It does not make any
> > sense at all in terms of what was being discussed. Again, you'd have to
> > be a fool not to know that. I'll assume that you are not a fool and
> > that this is yet another feeble attempt by you at entertaining yourself.
> > I'd advise caution in calling another a liar.
>
> I can prove that you are a liar in a court of law, Dave.

Please do so, Cecil. Prove me a liar in a court of law and I'll accept
the badge.

> From Websters:
> "lie 1 b: an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or may not be believed
> true by the speaker" This is the second definition from _Webster's_Ninth_New
> _Collegiate Dictionary_.

What does the first definition say, Cecil? You probably know that the
first definition listed is the more typically used.

> You said you didn't use the word comparting. You did.
> You lied. If you deny meeting the above definition of lying, you are lying.

I don't even accept your definition, Cecil.

> > > > Your back pedalling on the items N2EY just called you on are much closer
> > > > to whoppers than what of which you continue to accuse me.
> > >
> > > I haven't back pedaled. The things that N2EY "called" me on simply means
> > > he has on his blinders and is not seeing the big picture. If you have two
> > > investments the sum of which increases by 4%, you are not going to be
> > > happy with both if one investment yields 20% while the other yields -16%.
> >
> > Whoops! You mean you really didn't mean what you stated in the exchange
> > quoted below?
>
> Two was the next natural number up from one. One was false. Thus the "twice".
> I didn't backpedal. "Twice" wasn't never meant to be exact.

In other words, you lied then and are lying now by any dictionary's
definition.

Dave K8MN

756. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 05:49:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8omkh$59j$0@208.207.71.155>
Source record: 39976

K0HB wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Watch the enforcement letters for a few months and see how many are issued
> to
> > hams actually using Morse code.
> >
>
> With all due regard, that's a red-herring, Jim.

Hans, with all the trolling you do here, and all your "mucking around
in boats" on your share of the 10K lakes up there when they aren't
frozen, seems you're a second cousin to a red herring.

>
> The same can be said for those "actually using" RTTY, SSTV, ATV, PSK31, or
> whatever.
>

Of course, both of them (relatively speaking).

> If a person wants to be a bad actor, they want the largest possible
> audience. That audience is most conveniently and broadly available on voice
> modes, and has no relation to what other modes the operator might be
> trained, equipped, and capable in.
>

Maybe that's why Jim said "it's not the test, its the USE of Morse
code"!

> Check out some of the cesspool-QRG's on 80M and 20M -- all those clowns are
> Morse tested.

At least they got credit for passing a test. There are an unknown "many"
licensed hams who got their code test credit by various nefarous means.

Did you ever know a ham who had trouble with the code who "went away"
and came back with a full coded license? It's not that uncommon.

757. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 05:56:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8on1l$59j$1@208.207.71.155>
Source record: 39977

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> From Dave: He who attempts to play word games as an excuse to call
> another a liar is a man with no character.

Boy you pretty much nailed that one.

758. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 08:07:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8oun6$q5j$0@208.207.71.155>
Source record: 39978

Dick Carroll wrote:
>

> >
> > 2) Val's "re-positioning amateur radio" sounds a LOT like
> > some bad, retro, time-warp, "back to the future" theme ...
> >
>
> Well, so much for you clowns and your thirst for "new blood" into the
> ARS.
> While you warmly welcome the most shifty-eyed denizen of the nether
> regions above 27 MhZ with open arms, when comes a newbie with some
> actual knowledge and even a bit of experience from looking over his ham
> neighbors shoulder for years, and who espouses some novel ideas for
> improving the Service not heard before, you set the hounds to him.
> Whatta bunch of lightweights.

And to top it all, he's a NO-CODE TECH!!!

759. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 12:43:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB03F09.5FA22188@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39979

Mike Coslo wrote:
> I'm amazed in this thread that we have actually had people stand up for
> poor design as if it were a mark of superior content, via the "if they
> spend time on design, they take it away from content!!! Or "if they pay
> an art director" (or apparently an illustrator) "they steal from" (pick
> your choice) "which is much more important."

Why on earth would someone want an amateur radio magazine to look
professional? Wouldn't that be false advertising?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

760. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 12:51:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB040D6.14FA16F7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39980

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <a8mto7$n4s$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Another of the 50s/60s celebrity hams was
> >Arthur Godfrey. Also we had Barry Goldwater carrying our
> >message.
>
> Let us also remember Jean Shepard, K2ORS ("You'll shoot your
> eye out, kid!!")

Also the lady C&W singer whose name slips my mind at the moment.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

761. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 12:57:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB04240.842C7439@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39981

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Jim, how many coded hams were there in 1990?
>
> All of them.
>
> >How many coded hams were there in 2000?
>
> Impossible to say.

Impossible to estimate? How many hams were not nocode techs in 2000.

> >Was there an increase or decrease?
>
> I dunno. Do some research and present your findings here.

Where can I find the numbers?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

762. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 13:01:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB04318.B502E61F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39982

Dave Heil wrote:
> You describe the term as "common". Perhaps it is where you live. Many
> things which are common are also moronic. I've most often heard
> "thinking outside the box" used by people trying to impress others by
> hinting that they have somehow learned a new way of putting together
> thoughts--one without boundaries.

Galileo is an example of thinking outside the box. In that case,
the box was the earth which the clergy thought was the center
of the universe.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

763. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 13:02:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB04361.23107953@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39983

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > From Websters: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or may
> > not be believed true by the speaker" You lied, Dave!
>
> From Dave: He who attempts to play word games as an excuse to call
> another a liar is a man with no character.

Leg pullers have no character?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

764. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 13:06:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB04441.E7283507@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39984

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I'm an engineer, not an English major.
>
> I also seem to recall you stating that you were a teacher at some point.

Math teacher, not an English teacher.

> I've already stated that the word "comparting" did not make contextual
> sense.

But why did you wait so long to say that? My reputation could have been
ruined in the meanwhile by your delaying tactics.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

765. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 13:12:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB045DB.7B6967E4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39985

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> When did I ask you to become a mindreader? You knew it to be a typo.
> To state otherwise now is a lie on your part.

How was I supposed to know it was a typo since you kept denying that you
had made a typo?

> What does the first definition say, Cecil? You probably know that the
> first definition listed is the more typically used.

Yep, but that wasn't the definition I was using. Are you suggesting that
r.r.a.p postings be limited to only the first definitions?

> I don't even accept your definition, Cecil.

Well then, you don't accept the English language. What language are you going
to post in from now on?

> In other words, you lied then and are lying now by any dictionary's
> definition.

Not only do you want to limit definitions to the first definition in the
dictionary but you also want to outlaw figures of speech?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

766. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 13:15:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0465E.45759CAA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39986

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> > Check out some of the cesspool-QRG's on 80M and 20M -- all those clowns are
> > Morse tested.
>
> At least they got credit for passing a test. There are an unknown "many"
> licensed hams who got their code test credit by various nefarous means.
>
> Did you ever know a ham who had trouble with the code who "went away"
> and came back with a full coded license? It's not that uncommon.

Many of the troublemakers went away to the FCC office and came back
with a coded license just like you and I did.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

767. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 13:16:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB046C2.886A6544@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39987

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > From Dave: He who attempts to play word games as an excuse to call
> > another a liar is a man with no character.
>
> Boy you pretty much nailed that one.

Don't you think it's time for you guys to put your legs back in the
sockets and get on with your lives?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

768. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 13:33:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB04ABC.D08F5766@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39988

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Two was the next natural number up from one. One was false. Thus the "twice".
> > I didn't backpedal. "Twice" wasn't never meant to be exact.
>
> In other words, you lied then and are lying now by any dictionary's
> definition.

Nope, I asked a rhetorical question. How could a rhetorical question
possibly be lying? Here's what I said:

"Wouldn't it be better to have double the number of emergency operators
available even if they don't know Morse code?"

Please point out the lie. I didn't say there would be twice the number
of emergency operators. I simply asked a rhetorical question. You are
still lying.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

769. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 13:48:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB04E29.9A4989F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39989

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > Wouldn't it be better to have double the number of emergency operators
> > available even if they don't know Morse code?
> >
> Did the reduction in code test requirements to the bare minimum two years ago,
> or the elimination of the code test for Technicians 11 years ago give us twice
> the number of emergency operators?

Jim, I wanted to repost this interchange to show you exactly how mistaken
you are if you think I stated that eliminating the code test would double
the number of emergency operators. I merely asked a rhetorical question
and you later jumped to an irrational conclusion. Now Dave is accusing
me of lying about the erroneous conclusion to which you jumped. Are you
guys members of a tag team?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

770. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 13:59:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB050DC.969DC643@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39990

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CACD1E1.D77DD311@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> Did the reduction in code test requirements to the bare minimum two years
> >>ago, or the elimination of the code test for Technicians 11 years ago give us
> >>twice the number of emergency operators?
> >
> >"Twice" was just a talking point.
>
> You said we'd have twice as many. Now you backpedal.

I certainly did not say that, Jim, so I have no reason to backpedal. I would
appreciate it if you would stop misquoting me and making false statements.
I simply asked a rhetorical question. How could a rhetorical question be
taken as a statement on anything? Here's the rhetorical question that I asked:

"Wouldn't it be better to have double the number of emergency operators
available even if they don't know Morse code?"

Please point out where I said "we'd have twice as many". You often get into
trouble by inferring false things from questions. Seems you would learn.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

771. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:03:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cafd39b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39968

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:hWHr8.20937$nt1.1717821@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote
>
> >
> > As far as using it on the air ... "You should live so long."
> >
>
> And here we thought it was all about *testing* -- silly us!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Hans,

Just because I don't have any intention of using Morse doesn't mean I mind if anyone else does ... in fact, I've said that many times.

Carl - wk3c

772. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:05:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CmYr8.5143$qO5.1013040315@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39991

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406225717.21793.00000972@mb-ch.aol.com...

> Dave:
>
> Incorrect. This attention is exactly what *Kim* wants.

And Larry wants to please Kim's every wish and fantasy.

773. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:14:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <OuYr8.5146$KZ5.1013767312@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39992

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAFD715.714AB992@earthlink.net...

> I can improvise a guitar solo to a
> jazz tune I've heard once. Can you?

> Dave K8MN

Was that you doing that "dueling banjos" thing about 30 years ago? Scary
stuff.

Brian

774. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:15:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <RvYr8.5147$7Z5.1013727271@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39993

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406225718.21793.00000974@mb-ch.aol.com...

> Kim:
>
> Don't look now, but Dick and I are *not* "Nickle Extras."

Nope, you're Two-bit Extras. Get used to it.

Brian

775. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:20:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8pkof$4j0$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39996

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:a8okth$1gph$1@heap.juniper.net...
> N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> >>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >>news:3CAC7317.BA11EA33@IEEE.org...
> >>> N2EY wrote:
> >>> > Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
> >>> > restructuring is working perfectly?
> >>>
> >>> Yep, I begin to worry when the ham population starts to decrease.
> >>
> >>*THAT'S* when we'd better start noting that we may lose some spectrum!
> >
> >Then start noting.
> >
> >From
> >
> >http://www.AH0A.org:
> >
> >Total US hams, end-of-month:
> >
> >September 1998 (the minimum in recent history, 20 months before
restructuring):
> >672,678
> >
> >March 2000 (last full month before restructuring):
> >677,784
> >
> >April 2000 (transition month):
> >678,539
> >
> >May 2000 (first full month after restructuring):
> >677,349
> >
> >March 2001 (the maximum in recent history):
> >684,359
> >
> >November 2001: (minimum in past year):
> >682,512
> >
> >March 2002(most recent full month):
> >683,180

> >
> >For those who say the Tech has somehow "kept ham radio afloat", note
> >that the number of Techs/Tech Pluses peaked at 338,334 in March 2000
> >and has since declined to 319,880.
>
> That's a carefully worded sentence if I ever saw one. To be specific
> Tech/Tech+ numbers declined from 338,334 in March 2000 to 319,831
> in July 200, a 4 month period, and has been pretty much stable since
> then.

That 4 month period did, as Dennis states below, see many
upgrades of coded techs direct to General during the April-July
2000 period. The tech upgrades fell into three catagories:

1. Paper upgrades of techs licensed prior to 1987. All they
needed was proof of having the license prior to ' (exact date
escapes me) and they simply were upgraded upon application
at any post 4/15 VE session.

2. Written test only upgrades of coded techs that only needed to
pass the General written element. Many took and obtained the CSCE
for the credit and then simply upgraded post 4/15/00 and others
continued to do it since then...with a spurt of such upgrades
happening 4/00 to 7/00.

> Given the timing and the fact that it happened all at once, it
> is probably the case that most of those hams didn't disappear from the
> service but rather upgraded after the removal of the 1b and 1c
requirements.
> How does Tech upgrading after restructuring relate in any way to the issue
> of whether the Tech license "kept ham radio afloat" or not? I don't see
> it.
>
> > Note also that in April of 2000 the
FCC
> >began renewing Tech Pluses as Techs, so the number of Techs is growing
from
> >three sources (new licenses, Tech Plus renewals, and Novice upgrades) not
> >just new licenses.
>
> But we also know that the growth rate of the ARS from 1989 through
> March 2001 was effected by two "statistical anomalies" that made the
> license expiry rate artificially low (we know this because you said it
> a few years ago, though you no longer mention it now), and since
> then we've entered a period with an anomalously high rate of license
> expiry as the Tech 10-year bubble moves through.
>
> The fact is that the rate of new license issues increased by about
> 40%, or about 600 new hams per month, since restructuring, and this
> has just about balanced the rate at which Tech's let their licenses
> expire starting in March 2001. While this has resulted in a small

> decline in the numbers I've got to believe it has actually been a net
> good for the service. At least some of the hams that got their license
> in the last year or two are likely to still be active, while Techs who
> let their 10-year-old licenses lapse were probably long gone anyway.
>
> So you'll have to forgive me for thinking that the numbers actually
> indicate that restructuring was a modest success, at least initially.
> It has apparently attracted new interest in the service at a time
> when there are a whole lot of other things to be interested in. The
> ARS is no longer the best place for an individual to blab their opinions
> to a big audience, there are other places where you can get a far bigger
> audience with less investment. It is no longer a cheap replacement for
> (mobile) telephone service since the real thing has gotten cheap as dirt.
> There's enough other stuff to play with that it isn't surprising that
> ARS growth has gone negative. There are fewer and fewer advantages
> to the ARS other than the primary one, that it is still one of the best
> places to go if what you want to do is build or assemble equipment that
> produces RF and put that on the air for the sheer pleasure of doing that,
> but if the higher speed code tests really were discouraging 600 new hams
> a month with this interest from entering the service, as apparently may
> have been the case, it was probably time for the code tests to go. I
> do admit the jury's still out over the longer term, however. The codefree
> Tech initially had a novelty factor that wore off after a few years.
>
> Not that the numbers game matters all that much. The FCC probably wasn't
> worried about numbers when they made these changes, and I've never seen
> anyone from the FCC mention that the future of the ARS depends on it
> getting larger. What they do keep mentioning is that what hams do
matters,
> so shrinkage due to 10-year-old, novelty Tech licenses lapsing probably
> doesn't change anything at all since they weren't doing anything anyway.
> It is up to the people who remain to keep the service healthy by doing
> stuff to ensure the service continues to be viewed as valuable.

Agree.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

776. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:22:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ZCYr8.5151$t96.1014522018@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39995

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8omkh$59j$0@208.207.71.155...
>
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > Check out some of the cesspool-QRG's on 80M and 20M -- all those clowns
are
> > Morse tested.
>
> At least they got credit for passing a test.

NOT an acceptable answer. Its not OK to create a cesspool just because they
are code tested. Ever.

777. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:24:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <AEYr8.5154$va6.1014589539@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39997

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CAFB3BC.732D113A@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > Are there more than one FISTS site? It definitely looked different than
the
> > last time I looked.
>
> There's an American page and a European page if I remember right.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Well, no ones calling me a liar. They're just remaining silent, other than
saying its not there now.

Brian

778. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:27:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aHYr8.5157$0g6.1014949900@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39998

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8ogpd$i40$0@208.207.71.169...

> Well, so much for you clowns and your thirst for "new blood" into the
> ARS.
> While you warmly welcome the most shifty-eyed denizen of the nether
> regions above 27 MhZ with open arms, when comes a newbie with some
> actual knowledge and even a bit of experience from looking over his ham
> neighbors shoulder for years, and who espouses some novel ideas for
> improving the Service not heard before, you set the hounds to him.
> Whatta bunch of lightweights.

You think Val's not a CBer?

779. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:39:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8pm0trcr1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40000

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uau125mqtkjrc5@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >ROTFLMAO!
>
> Not even a GOOD try from you. Sad, really.
>
> >It's been my "signing" mode since the day this
> >newsgroup was started. As for "lack of class" from
> >you, you're not the first and you certainly aren't
> >likly to be the last around here...so there's no need
> >for me to get used to it from you. Indeed, the
> >non-class type of comment you spouted states much
> >about your attitudes.
>
> Well, gee, whiz, I'm really impressed -- NOT. And, no,
> I don't think I'm the first, or the last, to see BS and hot
> air for what it is. There are exactly TWO people on
> this list who are currently producing messages that
> might have some value and interest.

Are we to believe that is you and ???. Do you ever
make a complete statement as to details. Just who are those two
people...or does everyone have to guess?

> Guess what,
> YOU ain't either one of 'em. Let's see something
> from you of VALUE, or INSIGHT, or even WIT!

I sure don't post to satisfy any criteria as to what YOU
might consider to be value, insight or wit.

> See that pedal on the floor, the clutch to the transmission
> of what's left of your brain? Depress it, engage the
> mechanism, PRODUCE some THOUGHT that might
> be of some value to somebody, or even to HAM RADIO,
> and then WRITE it BELOW!

Orders from the royal keyboard of Val?

> Your long-valued avocation seems to be IN TROUBLE

It (ham radio) is in trouble??? Perhaps you can
tell us WHY you believe that? Your spiel is nothing

new and has been rolled out by some hams everytime
rules, regs or technology of ham radio has changed.

> and I'm trying to HELP OUT, even if it means pissing
> off guys like you, who seem to have very little clue as to
> exactly, or even fuzzily, what's wrong!

You are right as to not having a clue as to what is
wrong. I guess your joining the fold will fix everything
that's wrong...if and when you once tell us just
what is wrong in the first place.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

780. The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:39:48 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub0lg34qc3gu76@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39994

The End of "Amateur" Radio?

I am looking as I write this at the "house ad" on page 130 of the current issue of QST. It is headlined "YOU'RE INVITED" and as you look at it you are naturally inclined to ask yourself, "to what?" Well, you're being "invited" to "increase the impact of amateur radio and to insure its future" through the "Education and Technology Program," the Big Project, that was written of in the March issue as being of major, if not VAST, importance. Now, I had the impression that there was a real sense of urgency here, and that the ball was ready to ROLL! But, no, we're just getting off the ground, and not only that, all the ARRL wants from us is our money.

As you look at the ad in question, placed at the back of the magazine, at the bottom left of the double truck, opposite an equipment ad that totally dominates it, you see a circular image, what I interpret as the patch-to-be for this project. In that patch, is seems to me, are encapsulated many the internal problems facing "amateur radio" right now. So, I'll begin my discussion with that patch.

It is headlined, in Big Type, "Amateur Radio."

Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO ONE wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur." I say this knowing full well the long and honored history of "amateurs" in many fields, and the origin and meaning of the word. But none of that matters. "AMATEUR" has to GO!

In a couple of weeks I am going to be speaking to a lot of people about "amateur radio" without ever using that expression. No, I'm going to be speaking to people about the things they can DO with radio, fascinating things, educational things, for a relatively small amount of money. I am going to be stressing the links between radio and the computer, and the InterNet, because almost everyone who will come to our event, at an "upscale" high school, WILL have a computer, for SURE, and that computer will be hooked to the net. The key is the initial VISUAL impact, backed up with enthusiasm and a brief look at some activities and equipment. This is how I have been doing astronomy programs for about 20 years, and how, in part, I re-built the local astronomy club.

Very briefly, I joined this group about twenty-five years ago, immediately after it had lost both of its leaders, one to an accident and one to a terrible disease. So, when I joined, the club was doing very little other than maintaining itself. By 1982, I had become president of this group and was able to encourage the membership to show up for public "star parties" at local high schools and other locations. We did the first ones twenty years ago this spring. We now have our own remote site and observatory, plus a continuing presence in print, on the radio and on television. Our

membership is about double what it was when I joined and is very active and involved. We're able to raise money. In short, I am proud of what I have helped to vis-�-vis astronomy here in Columbia and look forward to helping with radio in a similar way. We'll see.

In any event, one of the things that truly helps that initial impression is a powerful and positive "point-of-purchase" display. That display has to STOP people and then when they stop, it has to SPEAK to them, visually, in a POWERFUL way. What the heck does the current "Big Project" patch SAY to people who "stop to look at it?":

It says, first and foremost: AMATEUR RADIO! Then it doesn't say much else, really, since the arcane and indecipherable (to the public) ARRL logo is THE BIGGEST THING IN IT, visually speaking. So, really, what' the BIG PROJECT all about? Well, it's about the ARRL, that's what! LOOK at that logo, on page 130 of the current QST! What are you getting out of it, visually? If you're the public -- ZIP! For that matter, if your a radio amateur, you getting just about zip.

What would that patch look like if I were designing it? Well, the center image would NOT be some impossible for (the public) to understand logo. No, the center image would evoke something, and therefore be ONE image, not the over-complicated hodge-podge you in fact see. For instance, something that immediately comes to MY mind is a silhouette image of a young person in a learning situation (seated, with a book, perhaps), and then one other artifact in the image, a RADIO artifact. And that's IT! The blurb at the top of the patch could say almost ANYTHING other than "AMATEUR RADIO." That is SO bad it is NOT worth talking about. The blurb could be just an acronym, if the center image was powerful enough. I would crank up something like "ARRL * ETP * ARRL" or, gee, ANYTHING else, and then a slogan at the bottom: "RADIO FOR EVERYONE" or something. The object is to ENGAGE people, not CONFUSE them.

Folks, Ham Radio needs a media consultant, a good one, BAD!

Val
KC0MUB

781. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:40:39 UTC
From: Bill w <billw@lead.comspaM>
Message-ID: <HTYr8.269137$Gf.24730861@bin2.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 39999

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA93E28.63A00321@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > ... this marginal growth
> > trend will not increase, and it will, in fact, turn into a downward
> > spiral all too soon.
>
> What ever happened to all those hordes of CBers who were
> predicted to overrun the ARS?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Oh there a comin Cecil, a whole group in my area just got Amatuer licenses
if they act the same as they do on the CB amatuer radio is in a world of
trouble.

782. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:42:58 UTC
From: Bill w <billw@lead.comspaM>
Message-ID: <SVYr8.38099$w7.3455348@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 40051

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a8dtt8aop1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a8bi3dnga1@208.206.142.88...
>
>
> Why Dick, you're shouting.
>
> One more time....If they are here already, just where
> are they all hiding?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Take a good look at rec.radio.cb and you will see how many CBers / Hams that are there. You will also be treated to how they still operate illegally.

783. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 14:53:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8pmmg$i04$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40053

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3caf1af7_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a8mto7$n4s$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > Not sure that some of your comments above weren't a bit
> > "tongue-in-cheek", but never-the-less Larry, well said!
> > Another of the 50s/60s celebrity hams was
> > Arthur Godfrey. Also we had Barry Goldwater carrying our
> > message. If celebrity endorsements work for the vast
> > variety of stuff sold, why not amateur radio too.
> >
> > Cheers (hope that cheers doesn't offend you :-)
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> You folks gripe and complain about the ARS "going away," about spectrum
> "disappearing," and so on to ad nauseum. Yet, what have any of you done
> lately to get the word out about the service? OH GOSH...I FORGOT...that's
> the job of the ARRL and of the actors and politicians in this world.
GOSH,
> no way no how could you get a spot on the council meetings of your city
and
> speak up for ham radio...

I served on my "city council" for 12 years and took every
opportunity I could to market ham radio.

> no way could you mention ham radio every chance you
> get at work,

Been there, done that.

> now way could you get hold of scouting and church youth
> organizations and show off ham radio, no way could you go to local stores
> and see if you can hand out some brochures on ham radio...

Kim, For wat its worth, I have also had letters to my local newspaper
every year thanking the area hams that help with our annual memorial
day parade of which my wife and I have been co-chairs for over
15 years. Through my efforts, we have a local town races group that has
its own dedicated space in a former police dispatcher room.
I am a scouting radio merit badge councelor and have done
demos with scout groups. That's just afew items.

> No way could any of you come up with anything else TO DO, other than sit
> around and wait for the next *famous* person to do it.

The "famous person" is but ONE way.
I simply added some names to the discussion that
Larry opened

> You know what? If
> you guys are so impressed with these famous people,

I could care less about those people...the discussion
centers on pointing others that are NOT already
hams to the fact that there are some "famous" people
that they may not even know are hams. I don't
need to be shown, I'm already in ham radio.

> then learn from them--do
> what you think they should do for the ARS. YOURSELVES!!

You are presuming, incorrectly. that we don't already.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

784. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 15:09:19 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub0n73f2ojsv08@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40052

N2EY wrote :a reasonable reply to my original message.

I've had my say on this and am perfectly sanguine with
nature taking its course. I have just put one more message
on this board, about the "Big Project" and its promotional
material, and that's about all I'm going to say about that.
Rolling large stones uphill is NOT something I want to do
long term. In general, about five or six weeks is quite enough.

As for joining the League, my check is on its way. I guess
I'll just have to tear off the covers right at the mailbox!

Val
KC0MUB

P.S. I've seen a LOT of QST covers, nearly all pretty bad,
over the last five or six years. We DO have a library here.

**

785. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 15:14:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB06266.24999C46@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40055

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> > Kim:
> > Don't look now, but Dick and I are *not* "Nickle Extras."
>
> Nope, you're Two-bit Extras. Get used to it.

Actually, they are 1.6-bit Extras. Two-bits is 25, not 20.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

786. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 15:15:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8po02$1fm$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40056

"Bill w" <billw@lead.comspaM> wrote in message
news:SVYr8.38099$w7.3455348@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a8dtt8aop1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:a8bi3dnga1@208.206.142.88...
> >
> >
> > Why Dick, you're shouting.
> >
> > One more time....If they are here already, just where
> > are they all hiding?
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Take a good look at rec.radio.cb and you will see how
> many CBers / Hams that are there.

So? That proves nothing regarding what anyone does as
a ham. No license needed for rec.radio.cb is there?

> You will also be treated to how they still operate illegally.

Not to condone illegal operation...BUT...if that illegal
operation isn't impacting hams or ham bands, then what's
the point? Dick claimed there are these bad people (CBers
and others) that have infiltrated amateur radio...yet he
offers no examples...nor does the r.r.cb offer any
example either.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

787. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 15:19:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB06380.30FBE5E9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40057

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > There's an American page and a European page if I remember right.
>
> Well, no ones calling me a liar. They're just remaining silent, other than
> saying its not there now.

www.fists.org and www.asel.demon.co.uk/fists-hq/
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

788. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 15:21:19 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub0nto3a66lm86@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40054

Clay N4AOX wrote:

>Hi Val,
>Better be careful about showing any QST / ARRL copied
>or related material in public. The Newington bunch might
>send one of their legal attack dogs after you for violating
>their copyright, trademark, etc. ;-0

I don't think I'll be using ANY material from ARRL, not when I've got Annapolis working for me! No, I'll be sticking with material from sites that are TRULY interested in engaging the public. Ain't THAT a heck of a note!

Val
KC0MUB

789. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 15:22:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0642D.3719821D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40058

Valentine Germann wrote:
> As for joining the League, my check is on its way. I guess
> I'll just have to tear off the covers right at the mailbox!

Is that what you do with your books?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

790. FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 15:24:52 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <8xZr8.548$Ku6.199123135@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40059

Can someone explain how a Technician class license holder is able to set up a repeater network or auxiliary stations? Each aux station would be a different individual with a unique call sign I assume, however my question is mainly about broadcast location. Are operators limited to broadcasting only from the address indicated on FCC license? An example would be where the FCC indicates operator "KABCD" lives in Los Angeles and operator "KEFGH" lives in Hollywood, but other information such as QRZ and other websites indicate that these two call signs (and others) are repeating in a closed/private status and that the locations are not Los Angeles and Hollywood, but somewhere else such as Pasadena and Santa Monica. I'd appreciate any help as I'm new to this. Thanks.

DL

791. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:03:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb07047_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40062

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAF2B58.F086928D@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CAE9313.F6B67F7@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > I brought it up over your supposed "typo". A typo is a typo for
you
> > but
> > > > > a lie for me by your definition.
> > > >
> > > > One more time. Everyone makes typos. You are the only person I have
> > > > ever known who lied for days denying that you had even made a typo
> > > > while it was being pointed out to you in every posting.
> > >
> > > You knew then that I meant "comparing", not "comparting". In every
> > > response to you, I used the words "comparing", "compare" or
"compared".
> > > I did not lie about anything. For you to continue your silly
> > > accusations makes you look small.
> > >
> >
> > I don't know about Cecil looking small. However, you look pretty
ridiculous
> > to keep responding.
>
> Oh, I don't know, Tugboat. I think you take top honors since you aren't
> involved.
>
> Dave K8MN

Well, see, there ya go again thinking you're a man on an island. First, I
did make posts to the original round of this, second, I participate in
this newsgroup. You're wrong twice...

Kim W5TIT

792. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:04:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb0709d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40063

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CAF2C48.B4E81A48@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CAE97B2.8F071C42@earthlink.net...
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > I wouldn't have achieved many of the things I have if I hadn't met a
> > dare,
> > > > from teachers, clergy, friends, bosses, co-workers, etc. To dare
and be
> > > > dared is to live.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > Izzat right? I've never had a teacher, clergyman or boss dare me to
do
> > > anything. "Friends" and co-workers will often dare one to do
something
> > > stupid while keeping a safe distance. They can often be heard saying
> > > afterward, "I can't believe he was stupid enough to do that". Sorry,
I
> > > can't buy into your Rod McKuen-ism.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave, you don't strike me at all as a person who does much thinking
outside
> > the box at all...so it doesn't surprise that you've never been dared, or
> > challenged. You're probably quite predictable. If the outcome is
already
> > known, why would anyone waste their time or effort with you?
>
> Kim, I don't even use such moronic phrases as, "thinking outside the
> box". To do something on a dare does not mean that you are doing any
> "thinking outside the box". I did not say that I had never been issued a
> dare. I stated that I'd never been dared by a teacher, a clergyman or a
> boss. I am quite predictable in that I don't do something because some
> fool dares me to do it. Fools have plenty of time to waste.
>
> Dave K8MN

Cough Yeah, cool. That and the silver spoon will get you through life as
though you lived in the closet, but perfectly in the closet.

Kim W5TIT

793. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:07:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb07123$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40064

Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3caf3303$1_1@news7.fast.net...
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAF2C48.B4E81A48@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Kim, I don't even use such moronic phrases as, "thinking outside the
> > box".
>
> Dave,
>
> Calling a common phrase such as "thinking outside the box" "moronic"
> illustrates an inability to process abstract concepts ... thus, I guess
you
> probalby can't "think outside the box" ... your thought process would
appear
> to be constrained to the mundane, familiar, predictable, and uncreative.
>
> >Fools have plenty of time to waste.
>
> I/m sure you would know, Dave ... BTW, how DO you waste all of your time?
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
>

Dave has a book on life, probably handed down for several generations now.
It tells him exactly how to think, what is bad, what is good, and makes
things a whole lot simpler than determining his own thoughts. Maybe he's
got the blueprint...the rest of us have the design.

Kim W5TIT

794. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:08:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb0718e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40065

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uauj645v1i5t84@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Richard McCollum:
>
> >Don't overestimate your importance
>
> I'm not important; I'm an irritant, an irritant
> combined with an agitator. That's "A-I".
>
> Man, what a third-rate newsgroup this is
> about 90 percent of the time. But then, I
> guess they ALL are, aren't they?
>
> Val
> KC0MUB
>
> P.S. Care to pat me on the head?
>
> **
>

Awwww, looky here. Looky here at Little Dickie's protoge... Dick, didn't you train the CB outta Val yet?

Kim W5TIT

795. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:09:30 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <_a_r8.24007$ml2.1886154@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40060

Val,

Did you send this jeremiad to someone who has influence in the matter, like your Division Director?

In case it slipped your mind, I've done so for you.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> The End of "Amateur" Radio?
>
> I am looking as I write this at the "house ad" on page 130 of the current
> issue of QST. It is headlined "YOU'RE INVITED" and as you look at it you
> are naturally inclined to ask yourself, "to what?" Well, you're being
> "invited" to "increase the impact of amateur radio and to insure its future"
> through the "Education and Technology Program," the Big Project, that was
> written of in the March issue as being of major, if not VAST, importance.
> Now, I had the impression that there was a real sense of urgency here, and
> that the ball was ready to ROLL! But, no, we're just getting off the
> ground, and not only that, all the ARRL wants from us is our money.
>
> As you look at the ad in question, placed at the back of the magazine, at
> the bottom left of the double truck, opposite an equipment ad that totally
> dominates it, you see a circular image, what I interpret as the patch-to-be
> for this project. In that patch, is seems to me, are encapsulated many the
> internal problems facing "amateur radio" right now. So, I'll begin my
> discussion with that patch.
>
> It is headlined, in Big Type, "Amateur Radio."
>
> Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO ONE
> wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur." I say this knowing full well
> the long and honored history of "amateurs" in many fields, and the origin
> and meaning of the word. But none of that matters. "AMATEUR" has to GO!
>
> In a couple of weeks I am going to be speaking to a lot of people about

> "amateur radio" without ever using that expression. No, I'm going to be
> speaking to people about the things they can DO with radio, fascinating
> things, educational things, for a relatively small amount of money. I am
> going to be stressing the links between radio and the computer, and the
> InterNet, because almost everyone who will come to our event, at an
> "upscale" high school, WILL have a computer, for SURE, and that computer
> will be hooked to the net. The key is the initial VISUAL impact, backed
up
> with enthusiasm and a brief look at some activities and equipment. This
is
> how I have been doing astronomy programs for about 20 years, and how, in
> part, I re-built the local astronomy club.
>
> Very briefly, I joined this group about twenty-five years ago, immediately
> after it had lost both of its leaders, one to an accident and one to a
> terrible disease. So, when I joined, the club was doing very little other
> than maintaining itself. By 1982, I had become president of this group
and
> was able to encourage the membership to show up for public "star parties"
at
> local high schools and other locations. We did the first ones twenty
years
> ago this spring. We now have our own remote site and observatory, plus a
> continuing presence in print, on the radio and on television. Our
> membership is about double what it was when I joined and is very active
and
> involved. We're able to raise money. In short, I am proud of what I have
> helped to vis-�-vis astronomy here in Columbia and look forward to helping
> with radio in a similar way. We'll see.
>
> In any event, one of the things that truly helps that initial impression
is
> a powerful and positive "point-of-purchase" display. That display has to
> STOP people and then when they stop, it has to SPEAK to them, visually, in
a
> POWERFUL way. What the heck does the current "Big Project" patch SAY to
> people who "stop to look at it?":
>
> It says, first and foremost: AMATEUR RADIO! Then it doesn't say much
else,
> really, since the arcane and indecipherable (to the public) ARRL logo is
THE
> BIGGEST THING IN IT, visually speaking. So, really, what' the BIG PROJECT

> all about? Well, it's about the ARRL, that's what! LOOK at that logo, on
> page 130 of the current QST! What are you getting out of it, visually?
If
> you're the public -- ZIP! For that matter, if your a radio amateur, you
> getting just about zip.

>
> What would that patch look like if I were designing it? Well, the center
> image would NOT be some impossible for (the public) to understand logo.
No,
> the center image would evoke something, and therefore be ONE image, not
the
> over-complicated hodge-podge you in fact see. For instance, something
that
> immediately comes to MY mind is a silhouette image of a young person in a
> learning situation (seated, with a book, perhaps), and then one other
> artifact in the image, a RADIO artifact. And that's IT! The blurb at the
> top of the patch could say almost ANYTHING other than "AMATEUR RADIO."
That
> is SO bad it is NOT worth talking about. The blurb could be just an
> acronym, if the center image was powerful enough. I would crank up
> something like "ARRL * ETP * ARRL" or, gee, ANYTHING else, and then a
slogan
> at the bottom: "RADIO FOR EVERYONE" or something. The object is to ENGAGE
> people, not CONFUSE them.
>
> Folks, Ham Radio needs a media consultant, a good one, BAD!
>
> Val
> KC0MUB
>
>
>
>

796. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:12:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb07252_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40066

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:FvMr8.22758$ml2.1752826@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Gerald Schmitt" <KK5YY@arrl.net> wrote
>
> >
> > If you display the hostility you display here I could see how you
> > might not be as well treated.
> >
>
> Hostility? Larry certainly expresses his thoughts openly and
> with a sense of conviction, but I don't ever recall any personal
> hostility in his writing.
>
> While such personalization is not uncommon on rrap, I don't
> recall K3LT being party to it.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

This is your best joke yet, Hans...

Kim W5TIT

797. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:14:34 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <8352b1f1c65fe3995f5e8b76c35d936b.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40061

Not having set up a bunch of repeaters, I feel unqualified to answer;
however, here is a neat URL for the 'megaplex' repeater system here
in Rochester, NY, that links 10, 6, 2, 220, 440, etc. etc. ...
Please note that as a technician class license holder, you could not
set up a machine on 10 ...
http://www.frontiernet.net/~mje/n2hjd.html
Enjoy!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:8xZr8.548$Ku6.199123135@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...

> Can someone explain how a Technician class license holder is able to set up
> a repeater network or auxiliary stations? I'd
> appreciate any help as I'm new to this. Thanks.
>
> DL

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

798. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:15:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb0730f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40067

Psssst, Val became a ham just so he could be an upgraded CB agitator kinda guy...

Kim W5TIT

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3CAFB706.4A22E560@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I just told you that I did not realize that I'd made the typo.
> > >
> > > That could not possibly be true, Dave. I told you about your typo
> > > and reposted your typo a dozen times over a period of five days.
> > > You would have to be blind not to be perfectly aware that you
> > > had made that typo. Yet you continued to deny making it.
> >
> > That's interesting, Cecil. Please point me to the post where you told
> > me about the typo to help sort things out. I don't recall that taking
> > place.
>
> I told you that you had posted "comparting". You denied it. That was
> a lie. Here's the proof.
>
> Dave originally posted:
> > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
>
> > W5DXP said:
> > > Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I.
>
> Dave responded:
> > I never used such a term. (a lie - see above)
>
> W5DXP said:
> > > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > > you know what that makes you.
>
> Dave responded:
> > You have indeed. (A lie since I never subdivided the two items)
>
> W5DXP said:
> > > I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse

> > > testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.
>
> Dave responded:
> > You'll get none from me. I never accused you of subdividing anything.
> > (A lie because "comparting" means "subdividing")
>
> From Websters: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or may
> not be believed true by the speaker" You lied, Dave!
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

799. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:22:29 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb074c3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40068

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406225715.21793.00000968@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3caf1944_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >>
> > >
> > >Why should those people be any more looked up to than anyone else,
Larry?!
>
> Because they are legitimate celebrities, who have the talent and
> industry connections that could be very useful in publicizing the ARS.
>

Then you have a much rosier opinion of Hollywood than reality.

You wouldn't mean something like the good 'ol movie, Frequency, would you?
Or, oh yeah, not to mention that great ham flic Twister. Those are the two
references I generally get from people now when I am mentioning ham radio.
The first thing I have to do is distance ham radio from either of those--

Movies, movie stars and popularity is not what will advertise ham radio at
its best. Ham radio at its best *is* the home-town individuals who've taken
the time to get out to the local public.

>
> >I think you're
> >probably just looking for more people to put down anyway--you couldn't
care
> >less if anyone joins the hobby.
>
> Well, Kim, if that's what you want to think of me, all I can say is that
> you're absolutely incorrect. I have a very deep concern for the future
> of the ARS -- one which you have not demonstrated so far.
>

You live up to the reputation every day, Larry. And, I'd daresay most
people (I include the silent readers) on this newsgroup, have the same
opinion, Larry--that all you wish to do is set another lair for your
attempts at degrading and humiliating people who choose this hobby.

>
> Another charming comment from Miss Congeniality herself.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah, I'm living up to your expectations, Larry...don't want to disappoint your opnion of yourself...

Kim W5TIT

800. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:25:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb07570_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40069

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406225718.21793.00000974@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3cae8a34_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> > > Why is it any more unlikely than her getting a Tech?
> >> >
> >> > Dick:
> >> >
> >> > Well, I guess I shouldn't say "never," in fact, I'm sure Kim is just
> >> > as capable as anyone of getting her Extra. Perhaps, in my own
> >> > way, I'm providing the encouragement she needs to do so. In
> >> > which case, if she does, it will have been because of me! I have
> >> > no problem with her getting her Nickle Extra. It will just prove
> >> > that anyone can do it.
> >>
> >>
> >> My point exactly.
> >
> >
> >Yeah, you guys did it, so surely anyone can...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Don't look now, but Dick and I are *not* "Nickle Extras." We achieved
> legitimate Amateur Extra-class status under the much more comprehensive
> and challenging Pre-Restructuring licensing requirements, including
> the 13- and/or 20-WPM code tests. Now that the licensing requirements
> have been significantly reduced, what is *your* excuse for not getting
> your "Nickle Extra?" I'm not saying that it is in any way mandatory or
> even expected, but it is certainly within your abilities -- as it was even
> in the Pre-Restructuring Era. Just a thought...
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh, I look, Larry. You need to realize that *anyone* could do what you guys
have done, with more grace and humility than you have in the tip of your
little fingers. Anyone can do what you guys did. However, I'd say that
most people who get their college degrees end up using the degree...

Kim W5TIT

801. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:29:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb0766d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40070

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020406225718.21793.00000974@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3cae8a34_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> > > Why is it any more unlikely than her getting a Tech?
> >> >
> >> > Dick:
> >> >
> >> > Well, I guess I shouldn't say "never," in fact, I'm sure Kim is just
> >> > as capable as anyone of getting her Extra. Perhaps, in my own
> >> > way, I'm providing the encouragement she needs to do so. In
> >> > which case, if she does, it will have been because of me! I have
> >> > no problem with her getting her Nickle Extra. It will just prove
> >> > that anyone can do it.
> >>
> >>
> >> My point exactly.
> >
> >
> >Yeah, you guys did it, so surely anyone can...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Don't look now, but Dick and I are *not* "Nickle Extras." We achieved
> legitimate Amateur Extra-class status under the much more comprehensive
> and challenging Pre-Restructuring licensing requirements, including
> the 13- and/or 20-WPM code tests. Now that the licensing requirements
> have been significantly reduced, what is *your* excuse for not getting
> your "Nickle Extra?" I'm not saying that it is in any way mandatory or
> even expected, but it is certainly within your abilities -- as it was even
> in the Pre-Restructuring Era. Just a thought...
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh, I forgot to answer your really important question, Larry. Why don't I upgrade? Why didn't I upgrade before?! I have no aspirations to going any further. I only got Tech+ for the benefit of our elmers, I tried HF and I don't care for it. So, why in the world would I waste my time getting a license that I'm not going to use? Oh, I forgot...you think studying for a degree and not using it is a great use of time. I don't. So, I also think

it would be a huge waste of time to get a ham radio license which I would never (where never=proportionate amount of total time) use.

And, you're right, my abilities are quite sufficient. My abilities are also far superior to yours in being a much better ham.

Kim W5TIT

802. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:40:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb078ec_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40071

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB04318.B502E61F@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You describe the term as "common". Perhaps it is where you live. Many
> > things which are common are also moronic. I've most often heard
> > "thinking outside the box" used by people trying to impress others by
> > hinting that they have somehow learned a new way of putting together
> > thoughts--one without boundaries.
>
> Galileo is an example of thinking outside the box. In that case,
> the box was the earth which the clergy thought was the center
> of the universe.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

I bet Dave still does...think the Earth is the center of the universe, that
is.

Kim W5TIT

803. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:50:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb07b43_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40072

I don't know about anyone else...but I just can't wait to have Val out there
in the field representing the ARS...

oh yeah...oh buhruther

W5TIT - Kim

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ub0nto3a66lm86@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
> >Hi Val,
> >Better be careful about showing any QST / ARRL copied
> >or related material in public. The Newington bunch might
> >send one of their legal attack dogs after you for violating
> >their copyright, trademark, etc. ;-0
>
> I don't think I'll be using ANY material from ARRL, not when
> I've got Annapolis working for me! No, I'll be sticking with
> material from sites that are TRULY interested in engaging
> the public. Ain't THAT a heck of a note!
>
> Val
> KC0MUB
>
>

804. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:55:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb07c92_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40074

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ub0n73f2ojsv08@corp.supernews.com...
>
> N2EY wrote :a reasonable reply to my original message.
>
> I've had my say on this and am perfectly sanguine with
> nature taking its course. I have just put one more message
> on this board, about the "Big Project" and its promotional
> material, and that's about all I'm going to say about that.
> Rolling large stones uphill is NOT something I want to do
> long term. In general, about five or six weeks is quite enough.
>
> As for joining the League, my check is on its way. I guess
> I'll just have to tear off the covers right at the mailbox!
>
> Val
> KC0MUB
>
> P.S. I've seen a LOT of QST covers, nearly all pretty bad,
> over the last five or six years. We DO have a library here.
>
> **
>

Val, it really concerns me that, despite these big, bad covers and this newsgroup, you still saw fit to join the hobby. There is probably a support group out there somewhere for you...

Kim W5TIT

805. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 16:58:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb07d3b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40075

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:aHYr8.5157$0g6.1014949900@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a8ogpd$i40$0@208.207.71.169...
>
> > Well, so much for you clowns and your thirst for "new blood" into the
> > ARS.
> > While you warmly welcome the most shifty-eyed denizen of the nether
> > regions above 27 MhZ with open arms, when comes a newbie with some
> > actual knowledge and even a bit of experience from looking over his ham
> > neighbors shoulder for years, and who espouses some novel ideas for
> > improving the Service not heard before, you set the hounds to him.
> > Whatta bunch of lightweights.
>
> You think Val's not a CBer?
>
>

ROFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!! ^^5

Kim W5TIT

806. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 17:04:58 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <___r8.23141$nt1.1875957@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40073

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

>
> It is headlined, in Big Type, "Amateur Radio."
>
> Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO ONE
> wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur." I say this knowing full
well
> the long and honored history of "amateurs" in many fields, and the origin
> and meaning of the word. But none of that matters. "AMATEUR" has to GO!
>

As Tonto was heard to say, "Speak for yourself, white guy!"

There are a whole host of folks who identify themselves as "amateur".
Below are just a few quick examples.

GGAFC http://www.users.bigpond.com/ggafc/
KAAL http://www.kaal.org/
World Pro-Ams http://www.golftournamenttours.com/
AAU http://www.aausports.org/mytp/home/aau_index.jsp
TAAA http://www.tucsonastronomy.org/
NSAAC http://www.star.net/people/~nsaac/
AAM http://www.amateurastronomy.com/
ATMoB http://www.atmob.org/

Good luck on this on now.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

807. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 17:58:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB088C2.FC2C0439@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40076

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You describe the term as "common". Perhaps it is where you live. Many
> > things which are common are also moronic. I've most often heard
> > "thinking outside the box" used by people trying to impress others by
> > hinting that they have somehow learned a new way of putting together
> > thoughts--one without boundaries.
>
> Galileo is an example of thinking outside the box. In that case,
> the box was the earth which the clergy thought was the center
> of the universe.

Galileo ideas are an example of thinking. There are no modifiers
needed.

Dave K8MN

808. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:00:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB08920.AEEE047A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40077

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > From Websters: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or may
> > > not be believed true by the speaker" You lied, Dave!
> >
> > From Dave: He who attempts to play word games as an excuse to call
> > another a liar is a man with no character.
>
> Leg pullers have no character?

...not when they impugn another's integrity based upon a typographical
error.

Dave K8MN

809. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:01:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB0895F.41F1C88@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40078

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'm an engineer, not an English major.
> >
> > I also seem to recall you stating that you were a teacher at some point.
>
> Math teacher, not an English teacher.
>
> > I've already stated that the word "comparting" did not make contextual
> > sense.
>
> But why did you wait so long to say that? My reputation could have been
> ruined in the meanwhile by your delaying tactics.

You didn't have much to ruin based on a number of years reading of your
posts.

Dave K8MN

810. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:05:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB08A52.D35D6CE7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40079

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAFD715.714AB992@earthlink.net...
>
> > I can improvise a guitar solo to a
> > jazz tune I've heard once. Can you?
>
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Was that you doing that "dueling banjos" thing about 30 years ago? Scary
> stuff.

Careful, Brian. A couple of weeks ago you told us that you'd seen
"Deliverance" and that you knew where it was filmed, implying that the
movie was filmed or set in West Virginia. It wasn't. Now it seems that
you don't know the difference between bluegrass and jazz.

Dave K8MN

811. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:07:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407140708.27399.00000345@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40083

I'm going to answer both Bill and Dennis' excellent posts at once, to save space and time.

In article <a8pkof$4j0$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
>news:a8okth$1gph$1@heap.juniper.net...
>> N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>> >"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>> >
>> >>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>> >>news:3CAC7317.BA11EA33@IEEE.org...
>> >>> N2EY wrote:
>> >>> > Do you think that a growth of 0.709% per year indicates the
>> >>> > restructuring is working perfectly?
>> >>>
>> >>> Yep, I begin to worry when the ham population starts to decrease.
>> >>
>> >>*THAT'S* when we'd better start noting that we may lose some spectrum!
>> >
>> >Then start noting.
>> >
>> >From
>> >
>> >http://www.AH0A.org:
>> >
>> >Total US hams, end-of-month:
>> >
>> >September 1998 (the minimum in recent history, 20 months before
>restructuring):
>> >672,678
>> >
>> >March 2000 (last full month before restructuring):
>> >677,784
>> >
>> >April 2000 (transition month):
>> >678,539
>> >
>> >May 2000 (first full month after restructuring):
>> >677,349
>> >
>> >March 2001 (the maximum in recent history):
>> >684,359
>> >

>> >November 2001: (minimum in past year):
>> >682,512
>> >
>> >March 2002(most recent full month):
>> >683,180
>> >
>> >For those who say the Tech has somehow "kept ham radio afloat", note
>> >that the number of Techs/Tech Pluses peaked at 338,334 in March 2000
>> >and has since declined to 319,880.
>>
>> That's a carefully worded sentence if I ever saw one.

Thanks!

>> To be specific
>> Tech/Tech+ numbers declined from 338,334 in March 2000 to 319,831
>> in July 200, a 4 month period, and has been pretty much stable since
>> then.

OK - I did not notice that trend. Pretty big decline, tho.

>That 4 month period did, as Dennis states below, see many
>upgrades of coded techs direct to General during the April-July
>2000 period. The tech upgrades fell into three catagories:
>
>1. Paper upgrades of techs licensed prior to 1987. All they
>needed was proof of having the license prior to ' (exact date
>escapes me) and they simply were upgraded upon application
>at any post 4/15 VE session.
>
>2. Written test only upgrades of coded techs that only needed to
>pass the General written element. Many took and obtained the CSCE
>for the credit and then simply upgraded post 4/15/00 and others
>continued to do it since then...with a spurt of such upgrades
>happening 4/00 to 7/00.

I agree 100% - but what's the third category?

Recall, too, that all during this time new Techs were being issued, and that
Novices were upgrading to Tech, though not in great numbers compared to
the above two categories.
>
>> Given the timing and the fact that it happened all at once, it
>> is probably the case that most of those hams didn't disappear from the
>> service but rather upgraded after the removal of the 1b and 1c
>requirements.

Yup. That's a good thing.

>> How does Tech upgrading after restructuring relate in any way to the issue
>> of whether the Tech license "kept ham radio afloat" or not? I don't see
>> it.

I agree.
>>
>> > Note also that in April of 2000 the
>FCC
>> >began renewing Tech Pluses as Techs, so the number of Techs is growing
>from
>> >three sources (new licenses, Tech Plus renewals, and Novice upgrades) not
>> >just new licenses.
>>
>> But we also know that the growth rate of the ARS from 1989 through
>> March 2001 was effected by two "statistical anomalies" that made the
>> license expiry rate artificially low (we know this because you said it
>> a few years ago, though you no longer mention it now), and since
>> then we've entered a period with an anomalously high rate of license
>> expiry as the Tech 10-year bubble moves through.

Whoa, hold on a minute.

The first statistical anomaly was the change from 5 to 10 year licenses in
1984. This conversion was complete by 1989, and there were no expirations from
1989 to 1994. But after 1994 the first of the 10 year licenses began to expire
- 8 years ago, and 6 years before restructuring.

The second anomaly was the dropping of the code test from the Tech in Feb 1991.
The number of Techs was reduced during the ten years after that change
only by upgrades and cancellations. However, unless Techs drop out at a higher
rate than other hams, there should be no sudden jump in losses after March
2001.

There was a lot of speculation about how many Techs would renew. I have always
thought the percentage would be comparable to other license classes.
>>
>> The fact is that the rate of new license issues increased by about
>> 40%, or about 600 new hams per month, since restructuring, and this
>> has just about balanced the rate at which Tech's let their licenses
>> expire starting in March 2001. While this has resulted in a small
>> decline in the numbers I've got to believe it has actually been a net
>> good for the service. At least some of the hams that got their license
>> in the last year or two are likely to still be active, while Techs who
>> let their 10-year-old licenses lapse were probably long gone anyway.

The question is whether it's a one-time jump or a continuing trend.
>>
>> So you'll have to forgive me for thinking that the numbers actually
>> indicate that restructuring was a modest success, at least initially.
>> It has apparently attracted new interest in the service at a time
>> when there are a whole lot of other things to be interested in.

Depends on how "success" is defined. K0HB sez the FCC did not consider
growth as a goal of restructuring.

>>The
>> ARS is no longer the best place for an individual to blab their opinions

>> to a big audience, there are other places where you can get a far bigger
>> audience with less investment.

Yup.

>> It is no longer a cheap replacement for
>> (mobile) telephone service since the real thing has gotten cheap as dirt.

Yup again.

>> There's enough other stuff to play with that it isn't surprising that
>> ARS growth has gone negative. There are fewer and fewer advantages
>> to the ARS other than the primary one, that it is still one of the best
>> places to go if what you want to do is build or assemble equipment that
>> produces RF and put that on the air for the sheer pleasure of doing that,

Exactly. What's happened is that the only folks who will want to be hams now
are
those who are really interested in RADIO as an end in itself, either from a
technical or operating standpoint, or public service comms that cannot be done
other ways.

>> but if the higher speed code tests really were discouraging 600 new hams
>> a month with this interest from entering the service, as apparently may
>> have been the case, it was probably time for the code tests to go.

They will be totally gone soon. FCC has all but set the date. 600 per month is
only
7200 per year - about 1%.

> I
>> do admit the jury's still out over the longer term, however. The codefree
>> Tech initially had a novelty factor that wore off after a few years.

And the same may happen after the code tests disappear entirely. A short-term
surge then back to near the old rates.
>>
>> Not that the numbers game matters all that much. The FCC probably wasn't
>> worried about numbers when they made these changes, and I've never seen
>> anyone from the FCC mention that the future of the ARS depends on it
>> getting larger. What they do keep mentioning is that what hams do
>matters,
>> so shrinkage due to 10-year-old, novelty Tech licenses lapsing probably
>> doesn't change anything at all since they weren't doing anything anyway.
>> It is up to the people who remain to keep the service healthy by doing
>> stuff to ensure the service continues to be viewed as valuable.
>
>Agree.

Same here.

There is one more factor to consider. FCC has changed the forms and renewal
rules several times in the past 10 years. FRN, ULS, TIN, 610, 605, all sorts of
alphanumeric soup. Plus the renewal window is VERY narrow, considering the

license term.

End result is that if a ham got his/her license back in the early-mid '90s and then never moved or vanitied, they may find themselves in a quandry when renewal time comes around - if they even remember! Note how many "renewals in the grace period" there are every month. At least some of these are "whoopsies" and others are "how the heck do I renew?" examples.

73 de Jim, N2EY

812. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:07:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407140709.27399.00000347@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40081

In article <a8po02$1fm$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Not to condone illegal operation...BUT...if that illegal
>operation isn't impacting hams or ham bands, then what's
>the point? Dick claimed there are these bad people (CBers
>and others) that have infiltrated amateur radio...yet he
>offers no examples...nor does the r.r.cb offer any
>example either.
>
The real issue here is just as Bill states: "if that illegal
operation isn't impacting hams or ham bands, then what's
the point?"

The problem is that such illegal operation has and does impact
hams and the ham bands. One impact is the RF amplifier regulations
imposed on us hams because of widespread violations by illegal users.
Did those 1978 regs stop the use illegal use of RF amplifiers by nonhams?
Of course not! But they impact the ability of hams to buy, sell and build Rf
amplifiers. (The rules prohibit kits as well as assembled units).

There are lots of other examples - RFI, anti-antenna ordinances and attitudes,
etc.

If I had a dollar for every time somebody asked "what's your handle?" upon
discovering that Isomeone was a ham, I could retire.

73 de Jim, N2EY

813. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:07:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407140709.27399.00000346@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40082

In article <3CB04240.842C7439@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Jim, how many coded hams were there in 1990?
>>
>> All of them.
>>
>> >How many coded hams were there in 2000?
>>
>> Impossible to say.
>
>Impossible to estimate?

With any precision, yes, for reasons I have previously stated. Some hams whose licenses say "Technician" are code tested. How many exactly? I don't know.

But the number is at least this many:

- all of the Tech Pluses who have renewed in the past two years and not upgraded are now Techs.
- all of the Novices who passed new Element 2 are now Techs
- all of the Techs who have passed Element 1 but have not yet passed another written test are now Techs.

The number is not insignificant.

>How many hams were not nocode techs in 2000.

See above.
>
>> >Was there an increase or decrease?
>>
>> I dunno. Do some research and present your findings here.
>
>Where can I find the numbers?

http://www.ah0a.org is one place to start. Old callbooks are another. Jon Bloom posted Callbook figures here some time back, as have I. Heck, this thread has lots of that info.

But ya gotta look for it. Have fun.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

814. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:07:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407140710.27399.00000348@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40080

In article <3CB040D6.14FA16F7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <a8mto7$n4s$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Another of the 50s/60s celebrity hams was
>> >Arthur Godfrey. Also we had Barry Goldwater carrying our
>> >message.
>>
>> Let us also remember Jean Shepard, K2ORS ("You'll shoot your
>> eye out, kid!!")
>
>Also the lady C&W singer whose name slips my mind at the moment.
>--
Patty Loveless.

As mentioned by others, we also have Ronnie Milsap, Jon Bon Jovi, Joe Walsh, Walter Cronkite and of course many current and past astronauts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

815. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:22:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB08E80.91D6C9E8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40084

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Not to condone illegal operation...BUT...if that illegal
> operation isn't impacting hams or ham bands, then what's
> the point? Dick claimed there are these bad people (CBers
> and others) that have infiltrated amateur radio...

Maybe Dick will publish a list of the callsigns of the
ex-CBer troublemakers. I was on 11m as a ham in the 50's
so Dick will probably include me on the list.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

816. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:24:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407142448.27329.00000395@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 40085

In article <OuYr8.5146$KZ5.1013767312@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>Was that you doing that "dueling banjos" thing about 30 years ago? Scary
>stuff.
>
>Brian

Brian, with all due respect, you spelled "benjo" wrong... :-)

817. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:24:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407142448.27329.00000394@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 40086

In article <3CAFD715.714AB992@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I do know, Carl. I've run into a number of fools over the course of 53
>years on the planet. I don't waste much of my time other than to
>respond to you or Leonardo da Andiron on occasion. We know how you've
>wasted at least some of your time. It only took you a couple of decades
>to upgrade. Good luck getting your brain back in that box.

...it would seem that Heil wasted 53 years trying to become
a human being. He hasn't shown he qualifies yet.

818. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:29:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0900B.737FCCF1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40087

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You describe the term as "common". Perhaps it is where you live. Many
> > > things which are common are also moronic. I've most often heard
> > > "thinking outside the box" used by people trying to impress others by
> > > hinting that they have somehow learned a new way of putting together
> > > thoughts--one without boundaries.
> >
> > Galileo is an example of thinking outside the box. In that case,
> > the box was the earth which the clergy thought was the center
> > of the universe.
>
> Galileo ideas are an example of thinking. There are no modifiers
> needed.

Hmmmmm, so you don't differentiate between good thinking and evil
thinking. I'm beginning to understand you better.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

819. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:33:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB090DC.F9CF232F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40088

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Leg pullers have no character?
>
> ...not when they impugn another's integrity based upon a typographical
> error.

Just when I thought you might be developing a mammalian sense of humor,
you revert to reptilian humor, i.e. a null set. Dave, no one can
possibly impugn your integrity more successfully than you do.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

820. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:34:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB09143.74EB8BD2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40089

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > But why did you wait so long to say that? My reputation could have been
> > ruined in the meanwhile by your delaying tactics.
>
> You didn't have much to ruin based on a number of years reading of your
> posts.

Pot - Kettle. Kettle - Pot. At least what I do, I do in fun.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

821. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:39:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0924A.2249273C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40090

N2EY wrote:
> If I had a dollar for every time somebody asked "what's your handle?" upon
> discovering that Isomeone was a ham, I could retire.

Back in the 50's, when 11m CB didn't even exist, most hams said,
"What's your handle?" What's wrong with what most hams did in
the 50's, long before 11m CW? What's wrong with it now? Saying
"What's your handle?" probably dates all the way back to when
AM was young.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

822. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:45:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB093C9.C0A2D320@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40091

```
W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAF2B58.F086928D@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3CAE9313.F6B67F7@earthlink.net...
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > I brought it up over your supposed "typo". A typo is a typo for
> you
> > > but
> > > > > > a lie for me by your definition.
> > > > > >
> > > > > One more time. Everyone makes typos. You are the only person I have
> > > > > ever known who lied for days denying that you had even made a typo
> > > > > while it was being pointed out to you in every posting.
> > > > >
> > > > You knew then that I meant "comparing", not "comparting". In every
> > > > response to you, I used the words "comparing", "compare" or
> "compared".
> > > > I did not lie about anything. For you to continue your silly
> > > > accusations makes you look small.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > I don't know about Cecil looking small. However, you look pretty
> ridiculous
> > > to keep responding.
> > >
> > Oh, I don't know, Tugboat. I think you take top honors since you aren't
> > involved.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Well, see, there ya go again thinking you're a man on an island. First, I
> *did* make posts to the original round of this, second, I participate in
> this newsgroup. You're wrong twice...

Okay, Tugboat Annie. You responded to the earlier incarnation and now
you've done it again. You really weren't a part of it then and you
really aren't a part of it now. Aside from that, you are quite correct.
```

Last time I checked, I wasn't on an island. I've heard that there a few folks living on a small island called Manhattan. Perhaps you've heard of it.

Dave K8MN

823. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:46:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB09418.54D05B74@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40092

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Impossible to estimate?
>
> With any precision, yes, for reasons I have previously stated. Some hams whose
> licenses say "Technician" are code tested. How many exactly? I don't know.

Was that true in 2000? We don't need an exact number. We are simply
trying compare the first ten years of the nocode tech license to the
rest of ARS members. If the ARS grew by 4% during that decade and
nocode techs made up 20% of the ARS in 2000, then there was about
a -16% decline in coded hams during that decade. Seems to me, even
with the uncertainties involved, the nocode techs saved the ARS
from decline during that decade. I know nocode techs make up more
than 4% of the ARS.

> >How many hams were not nocode techs in 2000.
>
> See above.

What, for the runaround?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

824. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:47:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB0944D.11F0E273@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40093

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CAF2C48.B4E81A48@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3CAE97B2.8F071C42@earthlink.net...
> > > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > I wouldn't have achieved many of the things I have if I hadn't met a
> > > dare,
> > > > > from teachers, clergy, friends, bosses, co-workers, etc. To dare
> and be
> > > > > dared is to live.
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > > Izzat right? I've never had a teacher, clergyman or boss dare me to
> do
> > > > anything. "Friends" and co-workers will often dare one to do
> something
> > > > stupid while keeping a safe distance. They can often be heard saying
> > > > afterward, "I can't believe he was stupid enough to do that". Sorry,
> I
> > > > can't buy into your Rod McKuen-ism.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Dave, you don't strike me at all as a person who does much thinking
> outside
> > > the box at all...so it doesn't surprise that you've never been dared, or
> > > challenged. You're probably quite predictable. If the outcome is
> already
> > > known, why would anyone waste their time or effort with you?
> >
> > Kim, I don't even use such moronic phrases as, "thinking outside the
> > box". To do something on a dare does not mean that you are doing any
> > "thinking outside the box". I did not say that I had never been issued a
> > dare. I stated that I'd never been dared by a teacher, a clergyman or a
> > boss. I am quite predictable in that I don't do something because some
> > fool dares me to do it. Fools have plenty of time to waste.
> >

> > Dave K8MN
>
> *Cough* Yeah, cool. That and the silver spoon will get you through life as
> though you lived in the closet, but perfectly in the closet.

Your comment doesn't seem to make much sense.

Dave K8MN

825. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:54:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB095D3.63A707E3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40094

Len Over 21 wrote:
> ...it would seem that Heil wasted 53 years trying to become
> a human being. He hasn't shown he qualifies yet.

Is that why he exhibits the humor of an alligator?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

826. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:56:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB09632.C5C34EBA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40095

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:3caf3303$1_1@news7.fast.net...
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CAF2C48.B4E81A48@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Kim, I don't even use such moronic phrases as, "thinking outside the
> > > box".
> >
> > Dave,
> >
> > Calling a common phrase such as "thinking outside the box" "moronic"
> > illustrates an inability to process abstract concepts ... thus, I guess
> you
> > probalby can't "think outside the box" ... your thought process would
> appear
> > to be constrained to the mundane, familiar, predictable, and uncreative.
> >
> > >Fools have plenty of time to waste.
> >
> > I/m sure you would know, Dave ... BTW, how DO you waste all of your time?
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
> >
> >
>
> Dave has a book on life, probably handed down for several generations now.
> It tells him exactly how to think, what is bad, what is good, and makes
> things a whole lot simpler than determining his own thoughts. Maybe he's
> got the blueprint...the rest of us have the design.

I dunno, Kim. I did some thinking on the meanings of several of your posts. I came to the conclusion that they were filled with New Age babble disguised as something you intended as being *deep*. I arrived at this conclusion without referencing a guide. I don't know who makes up "the rest of us" you refer to. Have you joined a "Dare To Be Tacky" club?

Dave K8MN

827. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:58:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB096D3.E18CEC08@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40096

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CB04318.B502E61F@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You describe the term as "common". Perhaps it is where you live. Many
> > > things which are common are also moronic. I've most often heard
> > > "thinking outside the box" used by people trying to impress others by
> > > hinting that they have somehow learned a new way of putting together
> > > thoughts--one without boundaries.
> >
> > Galileo is an example of thinking outside the box. In that case,
> > the box was the earth which the clergy thought was the center
> > of the universe.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
>
> I bet Dave still does...think the Earth is the center of the universe, that
> is.

...while you, of course, are quite certain that YOU are its center.

Dave K8MN

828. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 18:59:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0971D.49ED6C3B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40097

Dave Heil wrote:
> I dunno, Kim. I did some thinking on the meanings of several of your
> posts. I came to the conclusion that they were filled with New Age
> babble ...

Like Galileo's New Age babble in the early 17th century?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

829. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 19:04:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB09810.8E6E74A8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40098

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CAFD715.714AB992@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I do know, Carl. I've run into a number of fools over the course of 53
> >years on the planet. I don't waste much of my time other than to
> >respond to you or Leonardo da Andiron on occasion. We know how you've
> >wasted at least some of your time. It only took you a couple of decades
> >to upgrade. Good luck getting your brain back in that box.
>
> ...it would seem that Heil wasted 53 years trying to become
> a human being. He hasn't shown he qualifies yet.

If what you said had any truth to it, you'd still have sixteen years
time in grade on me, Leonardo. How's that five words per minute thing
coming along?

Dave K8MN

830. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 19:05:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB09863.F71CA46D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40099

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > You describe the term as "common". Perhaps it is where you live. Many
> > > > things which are common are also moronic. I've most often heard
> > > > "thinking outside the box" used by people trying to impress others by
> > > > hinting that they have somehow learned a new way of putting together
> > > > thoughts--one without boundaries.
> > >
> > > Galileo is an example of thinking outside the box. In that case,
> > > the box was the earth which the clergy thought was the center
> > > of the universe.
> >
> > Galileo ideas are an example of thinking. There are no modifiers
> > needed.
>
> Hmmmmm, so you don't differentiate between good thinking and evil
> thinking. I'm beginning to understand you better.

Oh? Was Galileo a thinker of evil thoughts? I'm beginning to get a
handle on you too. That dirty Galileo!

Dave K8MN
```

831. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 19:10:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB099AA.F6525A57@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40100

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Leg pullers have no character?
> >
> > ...not when they impugn another's integrity based upon a typographical
> > error.
>
> Just when I thought you might be developing a mammalian sense of humor,
> you revert to reptilian humor, i.e. a null set. Dave, no one can
> possibly impugn your integrity more successfully than you do.

Well, there's always you: A man who repeatedly accuses another of lying
when he knows differently. You don't have any integrity, Cecil. Your
sense of humor doesn't seem to extend to laughs at your expense. You
can fill us in on all you know about reptilian humor.

Dave K8MN

832. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 19:12:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB09A26.5DB05E77@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40101

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I dunno, Kim. I did some thinking on the meanings of several of your
> > posts. I came to the conclusion that they were filled with New Age
> > babble ...
>
> Like Galileo's New Age babble in the early 17th century?

No. More like Rod Kuen poems set to Kenny Gee music.

Dave K8MN

833. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 19:23:31 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <T01s8.9631$Rw2.825221@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40102

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:8xZr8.548$Ku6.199123135@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> Can someone explain how a Technician class license holder is able to set
up
> a repeater network or auxiliary stations? Each aux station would be a
> different individual with a unique call sign I assume, however my
question
> is mainly about broadcast location. Are operators limited to
broadcasting
> only from the address indicated on FCC license? An example would be
where
> the FCC indicates operator "KABCD" lives in Los Angeles and operator
"KEFGH"
> lives in Hollywood, but other information such as QRZ and other websites
> indicate that these two call signs (and others) are repeating in a
> closed/private status and that the locations are not Los Angeles and
> Hollywood, but somewhere else such as Pasadena and Santa Monica. I'd
> appreciate any help as I'm new to this. Thanks.
>
> DL
>
>

A bit of history is in order here and it will send your head spinning.
The nice piece of paper you got from the FCC is in fact two licenses, a permit to set up a station in the Amateur Service under a callsign, and a permit to operate it and any other station in the Amateur Service. The history of the ARS makes me N&#65533;BK but in reality the call sign belongs to the hardware. A number of changes have been made in the rules over the years without disturbing this concept and produces any number of situations that at first glance make no sense. Think of the old days of broadcast where Fizzledink Communications Inc. had the station license as WKRP and an engineer, Ignatz Q. Smurd, operated it. Content violations were Fizz's problem and harmonics belonged to Ignatz. That is the background.

When I got into this hobby, if I were to operate another station I was limited to the lesser of the privleges of the station license or my op license which at the time meant a Novice and Tech could not ever share a station. Now I can take your tech station which includes 1.5 kw rig on 20 which is perfectly legal for you to own and operate it as Your Call by N&#65533;BK. Things have moved on.

As the question involves repeaters let us say that I wanted to put up a 4-band repeater with central transmitters and remote receivers at four

locations. Given that I had obtained coordination on my freqs (part of the problem you would have is getting a freq pair coordinated with whoever does it in your area), each of the four central transmitters would ID N&#65533;BK/R with no need to get them individually licensed. Same if they were at four different locations. The UHF links to the transmitter would sign N&#65533;BK/A preferably not thru the main transmitters tho.

The short answer is so long as you tell the FCC where to find you, go nuts. But for enforcement purposes, there is a recognized frequency co-ordinator and woe betide the guy who just slaps one up and interferes; he is presumed to be wrong and has no rights worth mentioning.

If you are in SoCal you can pretty well give it up.

Dick N&#65533;BK

834. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 19:42:04 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204071940590.15154-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 40103

On Sun, 7 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
>Can someone explain how a Technician class license holder is able to set up
>a repeater network or auxiliary stations? Each aux station would be a
>different individual with a unique call sign I assume, however my question
>is mainly about broadcast location. Are operators limited to broadcasting
>only from the address indicated on FCC license? An example would be where
>the FCC indicates operator "KABCD" lives in Los Angeles and operator "KEFGH"
>lives in Hollywood, but other information such as QRZ and other websites
>indicate that these two call signs (and others) are repeating in a
>closed/private status and that the locations are not Los Angeles and
>Hollywood, but somewhere else such as Pasadena and Santa Monica. I'd
>appreciate any help as I'm new to this. Thanks.

Broadcasting is not allowed with an amateur radio license.

835. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 20:22:20 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub19hut129h558@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40104

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>I don't know about anyone else...but I just can't wait
>to have Val out there in the field representing the ARS...
>
>oh yeah...oh buhruther

Say, why don't YOU tell us about all you've done with
the public vis-a-vis the ARS? I'd sure like to know how
to go about it . . . if you've got some advice for me.

Val
KC0MUB

836. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 20:25:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407162535.09446.00000428@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 40105

In article <3caf30ad_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c-shack@fast.net> writes:

>While Val's poor attribution is annoying, what bothers me more
>is twofold:
>
>1) the idea of a smart-ass, newly-licensed, not even dry behind
>the ears newbie proclaiming him/her self an expert on anything
>and everything about ham radio (clearly the implication from
>the tone of Val's posts) ....

Interesting. How about "the idea of a smart-ass, newly-licensed, not even dry behind the ears newbie proclaiming him/her self an expert on anything>and everything about ham radio" who says code testing must end? We've had several of those here but I never recall you being bothered by them or their ideas.

>2) Val's "re-positioning amateur radio" sounds a LOT like
>some bad, retro, time-warp, "back to the future" theme ...

Electropolitically incorrect, huh?

73 de Jim, N2EY

837. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 20:25:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407162535.09446.00000427@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 40107

In article <djQr8.22290$nt1.1796629@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>>
>> Watch the enforcement letters for a few months and see how many are issued
>to
>> hams actually using Morse code.
>>
>
>With all due regard, that's a red-herring, Jim.
>
>The same can be said for those "actually using" RTTY, SSTV, ATV, PSK31, or
>whatever.

Of course. But none of those modes is anywhere near so popular on HF as
CW/Morse.

>If a person wants to be a bad actor, they want the largest possible
>audience.

Maybe - maybe not. Even if that's true, there's still a tremendous disparity in
enforcement
actions.

>That audience is most conveniently and broadly available on voice
>modes, and has no relation to what other modes the operator might be
>trained, equipped, and capable in.

Exactly! But the fact remains that the FCC doesn't find many violations among
hams using Morse
or PSK31 or SSTV or similar modes.
>
>Check out some of the cesspool-QRG's on 80M and 20M -- all those clowns are
>Morse tested.

Sure - at one time, they all allegedly passed a code test of at least 5 wpm.
But if you recall I noted
that maybe it's not the TEST but the MODE that is the key (bad pun intended).
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

838. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 20:25:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407162536.09446.00000429@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 40108

In article <EVCr8.3976$Cw2.190521595@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >But are you actually admonishing Val?
>>
>> I'm saying there are better choices of words. Val is not alone in making
>> less-than-optimum
>> choices.
>
>Why are all you'se guys giving Val a free pass?

He's not getting "a free pass". Most of my posts in response to him consist of disagreement. But he is a newcomer and I'm trying to set an example of how gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable.

> Let me guess.

Go right ahead.

>> >> > > FISTS' purpose is to promote the USE of Morse. Mandatory testing is
>> >only
>> >> > one
>> >> > > way to do that. FISTS focuses on other ways.
>> >> >
>> >> > FISTS advocates mandatory Morse tests.
>> >>
>> >> Where? I just visited the website. No mention of tests. FISTS did not
>> >submit
>> >> comments to the FCC on the issue and does not have an official position
>on
>> >it.
>> >> One can be a member of both FISTS and No-Code International without any
>> >> contradiction of either organization's rules or requirements.
>> >
>> >Yeh, I just revisited it too. The format has changed, and the call to
>> >support code testing is missing.
>>
>> I do not recall ever seeing such a "call". Not in any of my FISTS
>bulletins.
>> There may
>> be encouragement for FISTS members to make their voices heard, but there
>is NO
>> official FISTS position on the issue other than "let your governments know
>what
>> you
>> think".

>
>Are there more than one FISTS site? It definitely looked different than the
>last time I looked.

Perhaps. But since I've been a member there has never been an offical position
on the code test issue other than "make your views heard". Is it wrong to do
that?

>> >> Of course it's probably true that most FISTS members favor mandatory
>code
>> >> tests. But as far as I know FISTS as an organization has no official
>> >> position on the issue. FISTS membership does not limit the freedom of
>its
>> >> members to hold and express differing opinions on code testing.
>> >>
>> >> >It's a new focus.

Since when?
>> >>
>> >> Show us where FISTS, as an organization, advocates mandatory code
>testing.
>> >
>> >Sorry, no can do.
>>
>> Yet you say "it's a new focus" as if the policy had changed. It hasn't.
>
>Well, that may be true but I'm not ready to agree with it - yet. I've been
>there plenty of times before, clipping and pasting the "accuracy transcends
>speed" slogan when Dick was doing the banana boat swing jive. I know what I
>saw then, and the format of the site is different, and the "support" code
>testing button is gone.

What did such a button, if it even existed, actually do?

73 de Jim, N2EY

839. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 20:25:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407162537.09446.00000430@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 40106

In article <ub0n73f2ojsv08@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote :a reasonable reply to my original message.

TNX
>
>I've had my say on this and am perfectly sanguine with
>nature taking its course. I have just put one more message
>on this board, about the "Big Project" and its promotional
>material, and that's about all I'm going to say about that.
>Rolling large stones uphill is NOT something I want to do
>long term. In general, about five or six weeks is quite enough.

Let me say this about that....

While I think QST is a great mag, there's no doubt it could be improved. One thing I know for certain is that most of the articles and pictures come from hams who do not work at HQ. Outside submissions, that is, or whatever the correct publisher's term.

So here's my challenge to you and others, Val: Write an article, take a picture,
do a cover layout, whatever floats your boat, and submit it to QST for publication. They actually pay money for most stuff they use, btw. In other words, show 'em how it's done. They've published some of my stuff, so I know first hand that it can be done.
>
>As for joining the League, my check is on its way.

GREAT!

>I guess
>I'll just have to tear off the covers right at the mailbox!

Aw, c'mon, they're not THAT bad! ;-)
>
P.S. I've seen a LOT of QST covers, nearly all pretty bad,
>over the last five or six years. We DO have a library here.

I've seen more than 800 of them. They range from great to awful, and each era has its classics and its blunders. All depends what you like to see.

Some would say that the '30s era red covered ones were the acme of QST cover design. I like those, but there are other classic covers.

The W1CJD cartoons are timeless, though.

--

And while we're on the subject:

Some time back ARRL published a collection of "Gil" cartoons. Great little book but it's time for a second edition.

There is probably a decent market for a compilation of all the "Rotten Radio" stories by The Old Man (T.O.M.). The classic stories by W4VT ("Freshman Marlowe", "To A Lady With Red Hair" and "Jim") could be included, along with the stories that ran under the title "Dixie Jones' Owl Juice".

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

840. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 21:03:27 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <zu2s8.23623$nt1.1915612@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40109

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

>
> Your comment doesn't seem to make much sense.
>

Dave,

And why are you singling out just this comment?

73, de Hans, K0HB

841. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 21:35:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8qe2rncn0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 40110

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Bill w" <billw@lead.comspaM> wrote in message
> news:SVYr8.38099$w7.3455348@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a8dtt8$aop$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a8bi3d$nga$1@208.206.142.88...
> > >
> > >
> > > Why Dick, you're shouting.
> > >
> > > One more time....If they are here already, just where
> > > are they all hiding?
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Take a good look at rec.radio.cb and you will see how
> > many CBers / Hams that are there.
>
> So? That proves nothing regarding what anyone does as
> a ham. No license needed for rec.radio.cb is there?
>
> > You will also be treated to how they still operate illegally.
>
> Not to condone illegal operation...BUT...if that illegal
> operation isn't impacting hams or ham bands, then what's
> the point? Dick claimed there are these bad people (CBers
> and others) that have infiltrated amateur radio...yet he
> offers no examples...nor does the r.r.cb offer any
> example either.
>

I gotta say it, Bill _ You're a damfool. Blind, too.
```

842. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 21:50:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8qevk$pj9$0@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 40111

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > *Cough* Yeah, cool. That and the silver spoon will get you through life as
> > though you lived in the closet, but perfectly in the closet.
>
> Your comment doesn't seem to make much sense.
>

Boy, that's not unusual.
```

843. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:03:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0C21F.39E20921@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40112

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Hmmmmm, so you don't differentiate between good thinking and evil
> > thinking. I'm beginning to understand you better.
>
> Oh? Was Galileo a thinker of evil thoughts?

Hmmmmmm, why would you think that? It was the Catholic Church that was
thinking the evil thoughts. Sorry I had to be the one to break it to you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

844. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:04:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0C271.52207223@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40113

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Just when I thought you might be developing a mammalian sense of humor,
> > you revert to reptilian humor, i.e. a null set. Dave, no one can
> > possibly impugn your integrity more successfully than you do.
>
> Well, there's always you: A man who repeatedly accuses another of lying
> when he knows differently.

If you are denying meeting the dictionary definition of "lying", then
you are lying.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

845. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:06:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4q3s8.5290$bK.1057133754@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40114

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ub0lg34qc3gu76@corp.supernews.com...
> The End of "Amateur" Radio?
>
> I am looking as I write this at the "house ad" on page 130 of the current
> issue of QST. It is headlined "YOU'RE INVITED" and as you look at it you
> are naturally inclined to ask yourself, "to what?" Well, you're being
> "invited" to "increase the impact of amateur radio and to insure its
future"
> through the "Education and Technology Program," the Big Project, that was
> written of in the March issue as being of major, if not VAST, importance.
> Now, I had the impression that there was a real sense of urgency here, and
> that the ball was ready to ROLL! But, no, we're just getting off the
> ground, and not only that, all the ARRL wants from us is our money.

Val, this isn't East Germany. You don't have and AK stuck in your back, and
you don't have to give your money.

> As you look at the ad in question, placed at the back of the magazine, at
> the bottom left of the double truck, opposite an equipment ad that totally
> dominates it, you see a circular image, what I interpret as the
patch-to-be
> for this project. In that patch, is seems to me, are encapsulated many
the
> internal problems facing "amateur radio" right now. So, I'll begin my
> discussion with that patch.
>
> It is headlined, in Big Type, "Amateur Radio."
>
> Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO ONE
> wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur." I say this knowing full
well
> the long and honored history of "amateurs" in many fields, and the origin
> and meaning of the word. But none of that matters. "AMATEUR" has to GO!

You might have noticed while preparing for your Technician exam that the FCC
calls it "Amateur Radio." Make a suggestion to the FCC to change it if its
not catchy enough for you. Maybe we need a jingle, too.

> In a couple of weeks I am going to be speaking to a lot of people about
> "amateur radio" without ever using that expression. No, I'm going to be
> speaking to people about the things they can DO with radio, fascinating
> things, educational things, for a relatively small amount of money. I am
> going to be stressing the links between radio and the computer, and the
> InterNet, because almost everyone who will come to our event, at an

> "upscale" high school,

Dick's Alma Matta?

> WILL have a computer, for SURE, and that computer
> will be hooked to the net. The key is the initial VISUAL impact, backed
up
> with enthusiasm and a brief look at some activities and equipment. This
is
> how I have been doing astronomy programs for about 20 years, and how, in
> part, I re-built the local astronomy club.

I honestly doubt that you had a computer hooked up at the astronomy club 20
years ago, but none-the-less, its a good idea. Personally, I like going
with stuff that works. Thats why I'm not using code.

> Very briefly, I joined this group about twenty-five years ago, immediately
> after it had lost both of its leaders, one to an accident and one to a
> terrible disease. So, when I joined, the club was doing very little other
> than maintaining itself. By 1982, I had become president of this group
and
> was able to encourage the membership to show up for public "star parties"
at
> local high schools and other locations. We did the first ones twenty
years
> ago this spring. We now have our own remote site and observatory, plus a
> continuing presence in print, on the radio and on television. Our
> membership is about double what it was when I joined and is very active
and
> involved. We're able to raise money. In short, I am proud of what I have
> helped to vis-�-vis astronomy here in Columbia and look forward to helping
> with radio in a similar way. We'll see.

Just don't get yourself so busy that you blow off the code.

> In any event, one of the things that truly helps that initial impression
is
> a powerful and positive "point-of-purchase" display. That display has to
> STOP people and then when they stop, it has to SPEAK to them, visually, in
a
> POWERFUL way. What the heck does the current "Big Project" patch SAY to
> people who "stop to look at it?":

The ARRL has had an HQ person working the education slant for years. They
do like to rehash things and call it new.

> It says, first and foremost: AMATEUR RADIO! Then it doesn't say much
else,
> really, since the arcane and indecipherable (to the public) ARRL logo is
THE
> BIGGEST THING IN IT, visually speaking. So, really, what' the BIG PROJECT
> all about? Well, it's about the ARRL, that's what! LOOK at that logo, on

> page 130 of the current QST! What are you getting out of it, visually?
If
> you're the public -- ZIP! For that matter, if your a radio amateur, you
> getting just about zip.

OK.

> What would that patch look like if I were designing it? Well, the center
> image would NOT be some impossible for (the public) to understand logo.
No,
> the center image would evoke something, and therefore be ONE image, not
the
> over-complicated hodge-podge you in fact see. For instance, something
that
> immediately comes to MY mind is a silhouette image of a young person in a
> learning situation (seated, with a book, perhaps), and then one other
> artifact in the image, a RADIO artifact. And that's IT! The blurb at the
> top of the patch could say almost ANYTHING other than "AMATEUR RADIO."
That
> is SO bad it is NOT worth talking about. The blurb could be just an
> acronym, if the center image was powerful enough. I would crank up
> something like "ARRL * ETP * ARRL" or, gee, ANYTHING else, and then a
slogan
> at the bottom: "RADIO FOR EVERYONE" or something. The object is to ENGAGE
> people, not CONFUSE them.

Dave doesn't want radio for everyone. You'll have to ask him.

> Folks, Ham Radio needs a media consultant, a good one, BAD!
>
> Val
> KC0MUB

Val, I admire your enthusiasm, but rocking the boat will get you blackballed
faster than being a commie in 50's Hollywood. You just better settle down
and learn the code like a good boy. Keep your nose clean.

73, Brian

846. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:07:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407180710.27399.00000349@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40117

In article <3CAFD48B.51DA760A@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Had to do some major trimming to get this one in, Jim.

Tnx - does get wordy at times.
>
>N2EY wrote:
>
>> But what you get is an incomplete picture, unless you look at lots of those
>> letters and correlate
>> them over time. Often one "bad apple" generates a stream of letters.
>>
>> And what you see is what the FCC is acting on, which is not necessarily a
>> complete picture.
>> FCC enforcement is a perfect example of squeaky wheel greasing.
>
> True, but we have to start somewhere. Otherwise we end up with "gut
>feelings, which I always trust, but can never use to prove the point.

True, but it's important to know the accuracy of the data when drawing
conclusions. If we knew that the letters published were 80% of those actually
issued it would put a much different spin on things than if we knew that they
were
8% or 0.8% of those actually issued. In fact we have no clear idea what
percentage they are.
>
>> > and that dropping the morse Code testing is
>> >allowing the less desirable elements into the hobby.
>>
>> We'll know in a few years.
>
> Perhaps.

I have little doubt that S25.5 will be effectively deleted at WRC 2003. (I
could be mistaken, but all the data points that way). FCC will drop code
testing like the
proverbial high temperature tuber if/when that happens.

>I could be a exception, getting interested in amateur radio,
>then going for the advanced licenses after the one part which hindered
>me was reduced to the point where I could hope to pass it.

Not at all. The numerous upgrades show that others are doing the same thing.

>I know a
>pretty fair amount about everything else.
>
Great!

>> > Even so, I am pro-morse code. Perhaps it sounds like a
>contradiction,
>> >but I just don't believe the apocolyptic visions. I know that dropping
>> >it to 5wpm for general got me involved, and I'm just the sweetest guy on
>> >the block! 8^)
>>
>> There ya go! Meet me on 7040 or 3540 some time.
>
> I might try that. Let me brush up a bit.

Wouldn't it be ironic if it wound up being your favorite and most-used mode?

>> Being told that such behavior was not acceptable on this repeater had no
>> effect. The machine
>> was often shut down because of them. Control codes were changed because
>they
>> found out
>> how to restart the machine.
>>
>> All of this was reported to the FCC, with tapes, but little was done in
>those
>> pre-Riley days. They
>> laughed at our efforts, saying "FCC didn't care when we did the same thing
>on
>> 11 meters and
>> they don't care about your stupid repeater either". They finally got tired
>of
>> having the machine
>> shut down and moved on to another repeater.
>>
>> Worst part of all this is that an extended family of scanner enthusiasts
>who
>> were thinking of
>> becoming hams were turned off to ham radio. Those three "bad apples"
>probably
>> turned away
>> at least a dozen potential hams by their antics.
>>
>> You get one guess what license those three bad apples held.
>
> I was not involved in the ARS in those days, but those sort of
>incidents (in this case nightmare might be more appropriate) lend some
>understanding to a lot of peoples frustrations.

Exactly. And that's just one example.

>> >The potential ham needs to know that we are not all just
>> >sitting behind our radios in our underwear all night long.

>> >
>> AMEN!!
>
> Well, this is the sort of thing that needs to be propagated. Yet I
>wouldn't want to exclude the more sedate or reclusive members of the
>ARS.

The point is that we are not all couch potatoes (shack spuds?)

>It's also a great hobby for older people, not being strenous. (
>I'll try to remember that next time I'm up a tree trying to fix my
>antenna)

Been there, done that!

73 de Jim, N2EY

847. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:07:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407180711.27399.00000350@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40115

In article <AEYr8.5154$va6.1014589539@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CAFB3BC.732D113A@IEEE.org...
>> Brian P Burke wrote:
>> > Are there more than one FISTS site? It definitely looked different than
>the
>> > last time I looked.
>>
>> There's an American page and a European page if I remember right.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Well, no ones calling me a liar.

Most people I know define "liar" as "one who knowingly says untruths with the intent to deceive".

>They're just remaining silent, other than
>saying its not there now.

What else need be said? Were I to call you a liar, it would mean that I had proof
that you were intentionally speaking an untruth with intent to deceive. But in fact
all I have proof of is that you've made a mistake.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

848. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:07:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407180711.27399.00000351@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40118

In article <3CB09418.54D05B74@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Impossible to estimate?
>>
>> With any precision, yes, for reasons I have previously stated. Some hams
>whose
>> licenses say "Technician" are code tested. How many exactly? I don't know.
>
>Was that true in 2000?

YES

As I have written several times already, the FCC began renewing Tech Pluses as
Techs on April 15, 2000.
So any Tech Plus who renewed or got a vanity call after that date has a license
that says "Tech" even though
he/she is code tested.

> We don't need an exact number.

You need a reasonably accurate estimate if you want to be taken seriously. Of
course I know better than that....;-)

>We are simply
>trying compare the first ten years of the nocode tech license to the
>rest of ARS members.

So go get some data and present it here. I'm not going to do your research for
you.

>If the ARS grew by 4% during that decade and
>nocode techs made up 20% of the ARS in 2000, then there was about
>a -16% decline in coded hams during that decade.

If is for children, spinning daydreams. Show us some credible data, Cecil.

>Seems to me, even
>with the uncertainties involved, the nocode techs saved the ARS
>from decline during that decade.

How? Can you prove what the number of new hams would have been without the
dropping of the code test
from the Tech in 1991?

>I know nocode techs make up more than 4% of the ARS.

Sure. But you don't know how many new hams there would be without that license.

>
>> >How many hams were not nocode techs in 2000.
>>
>> See above.
>
>What, for the runaround?
>--
Nope. For the runaround, I refer you to the mirror.

73 de Jim, N2EY

849. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:07:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407180712.27399.00000352@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40116

In article <3CB0924A.2249273C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> If I had a dollar for every time somebody asked "what's your handle?" upon
>> discovering that Isomeone was a ham, I could retire.
>
>Back in the 50's, when 11m CB didn't even exist, most hams said,
>"What's your handle?"

I don't think most hams said that, but I'm sure many did. Back then "handle" was slang for "name".

None of the CW experts I know use "handle" instead of "name".

I always wondered why anyone would substitute a two syllable jargon/slang word for a one syllable word that anyone could understand.

>What's wrong with what most hams did in
>the 50's, long before 11m CW?

11 meter CW started after WW2 and ended in the late '50s.

>What's wrong with it now?

The meaning has changed.

> Saying
>"What's your handle?" probably dates all the way back to when
>AM was young.

In some areas, surely.

cb "handles" were invented as a means of hiding true identities. They began to be
used so that the FCC and others would not be able to positively identify the users.
The meaning of "handle" in connection with voice radio was changed from "name" to "alias to disguise true identity".

Now why would somebody using a radio transmitter not want the FCC to know their true identity? Think about it.

As a red-blooded, dyed-in-the-wool, tax-paying, law-abiding, All-American radio amateur, I have no need to conceal my identity on the air or mislead the FCC. I'm proud, not ashamed, to be on the air. Therefore I have no "handle" nor need of one. I do have a name, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

850. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:08:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tr3s8.5292$5M.1057257633@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40119

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CAB63D9.EFFBF91D@IEEE.org...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > There have been, in past years, "exceptions" to transmitting music, and
> > they were used as excuses for getting the foot in the door to
"broadcast".
>
> I've transmitted with Rush Limbaugh in the background. Does that count?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Was he playing his "Pretenders" intro music?

851. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:10:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0C3E7.3F99A67E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40120

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Like Galileo's New Age babble in the early 17th century?
>
> No. More like Rod Kuen poems set to Kenny Gee music.

I don't think Rod McKuen would appreciate you butchering his
name like that. My favorite CD is Glenn Yarbrough's, "The
Lonely Things" (The love songs of Rod McKuen). My favorite
song on there is, "People Change".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

852. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:14:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0C4CA.1404AC1F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40121

N2EY wrote:
> But if you recall I noted that maybe it's not the TEST but
> the MODE that is the key (bad pun intended).

Of course, it is virtually impossible to misbehave on CW except
for jamming, of course, which seems to be the most popular mode
for jamming.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

853. Re: Long reply got short

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:14:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <sx3s8.5294$bW.1057904809@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40122

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ual72q7e6uts37@corp.supernews.com...
>
> N2EY wrote, a lot of interesting material, including:
> >The ARRL leadership obviously thinks that fighting the code
> > test battle now is a waste of resources. FCC's position is
> >clear, and not going to be changed by repeating the same
> >arguments given in connection with the restructuring. Time
> >to move on to other issues.
>
> In the interests of peace in the valley, I will let the subject
> drop.

Oh thank God!

854. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:18:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0C5B3.EE44BE2B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40123

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I gotta say it, Bill _ You're a damfool. Blind, too.

Wonder if we should take anyone seriously who even can't spell
"damn fool"? Is a damfool someone who takes his finger out
of the dike?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

855. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:19:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <OB3s8.5296$W%.1058280503@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40124

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020407142448.27329.00000395@mb-bd.aol.com...
> In article <OuYr8.5146$KZ5.1013767312@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >Was that you doing that "dueling banjos" thing about 30 years ago? Scary
> >stuff.
> >
> >Brian
>
> Brian, with all due respect, you spelled "benjo" wrong... :-)

Maybe I did, but I never fell into one.

856. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:22:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0C6C0.B6161710@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40125

N2EY wrote:
> What else need be said? Were I to call you a liar, it would mean that I had
> proof that you were intentionally speaking an untruth with intent to deceive.
> But in fact all I have proof of is that you've made a mistake.

That's definition number '1b' for "liar". Ignorance is no excuse.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

857. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:25:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7H3s8.5302$e51.1058614414@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40126

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB06266.24999C46@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
> >
> > > Kim:
> > > Don't look now, but Dick and I are *not* "Nickle Extras."
> >
> > Nope, you're Two-bit Extras. Get used to it.
>
> Actually, they are 1.6-bit Extras. Two-bits is 25, not 20.

Are we talking Morse or Farnsworth?

858. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:28:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0C816.4D7BCB88@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40127

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

> As I have written several times already, the FCC began renewing Tech Pluses as
> Techs on April 15, 2000.
> So any Tech Plus who renewed or got a vanity call after that date has a license
> that says "Tech" even though
> he/she is code tested.

So upon what date are the year 2000 figures founded?

> So go get some data and present it here. I'm not going to do your research for
> you.

All I'm asking you is where to find it.

> >Seems to me, even
> >with the uncertainties involved, the nocode techs saved the ARS
> >from decline during that decade.
>
> How? Can you prove what the number of new hams would have been without the
> dropping of the code test from the Tech in 1991?

Einstein didn't prove his theory of relativity before he published it.

Let's do it the other way. How can you prove that Morse code would
have existed without human evolution? See, I can obfuscate just as
well as you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

859. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:37:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0CA20.D72FC3E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40128

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> None of the CW experts I know use "handle" instead of "name".

Of course not. "Handle" is longer than "name" in Morse code.
But on voice, "Name here is ...", is so pedestrian. What's wrong
with a little flair using ham lingo?

> >What's wrong with it now?
>
> The meaning has changed.

Who give a rat's patootie about CB? The meaning has not changed within
ham radio? Most of us OF's still say, "Handle here is ...".

> The meaning of "handle" in connection with voice radio was changed from "name"
> to "alias to disguise true identity".

Are you going to allow CBers to dictate what happens within ham radio?
My handle is Cecil and has been since 1951. If you don't like it, you
can lump it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

860. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:38:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0CA67.B568B2B5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40129

```
Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > I've transmitted with Rush Limbaugh in the background. Does that count?
>
> Was he playing his "Pretenders" intro music?

Could be. I haven't been super careful.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

861. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:43:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1Y3s8.5311$Ep1.1059936359@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40130

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB0CA67.B568B2B5@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > I've transmitted with Rush Limbaugh in the background. Does that
count?
> >
> > Was he playing his "Pretenders" intro music?
>
> Could be. I haven't been super careful.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Its OK as long as you know the code.

862. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:45:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407184517.23265.00000206@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 40131

In article <3CB095D3.63A707E3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> ...it would seem that Heil wasted 53 years trying to become
>> a human being. He hasn't shown he qualifies yet.
>
>Is that why he exhibits the humor of an alligator?

...that's a croc... :-)

863. Re: Fast-scan ATV needs incidental music exemption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:47:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB0CC78.34E52FAE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40132

```
Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CB0CA67.B568B2B5@IEEE.org...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > I've transmitted with Rush Limbaugh in the background. Does that
> count?
> > >
> > > Was he playing his "Pretenders" intro music?
> >
> > Could be. I haven't been super careful.
>
> Its OK as long as you know the code.

Rush's callers always say 'dit'o's. Why don't they ever say 'dah'o's?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

864. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:49:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <624s8.5313$4G1.1060996223@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40133

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB0C4CA.1404AC1F@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > But if you recall I noted that maybe it's not the TEST but
> > the MODE that is the key (bad pun intended).
>
> Of course, it is virtually impossible to misbehave on CW except
> for jamming, of course, which seems to be the most popular mode
> for jamming.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Now that you mention it, that's exactly what I hear in the pileups. I hope
they do that only "rarely or never."

865. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:52:30 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <O44s8.5315$HK1.1061283961@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40134

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020407180710.27399.00000349@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3CAFD48B.51DA760A@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:

> > True, but we have to start somewhere. Otherwise we end up with "gut
> >feelings, which I always trust, but can never use to prove the point.
>
> True, but it's important to know the accuracy of the data when drawing
> conclusions. If we knew that the letters published were 80% of those
actually
> issued it would put a much different spin on things than if we knew that
they
> were
> 8% or 0.8% of those actually issued. In fact we have no clear idea what
> percentage they are.

Roll back the clock to pre-1991. 100% of the letters were issued to coded
hams.

866. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 22:53:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <M54s8.5316$sL1.1061334203@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40135

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020407180711.27399.00000350@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <AEYr8.5154$va6.1014589539@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >news:3CAFB3BC.732D113A@IEEE.org...
> >> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >> > Are there more than one FISTS site? It definitely looked different
than
> >the
> >> > last time I looked.
> >>
> >> There's an American page and a European page if I remember right.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >Well, no ones calling me a liar.
>
> Most people I know define "liar" as "one who knowingly says untruths with
the
> intent to deceive".
>
> >They're just remaining silent, other than
> >saying its not there now.
>
> What else need be said? Were I to call you a liar, it would mean that I
had
> proof
> that you were intentionally speaking an untruth with intent to deceive.
But in
> fact
> all I have proof of is that you've made a mistake.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I know what I saw. Thanks for not calling me a liar.

867. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:10:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8qjlv$7fv$0@208.207.71.172>
Source record: 40138

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Your comment doesn't seem to make much sense.
> >
>
> Dave,
>
> And why are you singling out just this comment?
>

Hmmmmmm....good question! Maybe it's the one that doesn't make much
sense!

868. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:17:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407191716.27454.00002435@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40139

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 04/06/02 23:57 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020406225717.21793.00000971@mb-ch.aol.com>

>The "old" Delaware Amateur Supply has gone belly-up (that's tits-up
>to you, Kim!) and, AFAIC, good riddance! That was the dirtiest, grimiest,
>grungiest, most disgustingly unkempt ham radio store it has ever
>been my displeasure to set foot into!

Hmmmm....I was there from 1983 to 1986 and never recall the place being
anything but presentable...It certainly was NOT "Barnes and Noble", however I
wasn't ashamed to be seen there.

> Plus, I experienced very poor
>service from that lot after the purchase of a Yaesu HT from them at the
>1984 Dayton Hamvention.

I had a problem with an IC-02AT...They replaced it no-questions-asked.
That was late 84-early 85.

> I do live within less than an hour's drive
>to the HRO store in New Castle, Delaware, and I patronize that store
>regularly. It is professionally run by experienced and businesslike
>hams, and is a refreshing change from Delaware Amateur Supply.

I remember DAS's prices usually beat HRO by a fair amount. And with no
sales tax in DE, the hour "or so" drive to DE was certainly worth it.

73

Steve, K4YZ

869. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:21:21 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub1k1uk2si407b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40136

K0HB wrote:

>Did you send this jeremiad to someone who has influence
>in the matter, like your Division Director? In case it slipped
>your mind, I've done so for you.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

When can I expect to see the Black Helicopters? Remember,
my anti-aircraft batteries, which include heat-seeking missiles
as well as ballistic projectile point-defense systems, are ready.

Val
KC0MUB

870. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:23:22 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub1k5c3eubb4c3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40137

K0HB wrote:

>As Tonto was heard to say, "Speak for yourself, white guy!"

I thought I was!

However, I admit that I should have NOT have said that "no one"
wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur" today. I certainly
should have qualified that. But time was short and this IS UseNet.

Val

871. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:25:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407192520.29664.00000387@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 40140

In article <OB3s8.5296$W%.1058280503@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020407142448.27329.00000395@mb-bd.aol.com...
>> In article <OuYr8.5146$KZ5.1013767312@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
>P
>> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>>
>> >Was that you doing that "dueling banjos" thing about 30 years ago? Scary
>> >stuff.
>> >
>> >Brian
>>
>> Brian, with all due respect, you spelled "benjo" wrong... :-)
>
>Maybe I did, but I never fell into one.

Good thing! :-)

Right about now, there's a bunch of readers scratching heads or asking buddies in e-mail, "what are they talking about?!?" :-)

Let 'em guess...

872. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:25:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407192520.29664.00000388@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 40141

In article <3CB0CA20.D72FC3E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> None of the CW experts I know use "handle" instead of "name".
>
>Of course not. "Handle" is longer than "name" in Morse code.
>But on voice, "Name here is ...", is so pedestrian. What's wrong
>with a little flair using ham lingo?

It ain't OFFICIAL, Cecil. The OFFICIAL jargon, patois, and ptui are
all spelled out, must be rigidly enforced by all the holy radio cops.

It's a DUTY! (remember, the word "duty" is a four-letter word)

>> >What's wrong with it now?
>>
>> The meaning has changed.
>
>Who give a rat's patootie about CB? The meaning has not changed within
>ham radio? Most of us OF's still say, "Handle here is ...".

He's a radio cop. He does high-speed morse therefore he is Holy.

[holy moley! :-)]

>> The meaning of "handle" in connection with voice radio was changed from
>>"name" to "alias to disguise true identity".
>
>Are you going to allow CBers to dictate what happens within ham radio?
>My handle is Cecil and has been since 1951. If you don't like it, you
>can lump it.

I have a sneaky hunch that the PA radio cop has a CB in his closet,
'cuz that's why he knows all that stuff 'bout "voice radio use." :-)

Roger that?

I'm glad to see you still have a handle on things, Cecil. :-)

873. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:39:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8qlok$g2h$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40144

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020407140709.27399.00000347@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <a8po02$1fm$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Not to condone illegal operation...BUT...if that illegal
> >operation isn't impacting hams or ham bands, then what's
> >the point? Dick claimed there are these bad people (CBers
> >and others) that have infiltrated amateur radio...yet he
> >offers no examples...nor does the r.r.cb offer any
> >example either.
> >
> The real issue here is just as Bill states: "if that illegal
> operation isn't impacting hams or ham bands, then what's
> the point?"
>
> The problem is that such illegal operation has and does impact
> hams and the ham bands. One impact is the RF amplifier regulations
> imposed on us hams because of widespread violations by illegal users.
> Did those 1978 regs stop the use illegal use of RF amplifiers by nonhams?
> Of course not! But they impact the ability of hams to buy, sell and build
Rf
> amplifiers. (The rules prohibit kits as well as assembled units).

But, as you note, those rules are 24 years old.

> There are lots of other examples - RFI, anti-antenna ordinances and
attitudes,
> etc.

That's true, but it doesn't have any relationship to the restructiuring.

> If I had a dollar for every time somebody asked "what's your handle?" upon
> discovering that Isomeone was a ham, I could retire.

Handle, name, why should that matter so much?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

874. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:44:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8qlom$g2h$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40143

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020407140708.27399.00000345@mb-mr.aol.com...
> I'm going to answer both Bill and Dennis' excellent posts at once, to save
> space and time.
>
> In article <a8pkof$4j0$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
<SNIP>
> >That 4 month period did, as Dennis states below, see many
> >upgrades of coded techs direct to General during the April-July
> >2000 period. The tech upgrades fell into three catagories:
> >
> >1. Paper upgrades of techs licensed prior to 1987. All they
> >needed was proof of having the license prior to ' (exact date
> >escapes me) and they simply were upgraded upon application
> >at any post 4/15 VE session.
> >
> >2. Written test only upgrades of coded techs that only needed to
> >pass the General written element. Many took and obtained the CSCE
> >for the credit and then simply upgraded post 4/15/00 and others
> >continued to do it since then...with a spurt of such upgrades
> >happening 4/00 to 7/00.
>
> I agree 100% - but what's the third category?

I intended to break up 2 as those that held
CSCEs and then did the paper upgrade on post 4/15
and the third would then be those that took the
written general afetr 4.15.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

875. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:45:43 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub1lfd8tlv7r5f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40142

Brian P Burke wrote:

>"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
>news:ub0lg34qc3gu76@corp.supernews.com...
>> The End of "Amateur" Radio?
>>
>> I am looking as I write this at the "house ad" on page 130 of the current
>> issue of QST. It is headlined "YOU'RE INVITED" and as you look at it you
>> are naturally inclined to ask yourself, "to what?" Well, you're being
>> "invited" to "increase the impact of amateur radio and to insure its
>future"
>> through the "Education and Technology Program," the Big Project, that was
>> written of in the March issue as being of major, if not VAST, importance.
>> Now, I had the impression that there was a real sense of urgency here,
and
>> that the ball was ready to ROLL! But, no, we're just getting off the
>> ground, and not only that, all the ARRL wants from us is our money.

>Val, this isn't East Germany. You don't have and AK stuck in your back,
and
>you don't have to give your money.

No, I don't have to contribute. However, I likely WILL contribute, in spite
of
that ad on page 130 which didn't even mention an AMOUNT! What I was
commenting on, too quickly, was the fact that this is a top-down program
that appears to be bypassing most of the clubs entirely. And, I have to
admit,
I was expecting something that began with education of a less self-serving
type, that is, ELECTRONICS in general. FIRST. Now THAT would get our
foot in the door LOTS of places!

>> As you look at the ad in question, placed at the back of the magazine, at
>> the bottom left of the double truck, opposite an equipment ad that
totally
>> dominates it, you see a circular image, what I interpret as the
>patch-to-be
>> for this project. In that patch, is seems to me, are encapsulated many
>the
>> internal problems facing "amateur radio" right now. So, I'll begin my
>> discussion with that patch.
>>
>> It is headlined, in Big Type, "Amateur Radio."
>>
>> Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO

ONE
>> wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur." I say this knowing full
>well
>> the long and honored history of "amateurs" in many fields, and the origin
>> and meaning of the word. But none of that matters. "AMATEUR" has to GO!

>You might have noticed while preparing for your Technician exam that the
FCC
>calls it "Amateur Radio." Make a suggestion to the FCC to change it if its
>not catchy enough for you. Maybe we need a jingle, too.

I'm aware of what the FCC calls it. However, when interacting with the
public,
well, that fact need not be right up front as the first thing seen. Hey, I
think
the word "amateur" has a wonderful meaning when used with "radio," BUT,
to large sections of the general public it can have unfortunate
connotations.

>> In a couple of weeks I am going to be speaking to a lot of people about
>> "amateur radio" without ever using that expression. No, I'm going to be
>> speaking to people about the things they can DO with radio, fascinating
>> things, educational things, for a relatively small amount of money. I am
>> going to be stressing the links between radio and the computer, and the
>> InterNet, because almost everyone who will come to our event, at an
>> "upscale" high school,

>Dick's Alma Matta?

No, it's a new school.

>> WILL have a computer, for SURE, and that computer
>> will be hooked to the net. The key is the initial VISUAL impact, backed
>up
>> with enthusiasm and a brief look at some activities and equipment. This
>is
>> how I have been doing astronomy programs for about 20 years, and how, in
>> part, I re-built the local astronomy club.

>I honestly doubt that you had a computer hooked up at the astronomy club 20
>years ago, but none-the-less, its a good idea. Personally, I like going
>with stuff that works. Thats why I'm not using code.

As a matter of fact, we were using the first PCs just about 20 years ago,
though not at remote functions it's true. One of our members had a
North Star, I believe, running Word Star . . . MORE than 20 years ago!
And I had a VIC-20, trying to do astronomy . . . nearly 20 years ago.

>> Very briefly, I joined this group about twenty-five years ago,
immediately
>> after it had lost both of its leaders, one to an accident and one to a
>> terrible disease. So, when I joined, the club was doing very little
other

>> than maintaining itself. By 1982, I had become president of this group
>and
>> was able to encourage the membership to show up for public "star parties"
>at
>> local high schools and other locations. We did the first ones twenty
>years
>> ago this spring. We now have our own remote site and observatory, plus a
>> continuing presence in print, on the radio and on television. Our
>> membership is about double what it was when I joined and is very active
>and
>> involved. We're able to raise money. In short, I am proud of what I
have
>> helped to vis-�-vis astronomy here in Columbia and look forward to
helping
>> with radio in a similar way. We'll see.

>Just don't get yourself so busy that you blow off the code.

It's this new VX-5 radio that's doing that. Too many buttons and a 72-page instruction manual. I'm definitely falling behind!

>> In any event, one of the things that truly helps that initial impression
>is
>> a powerful and positive "point-of-purchase" display. That display has to
>> STOP people and then when they stop, it has to SPEAK to them, visually,
in
>a
>> POWERFUL way. What the heck does the current "Big Project" patch SAY to
>> people who "stop to look at it?":

>The ARRL has had an HQ person working the education slant for years. They
>do like to rehash things and call it new.

I think the idea BEHIND this "Big Project" is great. However, what I have found is that most middle-school teachers have quite enough on their plates already. What they need is for someone to come in and provide something that they don't have to expend a whole lot of time on up front. This is what I
have been doing for many years with astronomy. No doubt, some teachers who are Hams are going to take advantage of this. However, can it be a truly mass program? I have my doubts.

>> It says, first and foremost: AMATEUR RADIO! Then it doesn't say much
>else,
>> really, since the arcane and indecipherable (to the public) ARRL logo is
>THE
>> BIGGEST THING IN IT, visually speaking. So, really, what' the BIG
PROJECT
>> all about? Well, it's about the ARRL, that's what! LOOK at that logo,
on
>> page 130 of the current QST! What are you getting out of it, visually?
>If

>> you're the public -- ZIP! For that matter, if your a radio amateur, you
>> getting just about zip.

>OK.

Uh oh, now I'm worried!

>> What would that patch look like if I were designing it? Well, the center
>> image would NOT be some impossible for (the public) to understand logo.
>No,
>> the center image would evoke something, and therefore be ONE image, not
>the
>> over-complicated hodge-podge you in fact see. For instance, something
>that
>> immediately comes to MY mind is a silhouette image of a young person in a
>> learning situation (seated, with a book, perhaps), and then one other
>> artifact in the image, a RADIO artifact. And that's IT! The blurb at
the
>> top of the patch could say almost ANYTHING other than "AMATEUR RADIO."
>That
>> is SO bad it is NOT worth talking about. The blurb could be just an
>> acronym, if the center image was powerful enough. I would crank up
>> something like "ARRL * ETP * ARRL" or, gee, ANYTHING else, and then a
>slogan
>> at the bottom: "RADIO FOR EVERYONE" or something. The object is to
ENGAGE
>> people, not CONFUSE them.

>Dave doesn't want radio for everyone. You'll have to ask him.

What I hope to do is do something with radio similiar to the things I have
done with astronomy. That is, you show up with some very simple
equipment that will engage students in a hands-on activity, right on
the spot and "out of the box." Then you have something that follows
up, maybe a small project or class. I am thinking about radio
astronomy as the tie-in here. You get the science specialists involved
because you are NOT asking them to spend their money, or a whole
lot of their time. In short, I don't think it's necessary or even advisable
to try to hard sell Ham Radio with this kind of program. That will happen
by itself once you get them in the door for some other reason.

>> Folks, Ham Radio needs a media consultant, a good one, BAD!

>Val, I admire your enthusiasm, but rocking the boat will get you
blackballed
>faster than being a commie in 50's Hollywood. You just better settle down
>and learn the code like a good boy. Keep your nose clean.

I have a very clean nose these days! Why? I always carry a handkerchief!

Val

P.S. I'm going to set up my own project here, beginning in two weeks.
I'm going to go for the junior high kids and see what happens.

**

876. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:48:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8qm62$26t$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40145

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020407140708.27399.00000345@mb-mr.aol.com...
> I'm going to answer both Bill and Dennis' excellent posts at once, to save
> space and time.
> > Dennis wrote:
> >> So you'll have to forgive me for thinking that the numbers actually
> >> indicate that restructuring was a modest success, at least initially.
> >> It has apparently attracted new interest in the service at a time
> >> when there are a whole lot of other things to be interested in.
>
> Depends on how "success" is defined. K0HB sez the FCC
> did not consider growth as a goal of restructuring.

I believe Hans is correct. THE reasoning behind
restructuring was the FCC goal to reduce/eliminate
unneeded rules and regs.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

877. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-07 23:58:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407195847.19023.00000384@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 40146

In article <20020406155150.20757.00001663@mb-mw.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>The HRO in Burbank, CA, mini-mall at corner of Buena Vista and
>>Victory, has a coffee machine, cups, fixins, on one of the
>>counters.
>
> Spend a lot of time there wishing "Gee...wish >I< could do that
>too...???

Not really. It is convenient since right across Buena Vista is a huge new Ralph's supermarket where we shop regularly. The intersection of Buena Vista and Victory has four mini-malls. The nine-block long Empire Center close by doesn't have a bookstore/newsstand outlet and the nearest large newsstand is at a Barnes & Noble next to the Media City Mall in Burbank. The totally huge Fry's Electronics near the airport no longer stocks QST or CQ or 73 magazines but lots of other periodicals on a rack that must be 30 feet long, 6 feet high. The end result is just going across the street from Ralph's maybe bimonthly to check out article content in the closest outlet.

A walk-in store is good to compare relative quality of front panel displays in incident sunlight conditions. The Burbank HRO hasn't covered more than 30% of its front window with posters, notices, etc., so there is plenty of northern sky light hitting all those backlit LCD screens on front panels. Found none of them to be what I would consider good enough for mobile installations in sunbelt daylight, but others might think differently. I prefer LEDs for mobile relative to the pale backlit LCD displays.

The Internet is now the place to really shop for hobby equipment... but the on-line currency translators do not yet handle "Call" as a numeric-value price. :-)

I'm sure that your fist is still clenched inside that jar so I'm curious what the snarly insults will be in the inevitable reply... :-)

878. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 00:07:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407200709.09446.00000431@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 40147

In article <3CAEED83.CE7563E3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> From 1980 to 1990, the number of US hams rose 30%
>> From 1990 to 2000, the number of US hams rose 34%
>>
>> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
>> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.
>
>That's not a valid conclusion.

Why not? The growth in Decade 1 was 30% and the growth in Decade 2 was 34%.
The difference is 4%.

No licenses expired between 1989 and 1994, but by 1999 all of the
first-generation 10
year licenses had been renewed.

>What percentage of hams were nocode techs at
>the end of 2000? 20%?

Doesn't matter.

> Whatever it was means the coded part of the ham
>population
>fell off rather rapidly. -16%? Like I said, ham radio would be in decline if
>it were not for the adoption of the nocode tech license.

That's not a valid conclusion. You presume that none of the Techs would have
been licensed
if the code test had remained.
>
>> Is it not possible to use VHF/UHF for that purpose? I thought you and your
>> friends were all high-tech types. Does it really come down to HF
>ionospheric
>> propagation being your only option? Sure sounds like it.
>
>I don't do satellite stuff. Neither does he.

Only by choice.

And satellite stuff is not the only way to cover that path on VHF. Ever hear of
tropo
scatter? Put up nice big 2 meter arrays at each end and some decent power, plus
a
low noise front end and there's a good chance you can cover that path on CW.
And if
PACTOR II is as good as you claim, you can use it instead of CW.

73 de Jim, N2EY

879. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 01:04:12 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb0ef0b$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40149

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CB096D3.E18CEC08@earthlink.net...
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > I bet Dave still does...think the Earth is the center of the universe,
that
> > is.
>
> ...while you, of course, are quite certain that YOU are its center.
>
> Dave K8MN

Nope, I don't think that at all. I am nothing but an insignificant speck in
God's imagination. Thank goodness I was given the intelligence to realize
that, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

880. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 01:06:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204071706.3822b9fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40148

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<_a_r8.24007$ml2.1886154@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> Val,
>
> Did you send this jeremiad to someone who has influence in the matter, like
> your Division Director?
>
> In case it slipped your mind, I've done so for you.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
. . . the code test war in this NG at least had some relevance, now
it's down to WHAT??
>
>
BLEH. This NG is gone to hell. Back to radio.
>
>
w3rv

881. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 01:12:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb0f106_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40150

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ub19hut129h558@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >I don't know about anyone else...but I just can't wait
> >to have Val out there in the field representing the ARS...
> >
> >oh yeah...oh buhruther
>
> Say, why don't YOU tell us about all you've done with
> the public vis-a-vis the ARS? I'd sure like to know how
> to go about it . . . if you've got some advice for me.
>
> Val
> KC0MUB
>

Well, Val, let's see. I've spent one year on the team developing the ARRL ARECC course, have taken and received a certificate in all three courses, have served as instructor in at least two classes in each of the three Levels over the past year (in fact, have had just the last month or so off). I was Hunt County ARES EC for a year, until I had to give it up due to obligations I must fulfill at work. The last act I did in that capacity was spend a little more than $1500 of my own money to put together an all day ARES symposium in Hunt County. I have spent untold hours in storm spotting, was with MARS for about three years--one of which was as net control. I have been with NTS and served as net control there for about a year; have been with RACES and ARES organizations both in Kaufman and Hunt counties.

I've done it all by challenging the status quo but without your type of attitude, and never to the detriment of the ARRL--even though I have some serious differences with the ARRL. You seem to be beyond diplomacy and professionalism in your approach to criticism and I dare say that you are nothing, truly nothing, but an overaged agitator with a mission to become ever as arrogant and offensive and Larry Roll and Dick Carroll, to name a couple.

What else would you like to know, because there is more...

Kim W5TIT

882. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 01:13:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb0f146_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40251

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020407162536.09446.00000429@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <EVCr8.3976$Cw2.190521595@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >But are you actually admonishing Val?
> >>
> >> I'm saying there are better choices of words. Val is not alone in
making
> >> less-than-optimum
> >> choices.
> >
> >Why are all you'se guys giving Val a free pass?
>
> He's not getting "a free pass". Most of my posts in response to him
consist of
> disagreement. But he is a newcomer and I'm trying to set an example of how
> gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable.
>

Val would first have to find the gentleman in himself...

Kim W5TIT

883. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 01:20:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb0f2d8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40252

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB0C4CA.1404AC1F@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > But if you recall I noted that maybe it's not the TEST but
> > the MODE that is the key (bad pun intended).
>
> Of course, it is virtually impossible to misbehave on CW except
> for jamming, of course, which seems to be the most popular mode
> for jamming.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Well, mostly. We used to have a ragchew on 10M every night. After one local ham became an Extra, he spent many evenings getting on or near frequency and keying m-o-t-h-e-r-f-u...and you know the rest. Cliff, my husband, one night began sending the guy's callsign to him with a de and Cliff's callsign at the end. The guy never even recognized his own callsign.

Oh, how do we know it was him? Because he'd also "tune up" with aaauuuuuddddddiiioooo coming from his station. And, when we'd all start making comments on how he'd probably paid for his Extra class license, he'd get so pissed he'd start yelling at all of us...what an idiot.

Kim W5TIT

884. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 01:23:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb0f391$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40253

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ub1k5c3eubb4c3@corp.supernews.com...
>
> K0HB wrote:
>
> >As Tonto was heard to say, "Speak for yourself, white guy!"
>
> I thought I was!
>
> However, I admit that I should have NOT have said that "no one"
> wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur" today. I certainly
> should have qualified that. But time was short and this IS UseNet.
>
> Val
>

So, uh, Val....when you gonna start making money at ham radio and how you
gonna do it?

Kim W5TIT

885. ARNewsline 1286 - April 5 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 02:24:18 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020407222418.00564.00003800@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 40254

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1286 - April 5 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1286 with a release date of Friday, April 5th, 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Australian radio regulators say no to I-LINK and the NCVEC says its time to revamp Element 2. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1286 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

INTERNATIONAL: I-LINK NOT LEGAL IN AUSTRALIA

One of the very popular internet based linking protocols appears to be illegal to use in Australia. This as the Australian Communications Authority issues a finding against I-Link. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the background:

--
There are two competing systems being used in ham radio to link repeaters over the Internet. One is called I-LINK and the other is I-R-L-P.

I-R-L-P stands for the Internet Radio Linking Project. It was developed in Canada by Dave Cameron, VE7LTD. It's aim is to link ham radio systems separated by long distance over the Internet without the use of expensive eased lines or satellites. I-R-L-P uses Voice-Over-IP software to link radio sites around the world. But I-R-L-P uses its own custom interface board and software suite running on a Linux platform. And that's why many hams have opted for an alternative called I-LINK.

I-LINK does everything that I-R-L-P does in linking repeaters, but it does not require a computer running Linux or any proprietary hardware interface. The needed software is available to anyone. It runs on a P-C and anyone can have it in their computer. Even non-hams. And that is what seems to be bothering our regulatory body, the A-C-A. It says that the widespread and open availability of I-LINK could make it possible for non hams to get on the air.

Over the past few weeks, much comment has been made regarding the legality or otherwise of I-LINK here in Australia. To clarify the A-C-A position, let me quote in part from a letter by John Martin the Federal Technical Advisory Chairman.

"There should be no issue with I-LINK because the A-C-A has made it clear that it must be impossible for anyone to gain access to an amateur transmitter by any means other than on-air working one of the stations that is connected to the link. The only system which can comply with this is I-R-L-P."

This action by our A-C-A appears to not sitting well with I-LINK proponents in other nations. Some fear the decision here in V-K could bring similar action by other communications regulators in their parts of the world.

VK's National Society, the Wireless Institute of Australia's President Ernest Hocking VK1LK along with WIA/ACA Liaison team member Gilbert Hughes VK1GH met with the ACA Thursday 28 March to discuss the current situation.

--
Hocking: “In order to address this situation the ACA have agreed to develop an information paper in conjunction with the WIA ACA liaison team. This paper will aim to make clear the criteria under which Internet linking can take place. The paper will not endorse specific software or systems. Rather it will provide clear guidance on the conditions that need to be met for the operation of such linked systems to remain legal within the the Radio Communications Act.”
--

It was agreed that every effort would be made to develop the paperwithin a period of 4 - 6 weeks. WIA President VK1LK has called on the Ham population of VK to "ask for your patience over the next few weeks whilst this document is being developed".

From Q-News Australia, I'm Graham Kemp, VK4BB, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Articles describing I-LINK recently appeared in both CQ and QST Magazines. No matter. Basically the Australian Communications Authority has said IRLP is O-K but I-Link has to go. At least for now. (Q-News)

**

RADIO REGULATIONS: FCC PROPOSES TO STRENGTHEN RULES AGAINST REPETITIVE APPLICATIONS

The FCC has proposed changing its application rules for all wireless radio services--including the Amateur Radio Service--in an effort to expand the scope of its current ban on repetitious applications. Newsline’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has more:

--
The ARRL Letter reports that an FCC Notice of Proposed Rule Making released March 20th seeks to modify section 1.937 of its rules. This, to prohibit the filing of all applications that are substantially similar to applications the agency denied or dismissed with prejudice within the previous 12 months.

The term “with prejudice” means a legal issue or court case that is dismissed for good reason and the plaintiff is barred from bringing another action on the same claim. And, if the FCC gets its way, WT Docket No. 02-87 will bring a rules change that might prohibit a handful of applications filed by new and renewing hams where a similar or identical application was denied in the past 12 months.

The FCC cites the pending license request by Herbert L. Schoenbohm, ex-KV4FZ, as an example of a repetitious application. Schoenbohm's amateur license renewal was finally denied in 2000, when the US Supreme Court refused to hear the case. His authority to operate as a radio amateur expired in January 2001.

Then, last April, Schoenbohm applied for a new Amateur Radio license and passed the General exam. The FCC has designated that application for hearing, to determine, in part, if Schoenbohm deserves to be a Commission licensee.

The FCC says that such cases consume significant resources to re-litigate. Especially since they involve identical issues and the same applicants very close in time.

What about routine issues like dismissed vanity applications? The FCC says that they would not be impacted in any way. For vanity license applications, the FCC now allows these applicants to correct the mistakes and file again. The FCC says that it will continue to do so if the proposed rule change is adopted.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW
--

Comments on WT Docket No. 02-87, are due 30 days from the publication of the proposed rule in the Federal Register. Reply comments will be due 45 days after publication. (ARRL)

**

HAM RADIO TESTING: NEW ELEMENT 2 DRAFT EXAMINATION RELEASED FOR COMMENT

The proposed draft syllabus for the new Element 2 Amateur Radio examination has been released for public comment. As we go to air, Scotty Neustadter, W4WW, who chairs the NCVEC Question Pool Committee says that this draft syllabus will be posted to the ARRL's web page within a few days.

Neustadter adds the period for public comment will close on May 9th. He asks that you send your comments to all the members of the Question Pool Committee of the NCVEC. Their e-mail addresses are:

Scotty Neustadter, Chair w4ww@arrl.net
Bart Jahnke, Member vec@arrl.org
Fred Maia, Member fmaia@texas.net
John Johnston, Member Johnston.John1@worldnet.att.net)
(NCVEC, W4WW)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Santa Barbara Amateur Radio Club Net serving Santa Barbara California.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAMVENTION 2002 - THE CHAIRMAN SPEAKS OUT

The Dayton Hamvention is now just a bit more than a month away and its General Chairman, Jim Graver, KB8PSO, is speaking out. Actually he has been talking to RAIN Producer and 2002 Radio Amateur of the Year Hap Holly, KC9RP. One of the things he made public was who will be speaking at the Hamvention's grand awards banquet:

--
Graver: "It will be William Cross from the FCC and Paul Reid from FEMA, and they will be talking about emergency communications and preparedness in respect to Amateur Radio."
--

Want yo hear more? Well Holly has prepared an extended interviewww with Jim Graver. Part 1 is on line right now at www.rainreport.com. If you don't happen to have internet access, try calling 847-827-7246. (RAIN)

**

CONSUMER ALERT: TELEPHONE AREA CODE 809 IS COSTLY

If you get an e-mail, voicemail or page telling you to call a phone number with an 809 area code, beware. The CGC Communicator reports that chances are, it's a scam and your phone bill will be
astronomical. The FCC has already issued a public warning about calling this area code. Its on the web at www.fcc.gov/cib/consumerfacts/809.html (CGC Communicator, FCC)

**

COMMUNICATIONS BUSINESS: AOL REPORTEDLY COURTING LINUX

Linux users listen up. Your favorite operating system may finally be getting a shot at becoming a real competitor to Microsoft Windows as rumors surface that AOL Time Warner Inc. is negotiating to buy the Linux distributor Red Hat Inc.

The Washington Post reported in late January that such talks were underway. The deal could bolster AOL Time Warner against rival Microsoft as both companies design strategies for moving their services beyond the personal computer to mobile devices and such nascent services as interactive television. (Publised reports)

**

HAMFESTS: ST. JOHN LUTHERAN SCHOOL HAMFEST

Turning to the hamfest scene. The St. John Lutheran School Hamfest and Electronics Show is slated for Saturday, April 13th from 8 a.m. to 1 p.m. Location is in Garfield Heights Ohio. Garfield Heights is 10 minutes South East of Cleveland with the school at 11333 Granger Road. Admission is only one dollar. For more information please write by e-mail to ln4js@visn.net. (via E-Mail)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: KE4IQB NAME WITHDRAWN FOR DEPUTY NASA ADMINISTRATOR

NASA says the White House has withdrawn the nomination of Marine Corps Major General and former astronaut Charles F. Bolden, KE4IQB, to be the space agency's next Deputy Administrator. Bolden is currently Commanding General of the 3rd Marine Aircraft Wing, based in San Diego. According to the CQ website, the NASA announcement did not say why Bolden's nomination was withdrawn, but suggested that the Defense Department objected to losing him from an active military command during the war on terrorism. There was no immediate word on who would be named to the number two post at NASA instead of Bolden. (CQ)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: KB2GSD TO PITCH FOR FREE AIRTIME

Walter Cronkite, KB2GSD, will be the pitch man for a new campaign taking on broadcasters for not offering enough affordable or free airtime to federal candidates. This, even though the airwaves are owned by the American public.

The coalition sponsoring the Cronkite narrative said that its kicking off its grass-roots drive following passage of the landmark campaign finance reform legislation. This legislation spared broadcasters from having to offer deep discounts to federal candidates.

Under current federal law, broadcasters are required to give discounts to political candidates. However the actual rate can vary depending upon the time it is slated to air. (Publisged reports)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: W6TIA RETIRES FROM KFWB

Richard Rudman, W6TIA, the Chief Engineer of KFWB - AM in Los Angeles California is retiring following a truly illustrious thirty year career at the all-news station. Rudman, who is the National Chair of Congressional Emergency Alert System Advisory Committee is perhaps better known for his roles with the establishment and evolution of the E-A-S nationwide.

During Rudman's tenure heading up the engineering helm of KFWB, the region has been regularly challanged by major brush fires, power failures, earthquakes, riots, and more. Throughout all of this Rudman has kept KFWB on the air. A truly enviable record and one that W6TIA can be proud of.

And less we forget, W6TIA has agreeed to be a part of this years Newsline sponsored Ham Radio Town Meeting at the 2002 Dayton Hamvention. His topic will be the Emergency Alert System and introducing it to Amateur Radio. (CGC Communicator, ARNewsline(tm))

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for todays radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: SMART FENCES

Smart fences are possible. So say Pennsylvania State College researchers who are using acoustic technology to turn a simple chain-link fence into an intrusion detection system.

To make the system work, a single strand of galvanized steel wire, a system of springs and weights and some inexpensive ground sensors make the fence sensitive to intruders. Among parties interested in the technology are the U.S. military, airports and oil companies. (PSC News Release)

**

SPACE AND SCIENCE: REPLACEMENT TDRS IN TROUBLE

A NASA communications satellite launched into orbit on March 8th has developed a problem with its onboard supply of propellant. The trouble is delaying the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite-I from reaching its ultimate destination, a circular orbit about 22,300 miles above Earth's equator. The satellite's current egg-shaped orbit is 22,236 miles at its ap[ogee and about 4,970 miles at its perigee. The spacecraft's manufacturer, Boeing Satellite Systems, is hopeful that its engineers will ultimately be able to deliver the satellite into its proper orbit. If it can’t, the satellite could be declared a total loss. (Published news reports)

**

INTERNATIONAL - HOLLAND: NEW LATIN AMERICAN RADIO STATIONS CD

Dutch shortwave enthusiast Max van Arnhem has produced an audio Compact Disc featuring 371 wave files of Latin American and Caribbean radio stations. According to Media Network, most are off-air recordings as received in his home in The Netherlands, but there are also some recordings made on one of the five trips he made to Central America and the Caribbean between 1979 and 2001. You can find a review of the CD, and details of how to buy it at www.rnw.nl/realradio/booklist/html/lacd.html. (Media Network)

**

DX

In D-X, the Ducie Island DXpedition is being called a major success. The ifirst ever D-Xpedition to the newest DXCC entity came to an end March 26. The VP6DI team was on the air for just over nine days and loged over 39,000 contacts. VP6DI HF QSLs go via VE3HO, and 6-meter QSLs go to JA1BK.

And some good news for DXCC chasers. This as the ARRL announces that it will accept SSB contacts with P-5 slash 4L4FN in the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea for DXCC credit. The operator of the station is Ed Giorgadze of the Republic of Georgia. He has been active from the capital city of Pyongyang since last November. Valid contacts from the beginning his P-5 operation last fall may be submitted for credit, effective immediately. (ARRL)

**

A NEWSLINE FOLLOW-UP: THE POLITICS OF 11 METERS - PART 2: “A NATIONAL RESOURCE CALLED REACT”

Last week we told you that there has only been one truly successful organization with any political ties to 11 meters. In Part 2 of his special report on the not so political side of 11 meter Class D CB, Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, takes a look at REACT.

--

A long known name in CB radio is REACT, or Radio Emergency Associated Communications Teams. REACT's mission statement stresses public safety communications, assisting individuals, groups and government agencies.

The stated goal: To save lives, prevent injuries and give assistance wherever and whenever needed. The group promotes establishing a monitoring network of trained volunteer citizen-based communicators and using all means available to deliver their message. REACT, it seems, has succeeded on both counts.

The idea of using CB radio in an organized way for emergency communications was born in a mid-winter Chicago snowstorm. It happened after CB radio was used to summon assistance for a young family with a very sick child whose car was stuck on an expressway. That was in the winter of 1962 when CB was really still in its infancy.

Not long after, the groups founder, Henry B. "Pete" Kreer, convinced the Hallicrafters Company to sponsor the REACT program. The initial requirements for a Team was for three members who agreed to monitor 11 meters several hours a day for emergencies. There were no dues or other requirements except to comply with federal and state regulations.

By 1964, it was determined that there was a need for a National CB Emergency Channel. REACT National Headquarters asked all of its 800 teams to monitor channel 9 as a voluntary emergency channel. The scheme worked so well that in 1967, REACT led a movement to convince the FCC to designate channel 9 as the CB emergency channel. It was a major political success and many CB hobbyists began to look at REACT as a possible voice in Washington. But that was not to be.

In 1969, General Motors Research Labs assumed sponsorship of REACT. Also in 1969, Jerrold Reese -- a name that would become synonymous with the growth of REACT became its Managing Director. Founder Henry Kreer remained on with the title of Executive Director.

It was on April 24, 1973, that REACT and to a lesser degree 11 meter C-B probably got its greatest public exposure. That’s when NBC's Today Show televised an interview with Gerald Reese and Henry Kreer. Their interview dealing with the REACT program was aired on some 220 affiliated stations. It lead to over 500 inquiries.

In 1975, REACT broke from GM and started as an independent organization. Not long after, REACT International received not-for-profit status in the state of Illinois followed by federal tax exempt status.

REACT was on its own and less than a year later, it was represented at the first White House Conference on CB radio. And in the ensuing years it won many awards for promoting highway safety through its radio monitoring efforts.

But nothing last forever and the late 1970's brought declining use of 11 meter Class D CB. As the 80’a approached there were far more CB sets sitting on closet shelves than on the air. The C-B craze was dying and with it fewer people in the REACT program.

By the middle 1980’s REACT the only major organization with any ties at all to 11 meters. REACT had survived the CB shakeout probably because never claimed to be a savior or rallying point for 11 meter hobby operators. It’s self appointed task was assistance to the public. REACT was now national and chapterized and tax exempt. It also had broadened its horizons to include other bands and began using operators from other services including ham radio. C-B was now only a part of the REACT model.

In retrospect, one might say that REACT fought very hard for setting up an emergency communications monitoring system on 11 meters, but it was not a lobbiest for the rights of the 11 meter hobby radio operator. Instead, it always has lived to its mission statement and that’s probablly why it has survived and prospered for the last 40 years.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m David Black, KB4KCH.

--

To learn more about REACT International or to find out if there is an active REACT team in your area, please write to REACT International, Inc. 5210 Auth Road, #403, Suitland, Maryland 20746. You can also go to their website at www.reactintl.org.

Meantine, one question remains: Will anyone ever be successful in totally organizing political potential of 11 meter C-B? That part of the story, next week. (ARNewsline(tm))

**
NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2002 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year is now open. No significant changes from last year. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our website at www.arnewsline.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Mert Garlick, N6AWE, saying welcome to the year 2002, 73, and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

886. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 03:28:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB10E5C.95775279@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40255

N2EY wrote:

W5DXP wrote:
> >What percentage of hams were nocode techs at
> >the end of 2000? 20%?
>
> Doesn't matter.

To you. It matters to me.

> That's not a valid conclusion. You presume that none of the Techs would have
> been licensed if the code test had remained.

I'm not counting Tech+'s. And I am presuming that some of the Techs would
have been licensed if the code test had remained. If only half the Techs
would not have been licensed, then the ARS population would be in decline.

> And if PACTOR II is as good as you claim, you can use it instead of CW.

I'm already in email contact with him.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

887. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 03:28:43 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a8r2pb$2vc4$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 40256

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>> But we also know that the growth rate of the ARS from 1989 through
>>> March 2001 was effected by two "statistical anomalies" that made the
>>> license expiry rate artificially low (we know this because you said it
>>> a few years ago, though you no longer mention it now), and since
>>> then we've entered a period with an anomalously high rate of license
>>> expiry as the Tech 10-year bubble moves through.
>
>Whoa, hold on a minute.
>
>The first statistical anomaly was the change from 5 to 10 year licenses in
>1984. This conversion was complete by 1989, and there were no expirations from
>1989 to 1994. But after 1994 the first of the 10 year licenses began to expire
>- 8 years ago, and 6 years before restructuring.
>
>The second anomaly was the dropping of the code test from the Tech in Feb 1991.
>The number of Techs was reduced during the ten years after that change
>only by upgrades and cancellations. However, unless Techs drop out at a higher
>rate than other hams, there should be no sudden jump in losses after March
>2001.

I don't think this is correct. In February 2001 the rate at which
Techs were dropping out was zero. In March 2001 the rate at which
Techs were dropping out became non-zero. As the dropout rate for the
other license classes was unchanged between February and March 2001,
the dropout rate for the service as a whole, including Techs, must
have increased. That is, the dropout rate for the service as a whole
was abnormally low prior to March 2001, only since then has the dropout
rate become closer to "normal". In fact I think the number of dropouts
for Tech is now abnormally high, since the number of expiries for that
license are substantially higher over the 4 years following March 2001
then they are for the subsequent 4 years (i.e. a lot of people got the
Tech license when it was new).

>There was a lot of speculation about how many Techs would renew. I have always
>thought the percentage would be comparable to other license classes.

If I've done the calculations on the ah0a stats correctly (have awk
will travel), the percentages of hams failing to renew, including
adjustments for grace period renewals, averaged over the last year has been:

e=14% a=25% g=25% t=40% n=73%

If one also includes cancellations (I assume this is mostly SKs) one gets

e=37% a=30% g=35% t=43% n=73%

as a fraction of expiries+cancellations.

Every month the service now loses about 2450 licenses, sort of proportionately spread across all license classes. Before March 2001 the Tech fraction was much smaller (only Tech+ licenses expired) and the monthly loss was more like 1850. The growth (or lack-of-growth) rate for the service as a whole depends on how many new licensees there are to replace these.

>>> but if the higher speed code tests really were discouraging 600 new hams
>>> a month with this interest from entering the service, as apparently may
>>> have been the case, it was probably time for the code tests to go.
>
>They will be totally gone soon. FCC has all but set the date. 600 per month is
>only
>7200 per year - about 1%.

1% of the total amateur population, maybe, but it is 25% of the hams that disappear and more than 30% of the total new licenses. It is a significant fraction of all new hams. I can't help but think this is a good thing overall, though it remains to be seen whether the up-tick has staying power.

Dennis Ferguson

888. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 04:13:42 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <WN8s8.9955$QC1.931552@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40257

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:a8r2pb$2vc4$1@heap.juniper.net...
>
> I don't think this is correct. In February 2001 the rate at which
> Techs were dropping out was zero. In March 2001 the rate at which
> Techs were dropping out became non-zero. As the dropout rate for the
> other license classes was unchanged between February and March 2001,
> the dropout rate for the service as a whole, including Techs, must
> have increased. That is, the dropout rate for the service as a whole
> was abnormally low prior to March 2001, only since then has the dropout
> rate become closer to "normal". In fact I think the number of dropouts
> for Tech is now abnormally high, since the number of expiries for that
> license are substantially higher over the 4 years following March 2001
> then they are for the subsequent 4 years (i.e. a lot of people got the
> Tech license when it was new).
>
>
> If I've done the calculations on the ah0a stats correctly (have awk
> will travel), the percentages of hams failing to renew, including
> adjustments for grace period renewals, averaged over the last year has
been:
>
> e=14% a=25% g=25% t=40% n=73%
>
> If one also includes cancellations (I assume this is mostly SKs) one
gets
>
> e=37% a=30% g=35% t=43% n=73%
>
> as a fraction of expiries+cancellations.
>
> Every month the service now loses about 2450 licenses, sort of
proportionately
> spread across all license classes. Before March 2001 the Tech fraction
was
> much smaller (only Tech+ licenses expired) and the monthly loss was more
> like 1850. The growth (or lack-of-growth) rate for the service as a
whole
> depends on how many new licensees there are to replace these.
>

Having had some experience with the numbers, it is time to throw my oar in
the water.

First, cancellations are NOT SKs and in fact if I had the license and the death cert I am not sure I could cancel someone else's license at all. Several things cause cancellation, the biggest being the vanity callsign program; because the tickets are 10 years for the fee, the old one must be cancelled. While upgrades can be modifications, it may be necessary to cancel the old callsign to get the new one issued or it gets counted that way.

In any given month, four months of renewals are processed in bits and pieces or said another way, not even a good majority of April renewals will be April expirations. In fact, there will be a lot of July expires starting thru as they get past the 90 day bar. The only real way to tell is to follow a block of expirations over 4 months.

Your non-renewal figures are fairly close to what I got a few months back. But if one assumes that the reason for non-renewal among Extras is death, 14% implies six renewals or a sixty to seventy year Amateur career which is stretching a point just a bit. There is some demographic influence at work here. You might be amazed how many QCWA types are not Extras and a lot of them are renewing Class A's from WW2 but even at that there is nothing shabby about 25 percent because that implies a 35 year career AVERAGE.

Given upgrading which is typically done early, one would expect to see the non-renewals go up as privleges go down, and that is what you see simply because those who have upgraded are no longer Novices or Techs to be run thru the renewal process; they have self-selected.

Tracking these things has more hair than a barbershop floor.

Dick N BK

889. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 04:46:31 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8t2aj5ku6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40212

Never been challenged eh?

Ryan

> Izzat right? I've never had a teacher, clergyman or boss dare me to do
> anything. "Friends" and co-workers will often dare one to do something
> stupid while keeping a safe distance. They can often be heard saying
> afterward, "I can't believe he was stupid enough to do that". Sorry, I
> can't buy into your Rod McKuen-ism.
>
> Dave K8MN

890. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 04:50:02 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8t2ak6ku6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40214

You mean in the movie Deliverance?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> > I can improvise a guitar solo to a
> > jazz tune I've heard once. Can you?
>
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Was that you doing that "dueling banjos" thing about 30 years ago? Scary
> stuff.
>
> Brian
>
>

891. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 05:04:49 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8t2al7ku6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40211

He may not have a right to bitch about things they way they may be NOW, but
he has every right to complain about situations when he WAS a member.

Ryan

> The way I see it, if you're not an ARRL member, you have no right
> to complain about what they are or are not doing. I certainly have
> my "problems" with the ARRL -- issues of a highly personal nature
> which could easily influence me to take the same action you did
> in '84. However, I like ham radio more than I dislike the ARRL -- and
> I realize that as the National Organization for Amateur Radio, they
> are in the position to do a lot more to secure the future of this hobby.
> Or, at least, they could be. But, as an outsider, I realize that my
> own influence would be what yours is -- zero!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

892. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 05:07:17 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub28a7ilgg98ba@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40258

W5TIT - Kim wrote a lot of GOOD stuff!

Well, now, THAT's DIFFERENT! Congratulations, and I'm
serious in this! I have only one question, and it has to do with
"attitude." How does your call sign fit in there? That is, if
a female amateur radio operator showed up at a junior high,
or even a middle school, around HERE, with that call . . . well,
I don't think it would be well in most cases. Just a thought.

Val
KC0MUB

893. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 05:34:25 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8t2am8ku6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40213

The lords of amateur radio I guess eh? They can speak, doesn't mean I have to listen to them. Just like the old axiom goes, if you don't like what you hear on tv or radio (or ham radio) there are a couple of options:

Use the power switch, set to off position
Use the tuner dial, channel changer, remote or VFO to change the frequency
Use the volume control to turn it down.

Guess I look at it this way, as I remember it from when I was a kid. The louder someone yells, the less a person listens. Its all about how a person delivers the message.

Ryan

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:y5Dr8.3987$th2.189975773@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:a8etfm8mi3@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > What about people who weren't aware of ham radio until (what we need as
a
> > hobby need to do more of) someone introduced it to him? In order for
the
> > test to be considered dumbed down or the person lazy, they would have
had
> to
> > have had prior knowledge of what was going on before he jumped into the
> > boat. What about an 18 year old that gets licensed right now?
>
> Doesn't matter. Larry and Dick have spoken. Get used to it.
>
>

894. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 06:05:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB13343.71B89044@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40259

>
> And there are a lot of amateurish
> >photos, of guys standing around holding stuff, items that S&T banished a
> >long time ago. QST has the look, in places, of the very small Astronomical
> >League's REFLECTOR, which is moving up the food chain fast but still has too
> >many photos of, ah, guys standing around holding stuff. As for photos of
> >guys sitting at computers, indoors, with blown-out windows in the
> >background, they should be PURGED from ANY magazine, and a new art director
> >hired immediately. Or, more likely, it's time for QST to HIRE an art
> >director!

Look at page 77 through 80 of the December 2001 issue of S&T. There's pictures
of bunches of people with telescopes.

895. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 06:38:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB13AEB.5F8E36B2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40260

Valentine Germann wrote:

> The End of "Amateur" Radio?
>
>
>
> It is headlined, in Big Type, "Amateur Radio."
>
> Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO ONE
> wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur." I say this knowing full well
> the long and honored history of "amateurs" in many fields, and the origin
> and meaning of the word. But none of that matters. "AMATEUR" has to GO!

"Amateur" is an artifact of the early days of radio way back before the Funny Cookie Corporation was set up. Then the broadcasters who were the "professionals" got the ancestor of the FCC to ban the amateur broadcasters from playing music. Amateur radio evolved into the 2 way radio hobby/service we have today. You could mention "ham radio" but where the term "ham" cam from is not at all clear. But you have to distinguish it from CB, which some of the kids have seen and played with.

>
>
> In a couple of weeks I am going to be speaking to a lot of people about
> "amateur radio" without ever using that expression. No, I'm going to be
> speaking to people about the things they can DO with radio, fascinating
> things, educational things, for a relatively small amount of money. I am
> going to be stressing the links between radio and the computer, and the
> InterNet, because almost everyone who will come to our event, at an
> "upscale" high school, WILL have a computer, for SURE, and that computer
> will be hooked to the net. The key is the initial VISUAL impact, backed up
> with enthusiasm and a brief look at some activities and equipment.

Maybe a demo of packet, but with 1200 baud speed, that's not going to compete well with 56K dialup connections on the 'net. Maybe play recordings of QSOs with the space shuttle crews (live would be too prone to failure). Or set up an HF station using a wire dipole strung between trees where everyone can see, and during a contest make some quick contacts to some easy DX. Or some prearranged rag chew to a common DX station (common in that other hams won't try to snag a quickie for a card). Idea is to promote that this radio hobby doesn't require any infrastructure like the internet does (like phone company undersea fibre optic cables, etc) beyond a radio and an antenna. And no phone bill or ISP monthly charges.

Be sure to stress that ham radio is 2 way, so no kids think that
it's a way to play rap or heavy metal to the town.

BTW, Why is it called "American Radio _Relay_ League"?
A relay is an electromechanical switch driven by a coil, yes?
And radios don't use relays anyway....

896. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 06:56:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB13F1F.1E89E810@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40261

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Sun, 7 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
> >Can someone explain how a Technician class license holder is able to set up
> >a repeater network or auxiliary stations? Each aux station would be a
> >different individual with a unique call sign I assume, however my question
> >is mainly about broadcast location. Are operators limited to broadcasting
> >only from the address indicated on FCC license? An example would be where
> >the FCC indicates operator "KABCD" lives in Los Angeles and operator "KEFGH"
> >lives in Hollywood, but other information such as QRZ and other websites
> >indicate that these two call signs (and others) are repeating in a
> >closed/private status and that the locations are not Los Angeles and
> >Hollywood, but somewhere else such as Pasadena and Santa Monica. I'd
> >appreciate any help as I'm new to this. Thanks.
>
> Broadcasting is not allowed with an amateur radio license.

What you meant to say is "transmit". "Broadcast" means to
be on continuously transmitting music or such. Hams are not
to do that, we are to have "2 way" conversations when we
transmit. "How do you start such?" you ask. We have
special protocols for inviting any other ham to engage in a
conversation, such as saying "CQ" (CQ is shorthand for
"I would like to talk to anyone who hears my request").

Back in the old days, our callsigns were linked to radio
equipment set-ups. Nowdays, our callsigns are more
associated with the person, and they can use any ham
radio equipment set-up (i.e., if I visit a ham friend, and
he lets me use his station, I use my callsign, not his).

Hams have frequency coordination organizations
run by hams to "allocate" ham frequencies that
can be used for repeaters. You can't really have
two repeaters on the same frequency pair in the
same town or area. It would be like having two
TV stations on the same channel in the same town.

The FCC says that it will view the ham organization who
does the allocation as legal as if the FCC did it themselves.

Normally, hams can use any ham radio frequency that is not
being used by other hams at the time the ham wants to
transmit. Repeaters are a special case. We "self allocate"
when we decide to transmit, and when we finish our conversation,
return the allocation to the general pool for other hams to use.

But we must listen first to make sure we don't "step on" other
hams.

897. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 12:06:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408080646.29940.00000293@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40262

In article <3cb0f146_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020407162536.09446.00000429@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <EVCr8.3976$Cw2.190521595@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
>> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>>
>> >> >But are you actually admonishing Val?
>> >>
>> >> I'm saying there are better choices of words. Val is not alone in
>making
>> >> less-than-optimum
>> >> choices.
>> >
>> >Why are all you'se guys giving Val a free pass?
>>
>> He's not getting "a free pass". Most of my posts in response to him
>consist of
>> disagreement. But he is a newcomer and I'm trying to set an example of how
>> gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable.
>
>Val would first have to find the gentleman in himself...

Exactly. All he needs is a little help.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

898. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 12:23:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408082313.22527.00002599@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 40265

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>No wonder amateur radio seems to be tanking. Would
>you trade a couple of VTVMs for a cover you could READ?

If you think that the price of the changes you suggested be made to QST is "a couple of VTVMs," you are completely unrealistic.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

899. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 12:25:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408082547.22527.00002600@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 40263

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

> $100,000 /yr is a drop in the bucket compared to
>the overall Newington / Washington salaries.

Care to make a "drop in the bucket" donation of $100,000 to the ARRL Lab test-equipment fund?

If you can show that Amateur Radio would benefit $100,000 worth by adding those staff, I am sure that ARRL would go along with it.

Care to show your math?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

900. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 12:28:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408082837.22527.00002601@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 40264

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>They got Dick Van Dyke to sit down
>in front of a KWM-2 at one time, and that had more to do with getting
>me to become a ham than a dozen "Elmers" trying to "sell" me on
>the ARS.

When I was licensed, it only took one Elmer, and a TV ad would not have done it for me.

Did you really have a dozen Elmers trying to talk you into becoming a ham, but waited until you saw Van Dyke to a 30-second TV spot? Were these dozen Elmers untrustworthy people, or do you automatically trust people you don't know more than people you do?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

901. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 12:55:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408085542.09508.00002128@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40266

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/07/02 19:25 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020407192520.29664.00000388@mb-bk.aol.com>

>It's a DUTY! (remember, the word "duty" is a four-letter word

For a Putz who chafes at the idea of being a member of a radio SERVICE,
it's funny to see you "making fun" of the concepts of duty, poignant or not.

SR

902. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 13:04:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408090415.09508.00002129@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40267

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/07/02 19:58 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020407195847.19023.00000384@mb-mg.aol.com>

>> Spend a lot of time there wishing "Gee...wish >I< could do that
>>too...???
>
>Not really. It is convenient since right across Buena Vista is a huge
>new Ralph's supermarket where we shop regularly.

Convienient? Why? There's precious little in there that you can use,
Lennie. Legally, anyway.

>Found none of them to be what I
>would consider good enough for mobile installations in sunbelt
>daylight, but others might think differently.

For what purpose would you purchase an Amateur Radio transceiver anyway?

>I'm sure that your fist is still clenched inside that jar so I'm curious
>what the snarly insults will be in the inevitable reply.

I am sure you think it is, Lennie, but it's not. And no snarly
insults...Just the usual amount of wonderment that you can at once unleash
bushels of bile against Amateur radio such that you do, then patronize Amateur
Radio stores.

Usual Andersonian two-step.......

903. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 14:22:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB1A785.99901544@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40268

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Your comment doesn't seem to make much sense.
> >
>
> Dave,
>
> And why are you singling out just this comment?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

It was simply another lying typo on my part, Hans. The sentence should
have read "This comment, in particular, doesn't make much sense".

904. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 14:26:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB1A89F.5D46AFBC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40269

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Hmmmmm, so you don't differentiate between good thinking and evil
> > > thinking. I'm beginning to understand you better.
> >
> > Oh? Was Galileo a thinker of evil thoughts?
>
> Hmmmmmm, why would you think that? It was the Catholic Church that was
> thinking the evil thoughts. Sorry I had to be the one to break it to you.

Time for some self-examination, Cecil. The reason I could think you
meant that is due to the way you presented the material.

How did you establish that the Church was thinking evil thoughts?
Perhaps you meant that the Church was lying because it stated its belief
in something which was later found to be in error.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

905. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 14:30:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB1A97D.BE591951@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40270

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Like Galileo's New Age babble in the early 17th century?
> >
> > No. More like Rod Kuen poems set to Kenny Gee music.
>
> I don't think Rod McKuen would appreciate you butchering his
> name like that.

It was a typo. I must have been lying.

>My favorite CD is Glenn Yarbrough's, "The
> Lonely Things" (The love songs of Rod McKuen). My favorite
> song on there is, "People Change".

Some people own lava lamps. There's no accounting for taste.

Dave K8MN

906. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 14:36:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB1AB06.5F0854E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40271

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CB096D3.E18CEC08@earthlink.net...
> >
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > I bet Dave still does...think the Earth is the center of the universe,
> that
> > > is.
> >
> > ...while you, of course, are quite certain that YOU are its center.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Nope, I don't think that at all. I am nothing but an insignificant speck in
> God's imagination.

On that, we agree.

> Thank goodness I was given the intelligence to realize
> that, Dave.

It's a start.

Dave K8MN

907. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 14:40:14 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB1ABD0.BAB16E09@psu.edu>
Source record: 40272

I don't know about "professional", but I'll settle for attractive! ;^)

- Mike - KB3EIA

CAM wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > I'm amazed in this thread that we have actually had people stand up for
> > poor design as if it were a mark of superior content, via the "if they
> > spend time on design, they take it away from content!!! Or "if they pay
> > an art director" (or apparently an illustrator) "they steal from" (pick
> > your choice) "which is much more important."
>
> Why on earth would someone want an amateur radio magazine to look
> professional? Wouldn't that be false advertising?

908. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 14:45:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8sadnkjc0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 40273

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> > The End of "Amateur" Radio?
> >
> >
> >
> > It is headlined, in Big Type, "Amateur Radio."
> >
> > Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO ONE
> > wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur."
"AMATEUR" has to GO!
>
> "Amateur" is an artifact of the early days of radio way back before the Funny
> Cookie Corporation was set up.

> BTW, Why is it called "American Radio _Relay_ League"?
> A relay is an electromechanical switch driven by a coil, yes?
> And radios don't use relays anyway....

Bob, if you think 'Amateur' is an artifact, grab hold and hang on. The
"relay" in ARRL is a leftover from the EARLY Low Frequency days before
ionospheric propagation was discovered, when the only way to get a
message beyond ground wave distance was to "relay" it through however
many other ham radio (spark) stations it took to reach its destination.
'American Radio Relay League' has been named that from near its
beginnings in 1914.....

Dick

909. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 14:53:40 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB1AEF6.479304C6@psu.edu>
Source record: 40274

Bill Sohl wrote:

> The reality of new hams is, based on all those I've encountered,
> is that none happened to wonder into the hobby because of
> a copy of QST...or for that matter, 73 and/or CQ magazine.
> The sale of QST at newstands is relatively new to begin with
> (a few years at most).

Agreed.

> As to you bringing ham radio direct to some high schoolers,
> that's great...but I don't see any need to turn QST into an
> over-the-counter media glitz show just on the chance
> a handful of non-hams "might" gravitate to its cover. Far
> better for the personal outreach effort.

I think you are assuming that hams don't care to see an attractive layout. I want to see good layout and attractive content.

If you don't care for or appreciate attractive layout, that is okay, and you will be satisfied by anyhthing that is put out. This isn't to sound demeaning or anything, it just means that you aren't oriented that way. It can even be a plus,(the characteristic, not poor layout) as you won't be swayed by it.

But most people do react to proper design, even if unconsiously. That is why it is there.

And I really do agree with you that we don't want to turn QST into an "over-the-counter media glitz show". But you really took a suggestion for improvement and put it right on the slippery slope there. Those things are often not at all good design in the first place.

All that is needed is some good design. That doesn't take much doing. I am surprised that so many hams would be against this. In a hobby where so many try to be precise and accurate, they are satisfied with what amounts to a visual typo.

- Mike -

910. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 14:56:13 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB1AF8F.F6E2AB22@psu.edu>
Source record: 40275

WOW, is Joe Walsh active? What I wouldn't give to have a QSL with him!!!

- mike - KB3EIA

N2EY wrote:

> As mentioned by others, we also have Ronnie Milsap, Jon Bon Jovi, Joe Walsh,
> Walter Cronkite and of course many current and past astronauts.

911. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 14:59:32 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <ofis8.2965$Oy3.1406772435@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40276

Does it matter if it is voice or data? The same rules and regs apply?

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CB13F1F.1E89E810@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> > On Sun, 7 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
> > >Can someone explain how a Technician class license holder is able to
set up
> > >a repeater network or auxiliary stations? Each aux station would be a
> > >different individual with a unique call sign I assume, however my
question
> > >is mainly about broadcast location. Are operators limited to
broadcasting
> > >only from the address indicated on FCC license? An example would be
where
> > >the FCC indicates operator "KABCD" lives in Los Angeles and operator
"KEFGH"
> > >lives in Hollywood, but other information such as QRZ and other
websites
> > >indicate that these two call signs (and others) are repeating in a
> > >closed/private status and that the locations are not Los Angeles and
> > >Hollywood, but somewhere else such as Pasadena and Santa Monica. I'd
> > >appreciate any help as I'm new to this. Thanks.
> >
> > Broadcasting is not allowed with an amateur radio license.
>
> What you meant to say is "transmit". "Broadcast" means to
> be on continuously transmitting music or such. Hams are not
> to do that, we are to have "2 way" conversations when we
> transmit. "How do you start such?" you ask. We have
> special protocols for inviting any other ham to engage in a
> conversation, such as saying "CQ" (CQ is shorthand for
> "I would like to talk to anyone who hears my request").
>
> Back in the old days, our callsigns were linked to radio
> equipment set-ups. Nowdays, our callsigns are more
> associated with the person, and they can use any ham
> radio equipment set-up (i.e., if I visit a ham friend, and
> he lets me use his station, I use my callsign, not his).
>
> Hams have frequency coordination organizations

> run by hams to "allocate" ham frequencies that
> can be used for repeaters. You can't really have
> two repeaters on the same frequency pair in the
> same town or area. It would be like having two
> TV stations on the same channel in the same town.
>
> The FCC says that it will view the ham organization who
> does the allocation as legal as if the FCC did it themselves.
>
> Normally, hams can use any ham radio frequency that is not
> being used by other hams at the time the ham wants to
> transmit. Repeaters are a special case. We "self allocate"
> when we decide to transmit, and when we finish our conversation,
> return the allocation to the general pool for other hams to use.
> But we must listen first to make sure we don't "step on" other
> hams.
>

912. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 15:06:44 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB1B205.ABD3FE85@psu.edu>
Source record: 40278

There are all kinds of folk in here. I like most of them with one
notable exception.

Val can get wound up. Most of the time I see him getting this way with
people who indulge in name calling and who get wound up in similar fashion.

I've disagreed with him fairly regularly, and somehow manage to have a
friendly relationship in spite of that.

While I don't condone it when he gets umm.... fiesty, he seems to give
what he gets.

- mike - KB3EIA

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020407162536.09446.00000429@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <EVCr8.3976$Cw2.190521595@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> > Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >
> > >> >But are you actually admonishing Val?
> > >>
> > >> I'm saying there are better choices of words. Val is not alone in
> making
> > >> less-than-optimum
> > >> choices.
> > >
> > >Why are all you'se guys giving Val a free pass?
> >
> > He's not getting "a free pass". Most of my posts in response to him
> consist of
> > disagreement. But he is a newcomer and I'm trying to set an example of how
> > gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable.
> >
>
> Val would first have to find the gentleman in himself...
>
> Kim W5TIT

913. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 15:10:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB1B2DE.9B0A6EE4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40277

Dave Heil wrote:
> How did you establish that the Church was thinking evil thoughts?

Because they put Galileo, the truth teller, under house arrest.

> Perhaps you meant that the Church was lying because it stated its belief
> in something which was later found to be in error.

The church has contained and continues to contain some of the biggest
liars in the world. My pastor says that dinosaurs and Homo sapiens existed
at the same time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

914. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 15:28:26 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <uGis8.306$3P4.33745@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40279

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CB13343.71B89044@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> >
> > And there are a lot of amateurish
> > >photos, of guys standing around holding stuff, items that S&T banished
a
> > >long time ago. QST has the look, in places, of the very small
Astronomical
> > >League's REFLECTOR, which is moving up the food chain fast but still
has too
> > >many photos of, ah, guys standing around holding stuff. As for photos
of
> > >guys sitting at computers, indoors, with blown-out windows in the
> > >background, they should be PURGED from ANY magazine, and a new art
director
> > >hired immediately. Or, more likely, it's time for QST to HIRE an art
> > >director!
>
> Look at page 77 through 80 of the December 2001 issue of S&T. There's
pictures
> of bunches of people with telescopes.
>

Aw, crap, now you went and introduced some *facts* and
spoiled Val's lovely rant. Shame on you!

73, Hans, K0HB

915. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 15:49:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB1BC13.9B7A17A4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40280

N2EY wrote:
> >What percentage of hams were nocode techs at
> >the end of 2000? 20%?
>
> Doesn't matter.

It seemed to matter when you posted the following:

> Total number of N/T+/G/A/E in June, 1997: 503,549
> Total number of N/T+/G/A/E on June 25, 2000: 470,240

> Total number of Techs in June, 1997: 174,924
> Total number of Techs on June 25, 2000: 208,330

You also said:

> From 1980 to 1990, the number of US hams rose 30%
> From 1990 to 2000, the number of US hams rose 34%

That means there were about 506,000 coded hams in 1990.
Your figures indicate about 470,000 coded hams in 2000.
That's about a 7% decline in coded hams. If the nocode
tech license had not come about, about 17% of the year
2000 nocode techs would have to have decided to become
coded to keep the ARS from suffering a decline in
population.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

916. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 16:05:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204080805.1666dec1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40281

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CB0CA20.D72FC3E@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > None of the CW experts I know use "handle" instead of "name".
>
> Of course not. "Handle" is longer than "name" in Morse code.

It's longer on voice, too. And less clear.

> But on voice, "Name here is ...", is so pedestrian.

What do you have against walking? It's healthy exercise.

> What's wrong
> with a little flair using ham lingo?
>
What's wrong with plain English that is clear to everyone instead of
jargon
that is less clear and takes longer?

> > >What's wrong with it now?
> >
> > The meaning has changed.
>
> Who give a rat's patootie about CB?

Not me. I've never been a cb'er, never had a cb set or used one. I
have listened
to them a few times over the years on a general-coverage receiver.
Most of what
I heard were not things I would want to hear on the ham bands.

> The meaning has not changed within
> ham radio?

Sure it has.

> Most of us OF's still say, "Handle here is ...".

That's you, not me. What do you have against change? Us newer ops say
"name"
so that everyone understands.
>
> > The meaning of "handle" in connection with voice radio was changed from "name"
> > to "alias to disguise true identity".
>

> Are you going to allow CBers to dictate what happens within ham radio?

Not if I can help it.

> My handle is Cecil and has been since 1951.

You were born in 1951?

The primary meaning of some words changes over time. Consider what the word "gay" meant in 1951, and what it means now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

917. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 16:11:20 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <lijs8.11514$Rw2.964649@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40282

>> Val, KC0MUB, wrote:
>> .... Or, maybe, the FCC was consulting
>> Quiga boards for it's positions...

> Jim, N2EY, replied:
> .... Here's one possibility:
>
> FCC has been plagued for years by "freebanders"
> - illegal stations, mostly in the HF range, who
> simply ignore the rules and go on the air. CB is
> a quagmire of users whose respect for the rules
> varies from some to none.
>
> Ask any of these folks why they're not hams and
> one of the prime reasons is "the code test". By
> making it easier to get a license and eliminating
> the code test, FCC may hope to reduce freebanding
> and its associated problems.
>
> And that's just one reason....

And a very important one, IMHO, that seems to be consistently overlooked in these discussions. It may be because it leads to drawing a parallel between amateur radio (legalized "free-banding") and other "legalized" vices (gambling, prostitution, drugs). The approach seems to be the same -- put it out in the wilderness (Nevada, below 200 meters) or on a reservation (ham bands, Indian lands) and regulate the hell out of it. But make the legalized product or service still attractive enough so that illegal varieties can't compete in cost and convenience.

I believe that was the thinking back after the close of WWI when the US Navy wanted to maintain an iron-fisted control of the airwaves but the government moved to civilian regulation and formed the ARS. The realization was then that all those old pre-war spark-gap rigs were still out there and ready to be fired up again once the war fever had subsided. Better to give the hams their own, supposedly useless, wavelength sandbox to pee in.

That is still true today. I think the most valuable service the ARS renders to the worldwide wireless communications environment is that of diverting the

the ratchet-jawed communicators and garage experimenters into narrow, regulated slices of rf spectrum. If the ARS didn't exist as a relatively accessible medium, every land-mobile, aircraft, marine, and military radio set would have be treated as a "controlled substance" whose possession without official authorization would be a crime.

So I believe it is very much a necessity to make the ARS as accessible as possible to as many people as possible. I am not so sure that having an operator's license for the service is a good thing. Station licenses, yes, but nothing that requires a test. I think proof of financial responsibility would be an adequate qualification -- the reasoning being that any violations and subsequent NAL's would be easy to prosecute. For those less-well-off, an operator's test might be an alternative to posting a bond as a way of ensuring compliance with rules and regulations.

I make that suggestion with no small amount of trepidation. In my own, admittedly limited, contacts with freebanders and outlaw CB types, I am struck by the fact that, not only in the code test seen as a barrier, but the theory part is perceived as equally daunting. My impression is that these people know precious little about how or why radio equipment works. And seemly don't want to learn in any organized, effective way. This presents a very significant problem in terms of keeping them "on the reservation" so to speak (ie: inside allocations). So I am willing to concede there are indeed limits to licensing relaxation. But the direction still should be toward greater, and easier, availability.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

918. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 16:21:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204080821.466f6568@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40283

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<WN8s8.9955$QC1.931552@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
> news:a8r2pb$2vc4$1@heap.juniper.net...

Just a quick note:

> First, cancellations are NOT SKs and in fact if I had the license and the
> death cert I am not sure I could cancel someone else's license at all.

A close family member can get an SK's license cancelled so that the
call can
be reassigned. I know locals who have done this, and it may be one of
the most
common reasons licenses are cancelled.

> Several things cause cancellation, the biggest being the vanity callsign
> program; because the tickets are 10 years for the fee, the old one must be
> cancelled. While upgrades can be modifications, it may be necessary to
> cancel the old callsign to get the new one issued or it gets counted that
> way.

Is this known for sure?
>
> In any given month, four months of renewals are processed in bits and
> pieces or said another way, not even a good majority of April renewals
> will be April expirations. In fact, there will be a lot of July expires
> starting thru as they get past the 90 day bar. The only real way to tell
> is to follow a block of expirations over 4 months.

Or even longer. Add to this the fact that many renewals wind up in the
grace period for reasons such as mailroom delays, "whoopsies" and
"what form do I use" situations. A license issued as long ago as May
1990 is still renewable.

The renewal "window" is very short, and easy to miss. FCC's reasoning
on
renewal has changed many times over the years. I can recall getting
renewals
with each upgrade and address change. The idea seemed to be that if
FCC had
to print and mail a license they might as well renew it and possibly
save a
bit of work down the road. Today the opposite is true, possibly
because they
don't want the database any more full of SKs than it has to be. The

only auto-renew is of course a vanity call, and that's done to avoid prorating the fee.

There is also the "resurrection" factor. There may be a sizable block of hams
out there who have all but lost interest, and even let their licenses lapse.
But upon hearing about the restructuring, they renew and then upgrade because
it's so much easier now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

919. Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 16:48:04 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <8Rjs8.479$3P4.45874@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40284

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote

>
> So I believe it is very much a necessity to make the
> ARS as accessible as possible to as many people as
> possible. I am not so sure that having an operator's
> license for the service is a good thing. Station
> licenses, yes, but nothing that requires a test.

OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI (No Test International)!

Make a note of it.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

920. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 16:48:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204080848.1dde6a6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40285

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3CB13AEB.5F8E36B2@ix.netcom.com>...

> "Amateur" is an artifact of the early days of radio way back before the Funny
> Cookie Corporation was set up. Then the broadcasters who were the
> "professionals" got the ancestor of the FCC to ban the amateur broadcasters
> from playing music.

There's a bit of truth there, but "amateur radio" precedes
broadcasting.

There were noncommercial private stations on the air from the very
beginning
of radio. The term "amateur" evolved to describe stations and
operators who
did radio for its own sake.

1912 saw new laws governing radio enacted in the wake of the Titanic
disaster.
Amateurs were restricted to the wavelengths of 200 meters and "down"
(meaning
shorter, or higher in frequency). Formal licenses became mandatory at
that time.

> Amateur radio evolved into the 2 way radio hobby/service
> we have today.

That evolution was complete by 1925 or so.

Soon after the end of WW1, the idea of radio broadcasting began to
catch on. At that time there were no limitations on amateurs'
broadcasting music or one-way
transmissions, as long as it was done on amateur frequencies. The AM
broadcast band was actually carved out between the amateur's
allocations and those used for ships. (Note that "200 meters" is 1500
kHz, well inside the AM BC band).

In the very early 1920s there were some efforts to get away from the
"amateur" label, but the name was already "stuck".

> You could mention "ham radio" but where the term "ham"
> cam from is not at all clear.

"Ham" used to mean anything done in a haphazard way. It was a
derogatory term.
Radio amateurs turned it into a badge of honor. Word meanings evolve
over time.

> But you have to distinguish it from CB,
> which some of the kids have seen and played with.

Yup. Much of the population does not know the difference, which is a big
publicity/image problem for the ARS.

> BTW, Why is it called "American Radio _Relay_ League"?
> A relay is an electromechanical switch driven by a coil, yes?

That's one reason.

The organization was set up in 1914 because the amateur stations of that time
had limited range. Well-equipped 200 meter spark stations with the best equipment could do 1000 to 1500 miles when conditions were favorable. "Relay"
refers to the relaying of messages from station to station in order to improve coverage. The ARRL was set up to encourage and standardize message relaying, and to encourage technical and operating improvement through publication of periodicals and books.

Of course the ARRL evolved into much more over time, but again the original name "stuck".

> And radios don't use relays anyway....

All of mine do. My newest rig has the most - at least 17 of them! (most modern ham transceivers use them for bandswitching and other purposes).

73 de Jim, N2EY

921. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 17:05:17 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <h5ks8.11607$Rw2.969537@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40286

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204080821.466f6568@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<WN8s8.9955$QC1.931552@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > "Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
> > news:a8r2pb$2vc4$1@heap.juniper.net...
>
> There is also the "resurrection" factor. There may be a sizable block
> of hams
> out there who have all but lost interest, and even let their licenses
> lapse.
> But upon hearing about the restructuring, they renew and then upgrade
> because
> it's so much easier now.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

That little bit of Ham Metaphysics is basically why I gave up reading tea leaves. There was a Tech from 1976 who had dutifully renewed since show up on another group wanting to know how to be a General. How does one determine death?? So what falls under Resurrection and what under ReKindling? Intent I guess.

There is a ham very familiar to people of our vintage, Leo Myerson W�GFQ, originally W9GFQ that has dutifully renewed a Class A under its various permutations for well over 60 years. He ran World Radio Labs home of the infamous Globe Scout, Globe King etc.

For that matter my dad K�CHK hasn't been on the air since he had all amateur privleges but renews like a clock. I get him near CW now and again but usually get a blast of 'Goddam Computer CW'. FWIW he also favors dropping the code test for exactly the reasons we have mentioned, it destroys the ability to do it right.

You can count licenses till Argentina becomes a creditor nation and all you really have is a count of licenses.

The right way to do it is to track August expirations thru their path to oblivion, Sept, etc. You will never get them to balance exactly and will tear your hair trying. This is, BTW, a common problem in insurance reserving. On Private Passenger Auto you will maintain development triangles based on accident month, report month, policy issue month, and the sales guys will storm in and show you the accounting calendar month proving all their new biz is so good you should reduce rates. You, of course, knowing that this will develop for years had been writing a report

recommending the drawing and quartering of your sales and underwriting staff for putting that crap on the books. And you thought the Ins biz was uneventful.

Dick N&#65533;BK

922. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 17:16:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB1D075.6F48C5E2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40287

N2EY wrote:

> > You could mention "ham radio" but where the term "ham"
> > cam from is not at all clear.
>
> "Ham" used to mean anything done in a haphazard way. It was a
> derogatory term.

In 1951, my elmer told me that the word "ham" as applied to
amateur radio operators came from the way the Cockney English
hams pronounced h'amature.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

923. New Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 17:29:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB1D372.BA695B31@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40288

From "Worldradio", new products section:

"The Art & Skill of Radio-Telegraphy" by N0HFF. Available from:
Dave Clarke, VE6LX, 8607-34A Ave, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6K 0B9
for $14. $4 S&H for US orders. $5.50 S&H for Canadian orders.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

924. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 17:37:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408133720.19079.00002920@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40289

>Subject: An Answer Please, Lennie...
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 04/03/02 01:02 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020403000255.13715.00001794@mb-da.aol.com>
>
> In another thread, Leonard H. Anderson, allegedly once a "professional"
>in
>the radio electronics field, made the following really stupid assertion:

Given several days to correct his erroneous statement vis-a-vis the
"strictly recreational" status of certain radio services, Lennie instead makes
the following (poor) attempts to hide his foolishness.

Thanks again, Lennie, for proving the "superior intellect" is anything
but....

Steve

QUOTE:

This sort of comment does no good, Cecil. The poor guy has
this terrible hang-up and can't let go of it. It's the classic
equivalent of the monkey with his hand inside a container who
can't unclench his fist long enough to withdraw the hand.

UNQUOTE

QUOTE

Can't be. Monkey boy never lies. He tells others they lie!

(Note: Lennie has yet to be able to disprove anything I have
stated...however the comments he made that instigated this thread prove HIM
wrong...again)

UNQUOTE

QUOTE

It's a common practice in here for frustrated egoists to start
in with personal insults whenever they've been bested in any
messaging. Attempting to use "b*stard" or "bastard" in any
form is a personal insult to myself and to both of my late
parents. There's no cause for such things and certainly not
condoned in The Amateur's Code.

(Note: Yeah..let's skip the "bastard"...Even Lennie's folks must have
known what a pr*ck he was going to be...No use blaming them)

UNQUOTE

QUOTE

Not really. I've encountered monkeys with clenched fists in
containers all my life. Most of the time I, like most others,
will simply ignore such types. Not worth the time to bother.

(Note: I am sure Lennie's fist has been found clenched in tight places
before...I just wonder how he got his arm bent around back there...?!?!)

Since you are so into personal things, why don't you write
some more about your in-country days when you saved a
whole brigade with your trusty radio as sole support?
I just love those old war stories.

UNQUOTE

QUOTE

Petulance is not a virtue.

UNQUOTE

Lotsa hot wind...No facts...No answers.

Lennie...WHEN will you ever learn?

Steve

925. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 17:48:06 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB1D7D7.C4C1C14D@psu.edu>
Source record: 40290

It's down to:

People having long drawn out arguments about typos...
The never ending mammary glands argument....
People arguing about figures of speech....
People arguing about putziness...
The same old arguments about code/no code.
The "I hate ARRL/I love ARRL" argument

All interesting in their own way. But These same arguments were going on when I first subscribed to this group. After a while, the only interesting thing about them is just how persistant the authors are in trying to have the last word.

I enjoy Val's posts, even if I don't agree with all of them. Interesting, and very topical.

Personally I think he rejuvenates the group, which from time to time needs it VERY badly.

- Mike - KB3EIA

Brian Kelly wrote:

> . . . the code test war in this NG at least had some relevance, now
> it's down to WHAT??

926. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 18:02:52 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cb1db4a_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 40291

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:8Rjs8.479$3P4.45874@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote
>
> >
> > So I believe it is very much a necessity to make the
> > ARS as accessible as possible to as many people as
> > possible. I am not so sure that having an operator's
> > license for the service is a good thing. Station
> > licenses, yes, but nothing that requires a test.
>
> OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI (No Test
International)!
>
> Make a note of it.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans ... nice attempt at "guilt by association," but as you well know,
both I and the other leadership of NCI has repeatedly repudiated
anything inplying that NCI has an agenda to eliminate (or gut) the
written tests. I can also state with some confidence that the NCI
Board would vote to oppose any "NTI" initiatives filed with the FCC.

Have a nice day ...
Carl - wk3c

927. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 18:40:34 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Culs8.713$3P4.59899@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40292

Hey Carl,

I can get into enough trouble by myself without your fabrications.

I never mentioned either you or NCI.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3cb1db4a_2@news7.fast.net...
>
> "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
> news:8Rjs8.479$3P4.45874@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > So I believe it is very much a necessity to make the
> > > ARS as accessible as possible to as many people as
> > > possible. I am not so sure that having an operator's
> > > license for the service is a good thing. Station
> > > licenses, yes, but nothing that requires a test.
> >
> > OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI (No Test
> International)!
> >
> > Make a note of it.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hans ... nice attempt at "guilt by association," but as you well know,
> both I and the other leadership of NCI has repeatedly repudiated
> anything inplying that NCI has an agenda to eliminate (or gut) the
> written tests. I can also state with some confidence that the NCI
> Board would vote to oppose any "NTI" initiatives filed with the FCC.
>
> Have a nice day ...
> Carl - wk3c
>
>
>

928. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 18:45:18 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <a6a68e31c993d07d4513300f0b3fa187.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40293

Hans, we should point out that a station license would probably require
that you get the address correctly on the application. UNFAIR! Perhaps
we shouldn't require licenses of electricians. Hmmmm ... BTW, seems to
me that driver's licenses are unfair too ...

Still shaking my head in disbelief ....

73 from Rochester, NY ... and still in shock ..
Jim AA2QA

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:8Rjs8.479$3P4.45874@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

>
> "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote
>
> >
> > So I believe it is very much a necessity to make the
> > ARS as accessible as possible to as many people as
> > possible. I am not so sure that having an operator's
> > license for the service is a good thing. Station
> > licenses, yes, but nothing that requires a test.
>
> OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI (No Test International)!
>
> Make a note of it.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

929. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 19:41:48 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB1F27E.F2074BAC@psu.edu>
Source record: 40295

He treads the fine line between lying and willful ignorance. Besides,
didn't you ever watch the Flintstones?

I really wish the dinosaurs were with us today. They always had such
clever things to say when they were sassing the Flintstones. 8^)

- mike - KB3EIA

CAM wrote:

> The church has contained and continues to contain some of the biggest
> liars in the world. My pastor says that dinosaurs and Homo sapiens existed
> at the same time.

930. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 19:47:35 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB1F3D9.94933C1@psu.edu>
Source record: 40294

Does anyone swear on CW? Of course a person could, but it would seem odd
to do .

- Mike - KB3EIA

CAM wrote:

> Of course, it is virtually impossible to misbehave on CW except
> for jamming, of course, which seems to be the most popular mode
> for jamming.
>

931. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 20:31:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408163102.27628.00000345@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 40298

In article <20020408090415.09508.00002129@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>> Spend a lot of time there wishing "Gee...wish >I< could do that
>>>too...???
>>
>>Not really. It is convenient since right across Buena Vista is a huge
>>new Ralph's supermarket where we shop regularly.
>
> Convienient? Why? There's precious little in there that you can use,
>Lennie. Legally, anyway.

Convenient: One can pull out of the Ralph's and Sav-On combined parking lot onto Victory Boulevard going northeast, cross the Buena Vista intersection and immediately turn into the mini-mall (8 shops) parking lot on the corner. HRO's branch is at the western end of the Ell-shaped building structure, Baskin-Robbins at the opposite end. There's a Radio Shack store in the middle. It is convenient to pull out of the lot going northwest on Buena Vista on the way home. Baskin-Robbins is an ice cream specialty chain store. There's also the "Holly-Woof" dog care salon in the middle but we don't go there that with three cats in the house. :-)

Legal use: Quite a bit of HRO resold products are quite legal to use without a license...antennas of all kinds from simple wire kits to mobile antennas to (special order) $16K towers...scanners of both portable and base station use...tools and tool parts specifically for electronics that might not be available at Radio Shack, Electronic City, or Fry's Electronics in Burbank. They carry SWL receivers but my Icom IC-R70 works fine still (bought at the old store location in Van Nuys before the move to Burbank). Their Grundig and Sangean digital portable "SWL" radios face competition from slightly-lower prices off-the-shelf at Fry's.

It's not "illegal" to buy publications without a license at HRO. They have many in stock. Personally, I'd rather buy ARRL books there than have to order from Newington AND pay shipping which comes to more than the 8.25% California sales tax. There's many different publishers of radio-interest books on the market and HRO doesn't discriminate or demand a copy of a Form 605 to prove to them a buyer is "worth it."

A number of years ago, a whole group of us went to the old HRO Van Nuys store to buy a new radio setup for a mutual friend's birthday. We all chipped in for the cost and two-thirds of us had no amateur license. The friend's wife wasn't licensed either. HRO

didn't mind...and the sales group thought it a fun thing and
approved all around. A great surprise birthday party that started
off a four-day holiday!

>>Found none of them to be what I
>>would consider good enough for mobile installations in sunbelt
>>daylight, but others might think differently.
>
> For what purpose would you purchase an Amateur Radio transceiver anyway?

My purpose a few days ago was to get a group comparison of
front panel displays, mostly variously backlit LCD screens, with
strong incidental daylight illumination. That did not involve
INTENT TO PURCHASE!!! as you seem to imply.

Hello? Is your fist hurting so much in that jar that you can't
understand what I said before?

HRO carries the SGC line of HF SSB transceivers which has
become popular with sailboat owners. Different license
requirements than amateur, essentially a rubber-stamp process.
Nearly 3/4ths of SGC sales are to foreign markets, not bad for an
outfit that makes things in Bellevue, WA, USA.

>>I'm sure that your fist is still clenched inside that jar so I'm curious
>>what the snarly insults will be in the inevitable reply.
>
> I am sure you think it is, Lennie, but it's not.

Of course it is. You can't help yourself. It's your obsession.

You MUST do a break-in to every exchange with another. It's a form
of JAMMING and you feel righteous about employing such tactics.

You aren't accomplishing anything other than being obnoxious.

932. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 20:31:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408163103.27628.00000346@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 40296

In article <20020408085542.09508.00002128@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>It's a DUTY! (remember, the word "duty" is a four-letter word
>
> For a Putz who chafes at the idea of being a member of a radio SERVICE,
>it's funny to see you "making fun" of the concepts of duty, poignant or not.

D-U-T-Y has four letters...it is a four-letter word.

So are L-O-V-E and F-L-A-G and W-O-R-K. :-)

Please prove they are not four-letter words. :-)

Picard: "Counselor Troi, do you sense any hostility and anger
in this group?"
Troi: "Arrrrghhhhh!!!!" (Troi falls on floor holding head in agony)

933. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 20:31:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408163104.27628.00000347@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 40297

In article <3CB13AEB.5F8E36B2@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>BTW, Why is it called "American Radio _Relay_ League"?
>A relay is an electromechanical switch driven by a coil, yes?
>And radios don't use relays anyway....

The word "relay" as used in messaging originally meant a
transfer of a message from one courier to another on its way
to a destination or, as in the British and French semaphore
systems, the sending of a message from station to station.

The 1840 Patent of Morse and Vail described a telegraphic
relay apparatus which utilized an unattended solenoidal coil
operated key switch to repeat the original key-down, key-up
from the manual telegrapher. This overcame the inherent
limitations of wire resistance, battery voltage, battery losses,
etc. so that a telegraph circuit could extend farther than the
first 10 to 20 mile distance limitations. In the technology of
that century, up to four relay appartuses could be installed
to make a 100 mile telegraph circuit complete. For the
middle of the 1800s this was a remarkable and innovative
jump in communications technology.

Manual telegraphy was already known and understood, could
not in itself be patented. The solenoid-key relay was a new
thing, people in electrical technology noticed the application
and found other uses for it. Thus was born the word "relay" as
applying to the coil-isolated-and-insulated-switch electro-
mechanical structure that has been common in electricity-
electronics for over a century.

According to both official and unofficial sources, the American
Radio Relay League was born from a desire of a trio of New
Englanders in Connecticutt to be a very low-cost substitute for
telegramming others, ostensibly about radio parts and
availability. Neither telephones nor commercial telegraphy was
cheap in 1914. A local club near Hartford became a sort of
communications "hackers" group. :-)

The "relay" in ARRL refers to message relaying, the starting
purpose of a small local club. It was not the first such
organization. The Radio Club of American had already been in
existance for 5 years and several other "amateur" clubs had
sprung up throughout the USA in those 5 years. Competition
would naturally occur among clubs, most staying local, some

quit trying to become national. The ARRL survived and, being also a huge publishing group for amateur radio interests, has naturally published selective history to prove its inherent goodness. Early radio history does not always look with favor upon the early ARRL.

The RCA survives also and rightfully holds onto the claim of being the very first such radio organization in the world.

The electromechanical switch or "relay" owes its common word to the original Morse-Vail patent.

934. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 20:37:34 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204082035020.15870-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 40299

On Mon, 8 Apr 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
>"D. Stussy" wrote:
>> On Sun, 7 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
>> >Can someone explain how a Technician class license holder is able to set up
>> >a repeater network or auxiliary stations? Each aux station would be a
>> >different individual with a unique call sign I assume, however my question
>> >is mainly about broadcast location. Are operators limited to broadcasting
>> >only from the address indicated on FCC license? An example would be where
>> >the FCC indicates operator "KABCD" lives in Los Angeles and operator "KEFGH"
>> >lives in Hollywood, but other information such as QRZ and other websites
>> >indicate that these two call signs (and others) are repeating in a
>> >closed/private status and that the locations are not Los Angeles and
>> >Hollywood, but somewhere else such as Pasadena and Santa Monica. I'd
>> >appreciate any help as I'm new to this. Thanks.
>>
>> Broadcasting is not allowed with an amateur radio license.
>
>What you meant to say is "transmit". "Broadcast" means to
>be on continuously transmitting music or such. Hams are not ...

No. I didn't. I said broadcasting because I meant broadcasting. Now, you may think that the original query poster may have meant transmitting, but then gave examples with COMMERCIAL callsigns, so it was clear that he meant broadcasting.

935. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 20:38:58 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <Cdns8.11078$QC1.1025115@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40300

>> I posted:
>> So I believe it is very much a necessity to make the
>> ARS as accessible as possible to as many people as
>> possible. I am not so sure that having an operator's
>> license for the service is a good thing. Station
>> licenses, yes, but nothing that requires a test.

Hans, K0HB, replied:

> OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI
> (No Test International)!
>
> Make a note of it.

As Founder and Grand Pooh-Bah of NTI, I hereby appoint
you, Hans Brakob, K0HB, as chairman of the bored. Thank
you for your enthusiasm. ;-)

BTW: You didn't include the part about:

>> I think proof of financial responsibility would be
>> an adequate qualification -- the reasoning being
>> that any violations and subsequent NAL's would be
>> easy to prosecute...

Just wondering if you'd be willing to send the FCC your
VISA card number so that they could ding it for a couple
of thou' every time they came up with an NAL with your
name on it?

Me? I'd opt for an operator's test.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

936. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 20:46:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB201C1.E6EF043A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40201

mike coslo wrote:
> He treads the fine line between lying and willful ignorance.

The same line that Dave is walking. He denied saying "comparting"
even after I reposted his original posting containing the word
"comparting".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

937. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 20:51:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB202D8.B477AFE1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40202

mike coslo wrote:
> Does anyone swear on CW? Of course a person could, but it would seem odd
> to do .

Not only odd but anti-human. The swear words don't come from the same part of the brain as all the other Morse code words. People with a certain kind of brain damage have proved that to be a fact. It would take a mutant to swear using CW and include the swearing emotions. When I get angry enough to swear I can neither type nor send Morse code. Swearing is a verbal act akin to the chest beating of our closest animal kin.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

938. Re: New Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 21:03:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204081303.7ebccdf9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40203

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CB1D372.BA695B31@IEEE.org>...
> From "Worldradio", new products section:
>
> "The Art & Skill of Radio-Telegraphy" by N0HFF. Available from:
> Dave Clarke, VE6LX, 8607-34A Ave, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6K 0B9
> for $14. $4 S&H for US orders. $5.50 S&H for Canadian orders.

An excellent book on the subject, now in its 3rd edition.

Available for free download in PDF or Word format at:

http://www.qsl.net/n9bor/n0hff.htm

(Standard disclaimer of monetary interest applies)

73 de Jim, N2EY

939. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 21:12:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204081312.599229dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40204

mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3CB1AF8F.F6E2AB22@psu.edu>...
> WOW, is Joe Walsh active? What I wouldn't give to have a QSL with him!!!
>
> - mike - KB3EIA
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > As mentioned by others, we also have Ronnie Milsap, Jon Bon Jovi, Joe Walsh,
> > Walter Cronkite and of course many current and past astronauts.

He's an Extra in Studio City, CA. Joseph Walsh is his real name.

73 de Jim, N2EY

940. Insurance claim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 21:24:01 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <RTns8.1100$3P4.80297@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40205

An incredibly unlucky man was in a strange accident, and was trying to collect
insurance money for his suffering. After reviewing the claim the insurance
company contacted him and asked for more information. This was his response:

"I am writing in response to your request for additional information for block
number 3 of the accident reporting form. I put 'poor planning' as the cause of
my accident. You said in your letter that I should explain more fully and I
trust the following detail will be sufficient.

I am an amateur radio operator and on the day of the accident, I was working
alone on the top section of my new 80 foot tower. When I had completed my work,
I discovered that I had, over the course of several trips up the tower, brought
up about 300 pounds of tools and spare hardware.

Rather than carry the now unneeded tools and material down by hand, I decided to
lower the items down in a small barrel by using a pulley, which was fortunately
attached to the gin pole at the top of the tower. Securing the rope at ground
level, I went to the top of the tower and loaded the tools and material into the
barrel. Then I went back to the ground and untied the rope, holding it tightly
to ensure a slow descent of the 300 pounds of tools. You will note in block
number 11 of the accident reporting form that I weigh only 155 pounds.

Due to my surprise of being jerked off the ground so suddenly, I lost my
presence of mind and forgot to let go of the rope. Needless to say, I proceeded
at a rather rapid rate of speed up the side of the tower. In the vicinity of the
40 foot level, I met the barrel coming down. This explains my fractured skull
and broken collarbone.

Slowed only slightly, I continued my rapid ascent, not stopping until the
fingers of my right hand were two knuckles deep into the pulley. "Fortunately,
by this time, I had regained my presence of mind and was able to hold onto the

rope in spite of my pain. At approximately the same time, however, the barrel of
tools hit the ground and the bottom fell out of the barrel. Devoid the weight of
the tools, the barrel now weighed approximately 20 pounds. I refer you again to
my weight in block number 11.

As you might imagine, I began a rapid descent down the side of the tower. In the
vicinity of the 40 foot level, I met the barrel coming up. This accounts for the
two fractured ankles, and the lacerations of my legs and lower body. The
encounter with the barrel slowed me enough to lessen my injuries when I fell onto
the pile of tools and, fortunately, only three vertebrae were cracked. I am
sorry to report, however, that as I lay there on the tools, in pain, unable to
stand and watching the empty barrel 80 feet above me, I again lost my presence
of mind. I let go of the rope..."

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

If people concentrated on the really important things of life, there'd be a
shortage of fishing rods.

941. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 21:31:08 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <w_ns8.1109$3P4.80940@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40206

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote

> Now, you may think that the original query poster may have
> meant transmitting, but then gave examples with COMMERCIAL
> callsigns, so it was clear that he meant broadcasting.

What COMMERCIAL callsigns? The examples given didn't
resemble callsigns in any radio service, commercial, amateur,
or otherwise.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

942. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 21:41:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204081341.66e0b273@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40207

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:<Iijs8.11514$Rw2.964649@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> >> Val, KC0MUB, wrote:
> >> .... Or, maybe, the FCC was consulting
> >> Quiga boards for it's positions...
>
> > Jim, N2EY, replied:
> > .... Here's one possibility:
> >
> > FCC has been plagued for years by "freebanders"
> > - illegal stations, mostly in the HF range, who
> > simply ignore the rules and go on the air. CB is
> > a quagmire of users whose respect for the rules
> > varies from some to none.
> >
> > Ask any of these folks why they're not hams and
> > one of the prime reasons is "the code test". By
> > making it easier to get a license and eliminating
> > the code test, FCC may hope to reduce freebanding
> > and its associated problems.
> >
> > And that's just one reason....
>
> And a very important one, IMHO, that seems to be
> consistently overlooked in these discussions.

My point exactly.

> It
> may be because it leads to drawing a parallel between
> amateur radio (legalized "free-banding") and other
> "legalized" vices (gambling, prostitution, drugs).

I don't see how that parallel can be drawn. The reason for all the
fuss about gambling, etc., is that those activities are thought to
be very harmful. The same cannot be said for radio operating.

I would say that the whole freeband issue is overlooked here because
it's
not a pleasant one to contemplate. The nocodetest folks certainly
won't
like the idea that perhaps the reason the FCC agrees with their
arguments
is to license freebanders. And the procodetest folks aren't gonna be
happy

to realize that maybe claims like "drop the code test and the pirates
will
all show up on the ham bands with licenses" may have given the FCC the
idea
in the first place, and/or reinforced it for them.

Scary, huh?

> The approach seems to be the same -- put it out
> in the wilderness (Nevada, below 200 meters) or
> on a reservation (ham bands, Indian lands) and
> regulate the hell out of it. But make the legalized
> product or service still attractive enough so that
> illegal varieties can't compete in cost and convenience.

You're getting the idea.
>
> I believe that was the thinking back after the close of
> WWI when the US Navy wanted to maintain an iron-fisted
> control of the airwaves but the government moved to
> civilian regulation and formed the ARS. The realization
> was then that all those old pre-war spark-gap rigs were
> still out there and ready to be fired up again once the
> war fever had subsided. Better to give the hams their
> own, supposedly useless, wavelength sandbox to pee in.

Actually, the history is somewhat different. Hams were legally
authorized and limited to "200 meters and down" and a kilowatt
input way back in 1912. The Navy had control of licensing
in large part because the first major non-experimental/amateur use
of radio was to communicate with ships at sea. There were some strong
anti-amateur individuals in the Navy department at the time, too.

There were only about 4000 amateur stations on the air in the USA at
the shutdown in 1917, and many of their operators never came back from
the
war, or lost interest during the duration. Keeping a lid on a few
thousand hams would not be that difficult, had it gone that way. The
Navy had kept amateurs off the air through the war and for months
afterward, and could continue to do so indefinitely if allowed.

It should be noted that the WW1 ban included receiving, and that
antennas had to be lowered to the ground and apparatus disconnected
and sealed by the RI.

Technically, what was signed on 11/11/18 was an armistice
(cease-fire), not
a surrender or a treaty, so the Navy argued that we were still
technically
at war and no reactivation was possible.

What broke the logjam was the efforts of Maxim, Stewart and others,
backed by the remnants of the pre-war ARRL, who went to Washington and

argued on behalf of amateur radio. First the receiving ban was lifted, then the transmitting ban. New licenses were available, but the tests were tougher.

And the ARRL had to fight all through the 1920s and into the 1930s on both the national and international fronts in order for amateurs to stay on the air.
That fight continues today.

73 de Jim, N2EY

943. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 21:44:36 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <8bos8.1176$5w5.622404755@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40208

Actually the original poster (me) didn't know what he meant because he's not a HAM, and thus posted conflicting, uneducated information. You are actually both correct though because in this instance because I was referring to a non commercial HAI licensed individual that should only be transmitting, but seems to be broadcasting. (example call signs were just in alphabetical order and were only examples). Thanks for all the information though, as it was a big help.

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:w_ns8.1109$3P4.80940@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote
>
> > Now, you may think that the original query poster may have
> > meant transmitting, but then gave examples with COMMERCIAL
> > callsigns, so it was clear that he meant broadcasting.
>
> What COMMERCIAL callsigns? The examples given didn't
> resemble callsigns in any radio service, commercial, amateur,
> or otherwise.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>

944. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 21:51:45 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Rhos8.1138$3P4.83849@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40209

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> It would take a mutant to swear using CW and include
> the swearing emotions.

Sunuvugun! Somebody once distinctly sent "dididahdit dididah dahdidahdit dahdidah dahdidahdah dahdahdah dididah" to me on CW. Do you think maybe she was trying to be romantic?

dit dit, de Hans, K0HB

945. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 21:51:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204081351.96cacd2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40210

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CB1BC13.9B7A17A4@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > >What percentage of hams were nocode techs at
> > >the end of 2000? 20%?
> > >
> > Doesn't matter.
>
> It seemed to matter when you posted the following:
>
> > Total number of N/T+/G/A/E in June, 1997: 503,549
> > Total number of N/T+/G/A/E on June 25, 2000: 470,240
>
> > Total number of Techs in June, 1997: 174,924
> > Total number of Techs on June 25, 2000: 208,330
>
> You also said:
>
> > From 1980 to 1990, the number of US hams rose 30%
> > From 1990 to 2000, the number of US hams rose 34%

Interesting - Cecil CAN look things up.

> That means there were about 506,000 coded hams in 1990.

How do you figure that?

> Your figures indicate about 470,000 coded hams in 2000.

470,240 non-Techs in midyear.

> That's about a 7% decline in coded hams.

That is only true provided that ALL Technicians on that date are
assumed to be non-codetested. In fact that is not the case. As of the
end of June 2000, the FCC had been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs for
2-1/2 months.
There were also an unknown number of hams who held Tech Pluses but
whose licenses read "Technician" because the FCC took some time after
February 1991
to add the Tech Plus license class.

I know some Techs who were licensed in the late 1950s whose renewal
dates were in the early 1990s. Upon renewing, their licenses said
"Technician", even though
they were code-tested.

And of course any Tech who passed Element 1, or who upgraded from
Novice after
April 15, 2000, has a Technician license but is code-tested.

> If the nocode
> tech license had not come about, about 17% of the year
> 2000 nocode techs would have to have decided to become
> coded to keep the ARS from suffering a decline in
> population.

That's one in six over a nine year period.

Seems like you've disproved your own claim that the Tech kept ham
radio afloat, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

946. Re: New Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 22:06:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB2145A.BD3E2B3B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40215

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CB1D372.BA695B31@IEEE.org>...
> > From "Worldradio", new products section:
> >
> > "The Art & Skill of Radio-Telegraphy" by N0HFF. Available from:
> > Dave Clarke, VE6LX, 8607-34A Ave, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6K 0B9
> > for $14. $4 S&H for US orders. $5.50 S&H for Canadian orders.
>
> An excellent book on the subject, now in its 3rd edition.
> Available for free download in PDF or Word format at:

I have no reason to doubt the article which states: "Portions
of this book have been available on the internet, but the printed
version goes further, including input from many expert CW operators
from all over the world." In other words, the download version is
NOT same as the book.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

947. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 22:11:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB215A0.3BD1F8AA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40216

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > It would take a mutant to swear using CW and include
> > the swearing emotions.
>
> Sunuvugun! Somebody once distinctly sent "dididahdit dididah dahdidahdit
> dahdidah dahdidahdah dahdahdah dididah" to me on CW. Do you think maybe
> she was trying to be romantic?

Females may have better control over their emotions than males. I certainly
couldn't do that if I really meant it. If I get so angry at someone that I
could bring myself to send such, my hand would be shaking so badly that I
couldn't possibly send it. It takes control to send such. Most people who
say such are out of control.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

948. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 22:14:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB21642.F8DB707F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40217

N2EY wrote:
> > That's about a 7% decline in coded hams.
>
> That is only true provided that ALL Technicians on that date are
> assumed to be non-codetested. In fact that is not the case. As of the
> end of June 2000, the FCC had been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs for
> 2-1/2 months.
> There were also an unknown number of hams who held Tech Pluses but
> whose licenses read "Technician" because the FCC took some time after
> February 1991
> to add the Tech Plus license class.

Figures don't lie but liars figure. Give us an ever-loving break, Jim.
You cannot possibly be that irrational. Must be your agenda speaking.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

949. Re: Insurance claim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 23:06:22 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Onps8.16979$QC1.1043511@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40218

Would you believe this came off the old Fred Allen Show pre-WW2. The Mighty Allen Art Players strike again.

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:RTns8.1100$3P4.80297@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> An incredibly unlucky man was in a strange accident, and was trying to
> collect
> insurance money for his suffering. After reviewing the claim the
insurance
> company contacted him and asked for more information. This was his
response:
>
> "I am writing in response to your request for additional information for
> block
> number 3 of the accident reporting form. I put 'poor planning' as the
cause
> of
> my accident. You said in your letter that I should explain more fully
and I
> trust the following detail will be sufficient.
>
> I am an amateur radio operator and on the day of the accident, I was
working
> alone on the top section of my new 80 foot tower. When I had completed
my
> work,
> I discovered that I had, over the course of several trips up the tower,
> brought
> up about 300 pounds of tools and spare hardware.
>
> Rather than carry the now unneeded tools and material down by hand, I
> decided to
> lower the items down in a small barrel by using a pulley, which was
> fortunately
> attached to the gin pole at the top of the tower. Securing the rope at
> ground
> level, I went to the top of the tower and loaded the tools and material
into
> the
> barrel. Then I went back to the ground and untied the rope, holding it
> tightly
> to ensure a slow descent of the 300 pounds of tools. You will note in

block
> number 11 of the accident reporting form that I weigh only 155 pounds.
>
> Due to my surprise of being jerked off the ground so suddenly, I lost my
> presence of mind and forgot to let go of the rope. Needless to say, I
> proceeded
> at a rather rapid rate of speed up the side of the tower. In the
vicinity of
> the
> 40 foot level, I met the barrel coming down. This explains my fractured
> skull
> and broken collarbone.
>
> Slowed only slightly, I continued my rapid ascent, not stopping until
the
> fingers of my right hand were two knuckles deep into the pulley.
> "Fortunately,
> by this time, I had regained my presence of mind and was able to hold
onto
> the
> rope in spite of my pain. At approximately the same time, however, the
> barrel of
> tools hit the ground and the bottom fell out of the barrel. Devoid the
> weight of
> the tools, the barrel now weighed approximately 20 pounds. I refer you
again
> to
> my weight in block number 11.
>
> As you might imagine, I began a rapid descent down the side of the
tower. In
> the
> vicinity of the 40 foot level, I met the barrel coming up. This accounts
for
> the
> two fractured ankles, and the lacerations of my legs and lower body. The
> encounter with the barrel slowed me enough to lessen my injuries when I
fell
> onto
> the pile of tools and, fortunately, only three vertebrae were cracked. I
am
> sorry to report, however, that as I lay there on the tools, in pain,
unable
> to
> stand and watching the empty barrel 80 feet above me, I again lost my
> presence
> of mind. I let go of the rope..."
>
> --

> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> If people concentrated on the really important things of life, there'd
be a
> shortage of fishing rods.
>
>
>
>

950. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 23:39:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408193910.22643.00000344@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 40219

In article <Culs8.713$3P4.59899@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Hey Carl,
>
>I can get into enough trouble by myself without your fabrications.

You have done that! :-)

>I never mentioned either you or NCI.

The intent was clear. Denial doesn't hold water outside of Egypt.

951. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-08 23:39:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408193911.22643.00000345@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 40220

In article <3CB1D075.6F48C5E2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> > You could mention "ham radio" but where the term "ham"
>> > cam from is not at all clear.
>>
>> "Ham" used to mean anything done in a haphazard way. It was a
>> derogatory term.
>
>In 1951, my elmer told me that the word "ham" as applied to
>amateur radio operators came from the way the Cockney English
>hams pronounced h'amature.

Etymology in this case is going to be over-written by the
zealots. I have no doubt that professional telegraphers of a
bygone era would call beginner telegraphers "amateur" as
part of their showing-off. :-)

The extension to early-radio non-professional radio
hobbyists' label of "h'amateur" no doubt came from the
same path since on-off telegraphy was the only means
of communication in early radio. With the high comm
rates of early radio the foreshortening of "amateur" to
h-a-m ties in with "ham-fisted" (from another meaning but
also applied to manual telegraphy). Putting the didididit
before the didah "softens up" the word for telegraphy.

There's also a tie-in to food. Pork meat or ham had
traditionally been cheaper than beef. With the old fear
of trichinosis, pork/ham became less desireable, therefore
lower in cost. It was also cheaper to raise pigs than steer
(equated on pounds meat of carcass versus cost/effort to
raise to slaughter time). Ham (as meat) became "less
professional" than beef at the turn of the last century.

It's quite apparent that many radio amateurs resent the
term "amateur" because of the implication of "lesser
quality" in not being professional. They invariably use "ham"
as a self-descriptor and then rationalize the heck out of it.
:-)

In radio regulations there must be a distinction between
commercial/professional radio and other types/kinds of
radio activity. Back in times when ALL RF emitters had
to be licensed, "amateur" was a shorter form than "non-

pecuniary for personal use." The latter, of course, defines a hobby. An activity of a personal nature not having money-earning ability MUST be a hobby. It can't be anything else. :-)

952. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 00:03:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8tb4b$3gu$0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 40221

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> Never been challenged eh?
>

Not what he said. Said he has been intelligent enough to NOT confuse a
challenge with a stupid dare. Too bad so many posters here are not.

>
> > Izzat right? I've never had a teacher, clergyman or boss dare me to do
> > anything. "Friends" and co-workers will often dare one to do something
> > stupid while keeping a safe distance. They can often be heard saying
> > afterward, "I can't believe he was stupid enough to do that". Sorry, I
> > can't buy into your Rod McKuen-ism.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

953. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:07:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8tfbb$v4q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40222

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CB1AEF6.479304C6@psu.edu...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > The reality of new hams is, based on all those I've encountered,
> > is that none happened to wonder into the hobby because of
> > a copy of QST...or for that matter, 73 and/or CQ magazine.
> > The sale of QST at newstands is relatively new to begin with
> > (a few years at most).
>
> Agreed.
>
> > As to you bringing ham radio direct to some high schoolers,
> > that's great...but I don't see any need to turn QST into an
> > over-the-counter media glitz show just on the chance
> > a handful of non-hams "might" gravitate to its cover. Far
> > better for the personal outreach effort.
>
> I think you are assuming that hams don't care to see an attractive
> layout. I want to see good layout and attractive content.

The question is, at what cost? Ed Hare aptly
noted that if the cost could be justified, it'd be
spent. Basic business case modeling as I see it.

> If you don't care for or appreciate attractive layout, that is okay,
> and you will be satisfied by anyhthing that is put out. This isn't to
> sound demeaning or anything, it just means that you aren't oriented that
> way. It can even be a plus,(the characteristic, not poor layout) as you
> won't be swayed by it.

Agreed. I just don't see QST as having to meet some
level of art/design that I might otherwise expect from a
different type of publication. In fact, I only keep QST
for about a year and then pass them on.

> But most people do react to proper design, even if unconsiously. That
> is why it is there.

OK, but if I'm already a ham and ARRL member, what does it
buy? What's the business case offset that justifies the costs?

> And I really do agree with you that we don't want to turn QST into an
> "over-the-counter media glitz show". But you really took a suggestion
> for improvement and put it right on the slippery slope there. Those
> things are often not at all good design in the first place.

I can accept the suggestion for improvement...BUT, I think
the full analysis needs to be done. The business case again.

> All that is needed is some good design.
> That doesn't take much doing. I
> am surprised that so many hams would be against this.

The business case again. I'll take a well documented tech report
over design anytime.

> In a hobby where
> so many try to be precise and accurate, they are satisfied with what
> amounts to a visual typo.

I thought the issue was design, not accuracy?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

954. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:11:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8tf99$71s$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40223

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CB1D7D7.C4C1C14D@psu.edu...
> It's down to:
>
> People having long drawn out arguments about typos...
> The never ending mammary glands argument....
> People arguing about figures of speech....
> People arguing about putziness...
> The same old arguments about code/no code.
> The "I hate ARRL/I love ARRL" argument

That's more on the line of "The end of r.r.a.p. :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

955. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:13:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb242af_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40225

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ub28a7ilgg98ba@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote a lot of GOOD stuff!
>
> Well, now, THAT's DIFFERENT! Congratulations, and I'm
> serious in this! I have only one question, and it has to do with
> "attitude." How does your call sign fit in there? That is, if
> a female amateur radio operator showed up at a junior high,
> or even a middle school, around HERE, with that call . . . well,
> I don't think it would be well in most cases. Just a thought.
>
> Val
> KC0MUB
>

In all my dealings since I've had my callsign as W5TIT, I have talked to kids, I have talked to business meetings, I have done nets on the air, I have talked to visitors on our repeater (when I was much more active), I have been on HF (all bands) at different times and have never, ever had a problem with my callsign--except for some in this newsgroup and I'm certain their problem is more because I am a woman who thinks for myself and doesn't "give in." I brush the reaction in this newsgroup off--and would even brush off any kind of reaction from people who don't like it. I didn't get it for them...I got it to have fun, and because its a pretty obvious part of my vanity (which was what I goaded the guys about when they were all getting their initials--how boring).

At any rate, the callsign has never been issue. There have been those who "get it" right away and those who never do--and either way is fine for me. Works great in an HF pileup or for contesting. I guarantee you that if my callsign is heard in any way, net controls and contest stations will literally "part the waters" and ask everyone to stand by while they acknowledge the W5T "and I'm not sure I heard the rest right."

It's loads of fun and proves that ham radio can both be a serious as it needs to, and as funny as any other environment.

Kim W5TIT

956. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:20:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8tg3p$9rp$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40224

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CB13F1F.1E89E810@ix.netcom.com...
>
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > On Sun, 7 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
> > >Can someone explain how a Technician class license holder is able to
set up
> > >a repeater network or auxiliary stations? Each aux station would be a
> > >different individual with a unique call sign I assume, however my
question
> > >is mainly about broadcast location. Are operators limited to
broadcasting
> > >only from the address indicated on FCC license? An example would be
where
> > >the FCC indicates operator "KABCD" lives in Los Angeles and operator
"KEFGH"
> > >lives in Hollywood, but other information such as QRZ and other
websites
> > >indicate that these two call signs (and others) are repeating in a
> > >closed/private status and that the locations are not Los Angeles and
> > >Hollywood, but somewhere else such as Pasadena and Santa Monica. I'd
> > >appreciate any help as I'm new to this. Thanks.
> >
> > Broadcasting is not allowed with an amateur radio license.
>
> What you meant to say is "transmit". "Broadcast" means to
> be on continuously transmitting music or such.

Actually, it need not involve music nor be done
continuously to be considered broadcasting. If I
simply transmit a daily traffic report to no intended
ham recipient, then I am "broadcasting."

> Hams are not
> to do that, we are to have "2 way" conversations when we
> transmit.

Exactly.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

957. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:36:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb24829_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40228

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020408082837.22527.00002601@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >They got Dick Van Dyke to sit down
> >in front of a KWM-2 at one time, and that had more to do with getting
> >me to become a ham than a dozen "Elmers" trying to "sell" me on
> >the ARS.
>
> When I was licensed, it only took one Elmer, and a TV ad would not have
done it
> for me.
>
> Did you really have a dozen Elmers trying to talk you into becoming a ham,
but
> waited until you saw Van Dyke to a 30-second TV spot? Were these dozen
Elmers
> untrustworthy people, or do you automatically trust people you don't know
more
> than people you do?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

^5 Thank you...that's what I'm saying!

Kim W5TIT

958. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:36:54 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <WArs8.1570$3P4.122378@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40226

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> I have been on HF (all bands) at different times and have never, ever had
a
> problem with my callsign--

Riley might have a problem with a Tech+ being on *all* HF bands.

Perhaps you meant only 10, 15, 40 and 75?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

959. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:38:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb248a6$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40229

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CB1AB06.5F0854E@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CB096D3.E18CEC08@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > I bet Dave still does...think the Earth is the center of the
universe,
> > that
> > > > > is.
> > > >
> > > > ...while you, of course, are quite certain that YOU are its center.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Nope, I don't think that at all. I am nothing but an insignificant
speck in
> > > God's imagination.
> >
> > On that, we agree.
> >

Aw, gee, Davey. I thought you profess to be a non-judgemental type of
person.

> >
> > > Thank goodness I was given the intelligence to realize
> > > that, Dave.
> >
> > It's a start.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

Yeah, now *you* need to figure it out.

Kim W5TIT

960. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:45:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB247BE.BBDB6A33@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40227

Bill Sohl wrote:
> If I
> simply transmit a daily traffic report to no intended
> ham recipient, then I am "broadcasting."

How about if you transmit a daily Morse code practice to
no intended ham recipient?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

961. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:46:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb24a6c$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40230

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:WArs8.1570$3P4.122378@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> > I have been on HF (all bands) at different times and have never, ever
had
> a
> > problem with my callsign--
>
> Riley might have a problem with a Tech+ being on *all* HF bands.
>
> Perhaps you meant only 10, 15, 40 and 75?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Riley wouldn't have a problem at all with me having been on all the bands,
Hans. Noen at all.

Kim W5TIT

962. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 01:48:43 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40231

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:WArs8.1570$3P4.122378@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> > I have been on HF (all bands) at different times and have never, ever
had
> a
> > problem with my callsign--
>
> Riley might have a problem with a Tech+ being on *all* HF bands.
>
> Perhaps you meant only 10, 15, 40 and 75?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Whoops, I pushed send too quickly. Actually, my bird did. Anyway, the reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is I've done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times. I also have a General class licensee as a hubby, and have used his privileges several times while he sits on the internet.

Kim W5TIT

963. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 02:06:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020408220648.07448.00000462@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 40232

In article <3CB21642.F8DB707F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> > That's about a 7% decline in coded hams.
>>
>> That is only true provided that ALL Technicians on that date are
>> assumed to be non-codetested. In fact that is not the case. As of the
>> end of June 2000, the FCC had been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs for
>> 2-1/2 months.
>> There were also an unknown number of hams who held Tech Pluses but
>> whose licenses read "Technician" because the FCC took some time after
>> February 1991
>> to add the Tech Plus license class.
>
>Figures don't lie but liars figure.

You're the one who keeps asking for numbers and making unsubstantiated claims,
Cecil.

Is any of what I wrote above not true?

> Give us an ever-loving break, Jim.

A break from what? Facts and logic, I suppose.

>You cannot possibly be that irrational.

Is any of what I wrote above not true?

> Must be your agenda speaking.

Translation: You know I'm right, but you cannot admit it, so you attack me
rather
than refute my facts.

Typical.

73 de Jim, N2EY

964. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 02:29:08 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Ulss8.1675$3P4.133067@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40233

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> I also have a General class licensee as a hubby, and have
> used his privileges several times while he sits on the internet.

And did you sign as W5TIT or as W5CAW?

73, de Hans, K0HB

965. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 02:35:54 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <esss8.1693$3P4.134520@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40234

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
> How about if you transmit a daily Morse code practice to
> no intended ham recipient?
>

That is one of several types of allowed one-way transmissions.

73, Hans, K0HB

966. Re: Nitro 300A fs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 02:37:17 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0204081837.1d2caa9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40235
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

NI4L <ni4l@charter.net> wrote in message news:<3CB073B7.1D6D2BA7@charter.net>...
> FS Nitro 300A 10 meter amp. looks and works great. Nice Big Meter And
> plenty of lights..... Looks Like A huge Transel Watt meter 9x15x13.5
> its pretty heavy. 350.00 + shipping

Chris, MUST you stoop to advertising amps with "big meters and plenty
of lights" in CB groups?

-A

967. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 02:56:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CLss8.6578$9E2.336995542@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40236

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ub1lfd8tlv7r5f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> >news:ub0lg34qc3gu76@corp.supernews.com...
> >> The End of "Amateur" Radio?
> >>
> >> I am looking as I write this at the "house ad" on page 130 of the
current
> >> issue of QST. It is headlined "YOU'RE INVITED" and as you look at it
you
> >> are naturally inclined to ask yourself, "to what?" Well, you're being
> >> "invited" to "increase the impact of amateur radio and to insure its
> >future"
> >> through the "Education and Technology Program," the Big Project, that
was
> >> written of in the March issue as being of major, if not VAST,
importance.
> >> Now, I had the impression that there was a real sense of urgency here,
> and
> >> that the ball was ready to ROLL! But, no, we're just getting off the
> >> ground, and not only that, all the ARRL wants from us is our money.
>
>
> >Val, this isn't East Germany. You don't have and AK stuck in your back,
> and
> >you don't have to give your money.
>
> No, I don't have to contribute. However, I likely WILL contribute, in
spite
> of
> that ad on page 130 which didn't even mention an AMOUNT! What I was
> commenting on, too quickly, was the fact that this is a top-down program
> that appears to be bypassing most of the clubs entirely. And, I have to
> admit,
> I was expecting something that began with education of a less self-serving
> type, that is, ELECTRONICS in general. FIRST. Now THAT would get our
> foot in the door LOTS of places!

Agreed. I heard the "Big Project" mentioned in an ARRL forum at the
Shriner's Hamfest in Columbus last year. I think the ARRL did solicit input
from the ham population, but perhaps there were fewer takers with the

required "vision." I think your mixing amateur radio with astronomy is a superb idea. It ought to be pretty easy to set up a special event station at one of your sky parties for starters. And the idea of using your telescope tracking mech to track an amateur satellite or the ISS while making a contact is really noteworthy. Hurry up and do it before someone else does.

> >> As you look at the ad in question, placed at the back of the magazine, at
> >> the bottom left of the double truck, opposite an equipment ad that
> totally
> >> dominates it, you see a circular image, what I interpret as the
> >patch-to-be
> >> for this project. In that patch, is seems to me, are encapsulated many
> >the
> >> internal problems facing "amateur radio" right now. So, I'll begin my
> >> discussion with that patch.
> >>
> >> It is headlined, in Big Type, "Amateur Radio."
> >>
> >> Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO
> ONE
> >> wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur." I say this knowing full
> >well
> >> the long and honored history of "amateurs" in many fields, and the origin
> >> and meaning of the word. But none of that matters. "AMATEUR" has to GO!
>
> >You might have noticed while preparing for your Technician exam that the
> FCC
> >calls it "Amateur Radio." Make a suggestion to the FCC to change it if its
> >not catchy enough for you. Maybe we need a jingle, too.
>
> I'm aware of what the FCC calls it. However, when interacting with the
> public,
> well, that fact need not be right up front as the first thing seen. Hey, I
> think
> the word "amateur" has a wonderful meaning when used with "radio," BUT,
> to large sections of the general public it can have unfortunate
> connotations.

I'll admit that the word "amateur" really doesn't do it. But then I read an editorial by one of the staff at 73 magazine several years ago. It was pro-amateur. There is nothing "amateurish" about some of the accomplishments of amateurs.

> >> In a couple of weeks I am going to be speaking to a lot of people about
> >> "amateur radio" without ever using that expression. No, I'm going to

be
> >> speaking to people about the things they can DO with radio, fascinating
> >> things, educational things, for a relatively small amount of money. I
am
> >> going to be stressing the links between radio and the computer, and the
> >> InterNet, because almost everyone who will come to our event, at an
> >> "upscale" high school,
>
> >Dick's Alma Matta?
>
> No, it's a new school.

I felt compelled to say that. Dickster is a MO mule.

> >> WILL have a computer, for SURE, and that computer
> >> will be hooked to the net. The key is the initial VISUAL impact,
backed
> >up
> >> with enthusiasm and a brief look at some activities and equipment.
This
> >is
> >> how I have been doing astronomy programs for about 20 years, and how,
in
> >> part, I re-built the local astronomy club.
>
>
> >I honestly doubt that you had a computer hooked up at the astronomy club
20
> >years ago, but none-the-less, its a good idea. Personally, I like going
> >with stuff that works. Thats why I'm not using code.
>
> As a matter of fact, we were using the first PCs just about 20 years ago,
> though not at remote functions it's true. One of our members had a
> North Star, I believe, running Word Star . . . MORE than 20 years ago!
> And I had a VIC-20, trying to do astronomy . . . nearly 20 years ago.

I had an early CoCo and upped it to 64K. I also got a real disk drive and
chunked the cassette. I had to cut slots and holes in the disks to use both
sides. Then my buddy showed me a real 'puter, the 1st PC, jr. That was
about 85 I think. The Vic20 was concurrent with the CoCo.

> >> Very briefly, I joined this group about twenty-five years ago,
> immediately
> >> after it had lost both of its leaders, one to an accident and one to a
> >> terrible disease. So, when I joined, the club was doing very little
> other
> >> than maintaining itself. By 1982, I had become president of this group
> >and
> >> was able to encourage the membership to show up for public "star
parties"
> >at

> >> local high schools and other locations. We did the first ones twenty
> >years
> >> ago this spring. We now have our own remote site and observatory, plus
a
> >> continuing presence in print, on the radio and on television. Our
> >> membership is about double what it was when I joined and is very active
> >and
> >> involved. We're able to raise money. In short, I am proud of what I
> have
> >> helped to vis-�-vis astronomy here in Columbia and look forward to
> helping
> >> with radio in a similar way. We'll see.
>
> >Just don't get yourself so busy that you blow off the code.
>
> It's this new VX-5 radio that's doing that. Too many buttons and a
72-page
> instruction manual. I'm definitely falling behind!

I bought a IC-02AT when that was a big deal. Now I'm using RS dinosaurs
HTX202 and 404's. The hardest radio that I've come across was the IC-281, a
hybrid 2m radio with 440 receive. Not intuitive like the great IC28H's.

> >> In any event, one of the things that truly helps that initial
impression
> >is
> >> a powerful and positive "point-of-purchase" display. That display has
to
> >> STOP people and then when they stop, it has to SPEAK to them, visually,
> in
> >a
> >> POWERFUL way. What the heck does the current "Big Project" patch SAY
to
> >> people who "stop to look at it?":
>
> >The ARRL has had an HQ person working the education slant for years.
They
> >do like to rehash things and call it new.
>
> I think the idea BEHIND this "Big Project" is great. However, what I have
> found is that most middle-school teachers have quite enough on their
plates
> already. What they need is for someone to come in and provide something
> that they don't have to expend a whole lot of time on up front. This is
> what I
> have been doing for many years with astronomy. No doubt, some teachers
> who are Hams are going to take advantage of this. However, can it be a
> truly mass program? I have my doubts.

I think the ARRL was instrumental in getting the rule changed so that a ham
Teacher could be on the clock while using ham radio in the classroom. But

wouldn't it be better if a ham club could take a program off the shelf and bring it to a school and sell it rather than a ham teacher having to develop something new? That would be ideal for the ARRL to get behind. I also think that every school library ought to have at least a set of SW and Scanner radios and headphones so that a kid could come in and spend 20 minutes tuning around and discovering that there is a bigger world out there than the Cartoon Network and Fox. The Spanish teacher could assign a few minutes of listening to a Spanish SW broadcast or listening to La Lambada music. Local clubs could rebroadcast shuttle audio to be tuned in on any scanner.

> >> It says, first and foremost: AMATEUR RADIO! Then it doesn't say much
> >else,
> >> really, since the arcane and indecipherable (to the public) ARRL logo
is
> >THE
> >> BIGGEST THING IN IT, visually speaking. So, really, what' the BIG
> PROJECT
> >> all about? Well, it's about the ARRL, that's what! LOOK at that logo,
> on
> >> page 130 of the current QST! What are you getting out of it, visually?
> >If
> >> you're the public -- ZIP! For that matter, if your a radio amateur,
you
> >> getting just about zip.
>
> >OK.
>
> Uh oh, now I'm worried!
>
>
> >> What would that patch look like if I were designing it? Well, the
center
> >> image would NOT be some impossible for (the public) to understand logo.
> >No,
> >> the center image would evoke something, and therefore be ONE image, not
> >the
> >> over-complicated hodge-podge you in fact see. For instance, something
> >that
> >> immediately comes to MY mind is a silhouette image of a young person in
a
> >> learning situation (seated, with a book, perhaps), and then one other
> >> artifact in the image, a RADIO artifact. And that's IT! The blurb at
> the
> >> top of the patch could say almost ANYTHING other than "AMATEUR RADIO."
> >That
> >> is SO bad it is NOT worth talking about. The blurb could be just an
> >> acronym, if the center image was powerful enough. I would crank up
> >> something like "ARRL * ETP * ARRL" or, gee, ANYTHING else, and then a
> >slogan

> >> at the bottom: "RADIO FOR EVERYONE" or something. The object is to
> ENGAGE
> >> people, not CONFUSE them.
>
> >Dave doesn't want radio for everyone. You'll have to ask him.
>
> What I hope to do is do something with radio similiar to the things I have
> done with astronomy. That is, you show up with some very simple
> equipment that will engage students in a hands-on activity, right on
> the spot and "out of the box." Then you have something that follows
> up, maybe a small project or class. I am thinking about radio
> astronomy as the tie-in here. You get the science specialists involved
> because you are NOT asking them to spend their money, or a whole
> lot of their time. In short, I don't think it's necessary or even
advisable
> to try to hard sell Ham Radio with this kind of program. That will happen
> by itself once you get them in the door for some other reason.

A special event HF station on the side of a sky party will generate
interest. Tune in Jupiters noise on 15M. Don't sell anything. The only
selling involved is with the school administrators to let you introduce a
radio program into the curriculum.

> >> Folks, Ham Radio needs a media consultant, a good one, BAD!
>
> >Val, I admire your enthusiasm, but rocking the boat will get you
> blackballed
> >faster than being a commie in 50's Hollywood. You just better settle
down
> >and learn the code like a good boy. Keep your nose clean.
>
> I have a very clean nose these days! Why? I always carry a handkerchief!
>
> Val
>
> P.S. I'm going to set up my own project here, beginning in two weeks.
> I'm going to go for the junior high kids and see what happens.

Go for it.

Brian

968. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:02:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <sRss8.6585$AM2.337385905@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40237

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a8t2ak6ku6@enews3.newsguy.com...
> You mean in the movie Deliverance?
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR

Yep, thats the one.

969. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:06:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bVss8.6587$tS2.337673571@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40238

Oh yeah. Larry has a "friend" who used to send FU on cw. Then Larry says
that cw doesn't lend itself to profanity.

Brian
"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CB1F3D9.94933C1@psu.edu...
> Does anyone swear on CW? Of course a person could, but it would seem odd
> to do .
>
> - Mike - KB3EIA
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Of course, it is virtually impossible to misbehave on CW except
> > for jamming, of course, which seems to be the most popular mode
> > for jamming.
> >

970. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:10:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb25e28_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40240

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:Ulss8.1675$3P4.133067@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> > I also have a General class licensee as a hubby, and have
> > used his privileges several times while he sits on the internet.
>
> And did you sign as W5TIT or as W5CAW?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Hans, maybe you should read the FCC Rules and Regulations...

Kim W5TIT

971. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:16:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB25D12.B1FE048F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40239

N2EY wrote:
> Is any of what I wrote above not true?

It certainly is. The nocode tech class of license went from 0% of the
ARS in 1990 to 30% of the ARS in 2000 and all you give them credit
for is a 4% increase?

Your treatment of the nocode techs reminds me of the treatment of
black athletes in the 1960's.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

972. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:20:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40241

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:esss8.1693$3P4.134520@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> >
> > How about if you transmit a daily Morse code practice to
> > no intended ham recipient?
> >
>
> That is one of several types of allowed one-way transmissions.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
>

Two examples of what I would consider to be highly illegal transmissions, yet done every single day here in the Dallas area on 146.880:

One: For anyone who's listening, there's a big pileup on XXXX (where X=highway of choice), so don't go that way. A better way might be for you to take XXXX and get around this stuff because it's pretty bad.

What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a broadcast, addressing his/her comments to no one in particular. Now, I've even seen it happen that the person making the broadcast then ends their transmission without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.

Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place. These people check with each other often about traffic flow and route. Truckdrivers will also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere. Sorry folks, but both examples here are those that involve communication with pecuniary interest: namely employment.

There's pretty much only two repeaters I really ever listen to with any regularity. One is the most popular repeater in Dallas, the 146.880 machine. The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine. At dinners and other get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine have pretty much agreed we will not discuss traffic on our repeater. We also chide people who come on and do so...it's not good hamming at all.

Kim W5TIT

973. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:43:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020408234327.07832.00001079@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40243

In article <3cb1db4a_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>> OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI (No Test
>International)!
>>
>> Make a note of it.
>>
>> With all kind wishes,
>>
>> de Hans, K0HB
>
>Hans ... nice attempt at "guilt by association," but as you well know,
>both I and the other leadership of NCI has repeatedly repudiated
>anything inplying that NCI has an agenda to eliminate (or gut) the
>written tests. I can also state with some confidence that the NCI
>Board would vote to oppose any "NTI" initiatives filed with the FCC.
>
>Have a nice day ...
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

Like it or not, the NTI -- if and when formed, would/will always be
seen as a logical extension of NCI, whether or not that is actually
true. IMHO, the NCI had a great deal to do with bringing the ARS
to the precipice of the slippery slope -- and giving a good, firm push.

73 de Larry, K3LT

974. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:43:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020408234328.07832.00001080@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40244

In article <8Rjs8.479$3P4.45874@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>> So I believe it is very much a necessity to make the
>> ARS as accessible as possible to as many people as
>> possible. I am not so sure that having an operator's
>> license for the service is a good thing. Station
>> licenses, yes, but nothing that requires a test.
>
>OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI (No Test International)!
>
>Make a note of it.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

This is supposed to come as some sort of surprise? The NCTA
(soon to be simply the NTA) was heading in precisely this direction
all along. The whole point is to have a microphone, a "legal" high-
power amplifier, a VFO knob and a bandswitch in hand, without the
bother of having to actually learn any useful communications skills.
We started down the slippery slope with the No-Code Tech in '91 --
and we are picking up more speed as we get closer to the bottom.
All I can say is -- fasten your seat belts!

73 de Larry, K3LT

975. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:43:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020408234328.07832.00001081@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40246

In article <3cb07570_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Now that the licensing requirements
>> have been significantly reduced, what is *your* excuse for not getting
>> your "Nickle Extra?" I'm not saying that it is in any way mandatory or
>> even expected, but it is certainly within your abilities -- as it was even
>> in the Pre-Restructuring Era. Just a thought...
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Oh, I look, Larry. You need to realize that *anyone* could do what you guys
>have done, with more grace and humility than you have in the tip of your
>little fingers. Anyone can do what you guys did. However, I'd say that
>most people who get their college degrees end up using the degree...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I "use" my college degree each and every day of my life. The things I
learned, and the experience I had while learning them, have changed
me in ways that have improved my life considerably. Moreover, while
I am not presently employed in an occupation where I can "use" all of
the technical knowledge I gained from my major course of study, I have
learned to appreciate a job that I love to do and do well. The fact that
it pays well and has great benefits is the icing on the cake. All of the
"entry level" HR positions I applied for paid 5 - 10 kilobucks a year
less than what I'm making now. If I do take a different job in my
present company or elsewhere in the transportation industry, it will
most likely be as a Street Supervisor, Training and Development, or
Safety. So go ahead and keep ragging on how I'm not "using" my
degree. It just shows that, as usual, you don't know what you're
talking about.

73 de Larry, K3LT

976. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:43:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020408234330.07832.00001082@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40247

In article <3cb0766d_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Oh, I forgot to answer your really important question, Larry. Why don't I
>upgrade? Why didn't I upgrade before?! I have no aspirations to going any
>further. I only got Tech+ for the benefit of our elmers, I tried HF and I
>don't care for it. So, why in the world would I waste my time getting a
>license that I'm not going to use? Oh, I forgot...you think studying for a
>degree and not using it is a great use of time. I don't. So, I also think
>it would be a huge waste of time to get a ham radio license which I would
>never (where never=proportionate amount of total time) use.

Kim:

I spent three years working full time, 7 days a week, without vacations, and going to school 3 or 4 nights a week in order to get my Bachelor's Degree. I did it for only one reason: Because I wanted to have one. Whether or not I ever "use" it, in the sense of actually making my living working as a Human Resources Manager, was not the point. In earning that degree, I learned a lot of things that would be of great help to me in any field of endeavor -- not the least among them was exercising the intellectual discipline required to not only earn that degree, but to receive it with the highest academic honors.

When I was in the Air Force, I worked with a lot of officers who differed from me in only one way -- they were college graduates. A great deal of them had degrees in what would seem completely useless fields of study -- Art History, Physical Education, "Women's Studies," etc. However, they all proved their ability to succeed in an academic environment, and the majority of them became technically and managerially competent officers -- deserving of a leadership position. They invariably recognized me for my intelligence and always encouraged me to further my own education, which I did to the greatest extent possible during my years in the service. As a result, I was always promoted way ahead of my peers, and even though I wasn't qualified to be an officer, I was always given positions of supervisory and managerial responsibility. The people I had the most difficulty relating to in the military were fellow Non-Commissioned Officers who, though higher-ranking than myself, weren't nearly as intellectually flexible and administratively competent. I had one "boss" for whom I literally had to do all of his reading and writing! These people usually saw me as some kind of threat to them, because the difference in performance between us was so conspicuous.

You say you don't want to upgrade because you don't think you can "use" your upgraded privileges. Don't look now, Kim, but that is the

mindset of a loser. During the time when I was responsible for developing the future enlisted leaders of the Air Force, I've faced that same mindset many times, and have had considerable success in dispelling it. I would encourage you to do so as well. Whether you think you can do it or not, you're right. And I think you *can* do it. And the best reason to do it is to prove that you can do it. That's why I got my college degree at a great sacrifice of leisure and time spent in more "profitable" pursuits. It was something I wanted to do for the sake of getting it done. Now, it is something that cannot be taken away from me. Perhaps getting your Extra would be the start of your own epiphany -- one which could lead you to greater achievements in your life.

>And, you're right, my abilities are quite sufficient. My abilities are also
>far superior to yours in being a much better ham.

OK -- if that's what you think, prove it. You could start by changing your call sign and start looking like a boorish imbecile with the one you have now. If you truly are the outstanding ham you claim to be, it certainly doesn't become you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

977. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:43:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020408234330.07832.00001083@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40248

In article <3cb074c3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> >Why should those people be any more looked up to than anyone else,
>Larry?!
>>
>> Because they are legitimate celebrities, who have the talent and
>> industry connections that could be very useful in publicizing the ARS.
>>
>
>Then you have a much rosier opinion of Hollywood than reality.
>
>You wouldn't mean something like the good 'ol movie, Frequency, would you?
>Or, oh yeah, not to mention that great ham flic Twister. Those are the two
>references I generally get from people now when I am mentioning ham radio.
>The first thing I have to do is distance ham radio from either of those--

I didn't have any particular movie in mind, Kim. I wasn't proposing that we
make any direct correlation between how ham radio is or has been portrayed;
just that we exploit the resources of "celebrity" hams -- movie actors,
musicians,
whatever -- to publicize the ARS.

>Movies, movie stars and popularity is not what will advertise ham radio at
>its best. Ham radio at its best *is* the home-town individuals who've taken
>the time to get out to the local public.

I don't necessarily disagree with that, but do they have the resources to
assist in creating and producing a *national* mass media publicity campaign for
the ARS? That's what I'm talking about here. Please compare apples to
other apples.

>> >I think you're
>> >probably just looking for more people to put down anyway--you couldn't
>care less if anyone joins the hobby.

If that's what you think, why do you even bother responding to me?

>> Well, Kim, if that's what you want to think of me, all I can say is that
>> you're absolutely incorrect. I have a very deep concern for the future
>> of the ARS -- one which you have not demonstrated so far.
>>
>
>You live up to the reputation every day, Larry. And, I'd daresay most
>people (I include the silent readers) on this newsgroup, have the same
>opinion, Larry--that all you wish to do is set another lair for your

>attempts at degrading and humiliating people who choose this hobby.

Don't look now, Kim -- but I don't do that. All I do is take people who are already voluntarily degrading and humiliating themselves, mainly by making immature and inane objections to learning useful communications skills, and pointing out the foolishness of their attitudes.

>> Another charming comment from Miss Congeniality herself.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Yeah, I'm living up to your expectations, Larry...don't want to disappoint
>your opnion of yourself...

My "opnion (sic) of [my]self?" This is not about me, Kim.

73 de Larry, K3LT

978. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:43:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020408234331.07832.00001084@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40245

In article <3cb0f106_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Well, Val, let's see. I've spent one year on the team developing the ARRL
>ARECC course, have taken and received a certificate in all three courses,
>have served as instructor in at least two classes in each of the three
>Levels over the past year (in fact, have had just the last month or so off).
>I was Hunt County ARES EC for a year, until I had to give it up due to
>obligations I must fulfill at work. The last act I did in that capacity was
>spend a little more than $1500 of my own money to put together an all day
>ARES symposium in Hunt County. I have spent untold hours in storm spotting,
>was with MARS for about three years--one of which was as net control. I
>have been with NTS and served as net control there for about a year; have
>been with RACES and ARES organizations both in Kaufman and Hunt counties.

Kim:

That's truly impressive. I think you should be nominated for the 2002
Dayton Hamvention "Amateur Radio Operator of the Year." I doubt
that whomever has already been nominated could provide as a rï¿½sumï¿½
as imposing as yours.

73 de Larry, K3LT

979. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 03:43:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020408234332.07832.00001085@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40242

In article <20020408082837.22527.00002601@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>They got Dick Van Dyke to sit down
>>in front of a KWM-2 at one time, and that had more to do with getting
>>me to become a ham than a dozen "Elmers" trying to "sell" me on
>>the ARS.
>
>When I was licensed, it only took one Elmer, and a TV ad would not have done
>it for me.

Of course it wouldn't have, Ed. As soon as I mentioned it, I knew that it could never apply to you.

>Did you really have a dozen Elmers trying to talk you into becoming a ham,
>but waited until you saw Van Dyke to a 30-second TV spot? Were these dozen
>Elmers untrustworthy people, or do you automatically trust people you don't know
>more than people you do?

Don't look now, Ed, but the term "a dozen Elmers" was a figure of speech. I only had one "Elmer" per se, and I ended up teaching her more about ham radio than she taught me. She was, however, instrumental in teaching me the code.

73 de Larry, K3LT

980. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 04:06:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409000628.02598.00003606@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40249

>Like it or not, the NTI -- if and when formed, would/will always be
>seen as a logical extension of NCI, whether or not that is actually
>true.

I will back NTI, where do you sign up?

981. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 04:11:36 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <YRts8.1573$CA6.103824@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40250

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
> > And did you sign as W5TIT or as W5CAW?
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
>
> Hans, maybe you should read the FCC Rules and Regulations...

I have read them. That's why I asked you "did you sign as W5TIT or as W5CAW?"

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

982. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 04:19:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409001954.02598.00003607@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40152

>This is supposed to come as some sort of surprise? The NCTA
>(soon to be simply the NTA) was heading in precisely this direction
>all along. The whole point is to have a microphone, a "legal" high-
>power amplifier, a VFO knob and a bandswitch in hand, without the
>bother of having to actually learn any useful communications skills.
>We started down the slippery slope with the No-Code Tech in '91 --
>and we are picking up more speed as we get closer to the bottom.
>All I can say is -- fasten your seat belts!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Agree completely. Why dont we just get it over with, and stop pretending its not going to happen.
NCI opened the Door, and the FCC went right along with NCI Whinning.
All the Excusses NCI used in regard to CW, can just as easily be used for the Written.
Someone PLEASE start NTI, HELL I will even Donate to this cause, and you dont even have to give me some Phoney NTI number.

983. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 04:20:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB26C1D.50E41610@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40151

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > How did you establish that the Church was thinking evil thoughts?
>
> Because they put Galileo, the truth teller, under house arrest.

How did they know Galileo was a truth teller?

> > Perhaps you meant that the Church was lying because it stated its belief
> > in something which was later found to be in error.
>
> The church has contained and continues to contain some of the biggest
> liars in the world. My pastor says that dinosaurs and Homo sapiens existed
> at the same time.

You could always change churches or tell your pastor to quit reading
Ally Oop.

Dave K8MN

984. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 04:25:14 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <K2us8.1607$CA6.106526@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40153

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> At dinners and other get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine
> have pretty much agreed we will not discuss traffic on our repeater.

That's certainly your perogative.

> We also chide people who come on and do
> so...

That behavior is anal. Go to http://westid.com/amateur.htm. There, for
$59.95 plus a boxtop from any 2M HT, you can get a lovely gold anodized
official Radio Kop ID Badge.

>...it's not good hamming at all.

On one of our W0EF club repeaters, we have a roundtable gathering called the
"Afterwork Net" which typically consists of up to 20-30 homeward bound
commuters over the course of any given evening drive-time. Since many of us
use the same highways and freeways, we freely share information about
traffic conditions, including suggestions for alternate routes. Please
explain, citing pertinent FCC rules, why that is "not good hamming".

Good luck on this one now!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

985. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 04:25:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409002518.13747.00002931@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 40154

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/08/02 16:31 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020408163103.27628.00000346@mb-bj.aol.com>

>Please prove they are not four-letter words.

I didn't say they were in ANY context.

By the way, where's the answer on that "strictly recreational" radio service, Your Putziness?

986. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 04:29:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409002912.13747.00002932@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 40155

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/08/02 16:31 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020408163102.27628.00000345@mb-bj.aol.com>

>You aren't accomplishing anything other than being obnoxious.

AND...bringing to light your numerous and glaring inadequacies in what YOU perceive as your "place" in the radio world as it's Mentor and Soverign Leader.

Where's the answer to your assertion that there are radio services created for "strictly recreational" applications, Your Wrongfulness?

987. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 04:37:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CB27009.D08256B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40156

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CB1AB06.5F0854E@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3CB096D3.E18CEC08@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > > > I bet Dave still does...think the Earth is the center of the
> universe,
> > > that
> > > > > is.
> > > >
> > > > ...while you, of course, are quite certain that YOU are its center.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Nope, I don't think that at all. I am nothing but an insignificant
> speck in
> > > God's imagination.
> >
> > On that, we agree.
> >
>
> Aw, gee, Davey. I thought you profess to be a non-judgemental type of
> person.

You haven't been paying attention then. I'm the guy who says we are
called upon to make judgements each and every day of our lives.

> > >
> > > Thank goodness I was given the intelligence to realize
> > > that, Dave.
> >
> > It's a start.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Yeah, now *you* need to figure it out.

Oh, I'd figured out long ago that you aren't the center of the Universe.

Dave K8MN

988. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 04:40:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409004052.13747.00002935@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 40157

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/08/02 16:31 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020408163102.27628.00000345@mb-bj.aol.com>

>Convenient: One can pull out of the Ralph's and Sav-On combined
>parking lot onto Victory Boulevard going northeast...(SNIP)

Been there...Done that...got the shirt...

>Legal use: Quite a bit of HRO resold products are quite legal to
>use without a license...antennas of all kinds from simple wire kits
>to mobile antennas to....(SNIP)

I know what's there, Lennie. The question is, what are YOU doing there?
That's kinda like sending a blind man to a video store...

>There's many
>different publishers of radio-interest books on the market and HRO
>doesn't discriminate or demand a copy of a Form 605 to prove to
>them a buyer is "worth it."

Who does? Who said they should? Quotes, please....

>A number of years ago, a whole group of us..(SNIP)

Group of us who..??? More snotty "engineers" sneering at the unwashed
masses?

>My purpose a few days ago was to get a group comparison of
>front panel displays, mostly variously backlit LCD screens, with
>strong incidental daylight illumination. That did not involve
>INTENT TO PURCHASE!!! as you seem to imply.

And this comparison was for what..??? You doing research for "Consumer
Reports" now?

>You MUST do a break-in to every exchange with another. It's a form
>of JAMMING and you feel righteous about employing such tactics.

A "form of JAMMING"...???

BBBBBWWWWWHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA.!>!>!>!>!>!>!>!>!

As for "righteous"...As long as YOU feel 'righteous' forcing your bile on
us, some is due back to you. It's only fair.

Pretty sorry you started this now, aren't you?

989. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 05:04:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB27641.A0E42CFF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40158

> I think your mixing amateur radio with astronomy is a
> superb idea. It ought to be pretty easy to set up a special event station
> at one of your sky parties for starters. And the idea of using your
> telescope tracking mech to track an amateur satellite or the ISS while
> making a contact is really noteworthy. Hurry up and do it before someone
> else does.

When a good meteor shower is scheduled (yeah, like those are
easy to predict how good it will be!) set up some radios to do
some meteor bounce. An FM broadcast radio tuned to a station
normally out of range, like 200 miles away. With a somewhat directional
antenna. You should hear occasional bursts of reception. Do this
at the meteor viewing star party.

990. Re: Insurance claim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 05:16:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB27948.FEE10DC0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40159

I heard that this incident actually happened at the construction
site of the pyramids in Egypt way back when...

991. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 05:31:07 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB27C9B.30C483F9@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40160

There's already radio services that need no test.
1) 11 meter CB
2) FRS
3) cell phones

All with type accepted (or whatever the term is nowadays)
equipment.

With the things the FCC lets hams do, like build our own
equipment, develop new modes (psk31, packet, and such),
select from many bands a frequency to use, hams need to
pass a test to be sure that we are aware of various issues
involved when operating homebrew radios, etc.

Whether if one needs the knowledge required for an extra
to operate certain subbands vs other subbands the generals
are allowed, well.... (and I do have an extra). Running a
linear on 14.300 is not any different than if it's on 14.160
as far as safety and RFI and other rules and issues are concerned.

Not really comparable to flying small airplanes, as you need
more skill to do IFR vs VFR, IIRC. And there are tests to
get the revalent grade of flying license. Or driving busses
vs just a 4 door car....

992. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 06:04:31 UTC
From: misterRNNOSPAM@mercednet.com
Message-ID: <3cb2836e.1928212@news.localaccess.com>
Source record: 40161

Wow! After having stayed away from the newsgroup for a while
its nice to see some relevant discussions. I disagree with Val. I am
proud to be called an Amateur Radio Operator and I think the emphasis
should be on emergency communications instead of the computer linkage,
BUT thats what is great about a discussion. It is only my opinion and
I may be totally wrong. My point is at least we are looking at and
discussing other ideas.

Howard
N3TNQ

993. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 07:15:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020409031536.07832.00001106@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40163

In article <3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a broadcast,
>addressing his/her comments to no one in particular. Now, I've even seen it
>happen that the person making the broadcast then ends their transmission
>without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.

Kim:

Incorrect. An "announcement" of such a nature is perfectly legal, as
long as it is properly identified.

>Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place. These people
>check with each other often about traffic flow and route. Truckdrivers will
>also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere. Sorry folks, but both
>examples here are those that involve communication with pecuniary interest:
>namely employment.

Also incorrect. The fact that there are professional drivers involved does
not make such transmissions illegal in the ARS. This use of amateur
radio is certainly falls within limits of Public Interest, Convenience, or
Necessity, and are thus perfectly legal, even if the parties involved are
engaged in commercial activity at the time. What they are NOT
doing is actually advertising, dispatching, or otherwise directly facilitating
the day-to-day operation of their business. They are just promoting
traffic safety by operating their vehicles in a manner which not only
ensures the safe operation of the vehicles involved, but others on the
highways.

>There's pretty much only two repeaters I really ever listen to with any
>regularity. One is the most popular repeater in Dallas, the 146.880
>machine. The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine. At dinners and other
>get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine have pretty much agreed we will not
>discuss traffic on our repeater.

So, you not only get it wrong, but you encourage othes to get it wrong
as well? It just so happens that discussing local traffic conditions is a
perfectly legal and very reasonable and practical use of an amateur
repeater. Well, nothing new here -- just another example of W5TIT
not knowing what she's talking about, but attempting to be seen as
an authority in Amateur Radio Public Service while spewing nonsense.

>We also chide people who come on and do so...it's not good hamming
>at all.

How charming. You get on the air, and "chide" people who are actually using ham radio for a practical, useful, public service purpose -- and then you have the nerve to call yourself a Public Service expert within the ARS. You also infer that your "inner circle" of ham friends do likewise. Fools sure do love company! It's just a question of whether you found them, or they found you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

994. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 07:15:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020409031537.07832.00001108@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40162

In article <a8t2al7ku6@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>He may not have a right to bitch about things they way they may be NOW, but
>he has every right to complain about situations when he WAS a member.
>
>Ryan

Ryan:

Anyone who has cancelled or chosen not to renew their ARRL
membership certainly has the right to complain about the organization --
but those complaints carry much more weight when coming from
actual members in good standing (i.e. dues paid). However, having
said that, I'll give you this much -- the ARRL has a good track record
of ignoring the wishes of it's paying members just as much as outsiders.
They seem to do what they think is good for the organization, whether
or not it's good for the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

995. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 07:15:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020409031537.07832.00001107@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40164

In article <8xZr8.548$Ku6.199123135@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>, "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> writes:

>Can someone explain how a Technician class license holder is able to set up
>a repeater network or auxiliary stations? Each aux station would be a
>different individual with a unique call sign I assume, however my question
>is mainly about broadcast location. Are operators limited to broadcasting
>only from the address indicated on FCC license? An example would be where
>the FCC indicates operator "KABCD" lives in Los Angeles and operator "KEFGH"
>lives in Hollywood, but other information such as QRZ and other websites
>indicate that these two call signs (and others) are repeating in a
>closed/private status and that the locations are not Los Angeles and
>Hollywood, but somewhere else such as Pasadena and Santa Monica. I'd
>appreciate any help as I'm new to this. Thanks.

Lars:

The quick and dirty answer is that you can set up a virtually infinite number of repeaters, all id'ing with your callsign. All the FCC is interested in is who's hide to nail to the wall for rules violations -- but having more than one (or several) repeaters on different bands/freqs isn't one of them. Most club-owned repeater systems have more than one "machine" operating under a single club call sign -- perfectly legal.

You would do well to find out who the repeater coordinator is in your area. You can't set up a repeater without coordination -- it's possible, but it's just not done. Particularly in a high-density usage area (like most cities in California), your chance of putting a repeater on the air without interfering with someone else is practically nil without coordination. And you won't pick your frequency -- the coordinator will do that for you.

Keep in mind that you have no HF privileges on the FM/RPT portion of 10-meters, so a 10-meter repeater, or one with a cross-band link to 10-meters, is verboten for you, unless the 10-meter transmitter is running under the call sign of a General, Advanced, or Extra-class operator.

BTW -- and I'm sure you're going to be hit with this repeatedly, but the term "broadcasting" is a misnomer in the ARS. What we do is strictly "transmitting." "Broadcasting" implies a one-way transmission intended for a general audience. Amateur Radio operations are strictly 2-way operations intended to be conducted between other amateur radio operators, either individually or as a group network, or "net.". Certain stations do conduct scheduled one-way "bulletin" transmissions, but that is done strictly on the understanding that there

is no deliberate interference to be caused by such operation, and the content of such transmissions (not "broadcasts") are to pertain specifically to amateur radio and be of interest only to amateur radio operators. Please learn not to use the "B" word when referring to amateur radio. It's a hot button.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Vice-President and Trustee, Dover Amateur Radio Club (W3DOV)
Dover, Delaware

996. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 08:19:05 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8usus11rl2@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40195

And also RAIN, SNOW, WIFE are four letter words..... and all usually
annoying.

Ryan

>
> >It's a DUTY! (remember, the word "duty" is a four-letter word
>
> For a Putz who chafes at the idea of being a member of a radio
SERVICE,
> it's funny to see you "making fun" of the concepts of duty, poignant or
not.
>
> SR

997. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 08:24:44 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a8usut21rl2@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40197

Great..... Think I will start All-Code Intl. Anyone using a transciever would have to pass the code test amateurs are forced to. Obviously television and broadcast am/fm radio would be exempt because that is a one-way transmission. If morse code is that important, it obviously would be important for others to learn it. Hmmm.... a cop or firefighter gets injured somehow and cannot speak, well, they could send for help in morse code! As well as other radio services too......

Ryan

"> OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI (No Test International)!
>
> Make a note of it.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>

998. Re: Insurance claim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:03:30 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <S%ys8.18290$QC1.1130209@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40165

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CB27948.FEE10DC0@ix.netcom.com...
> I heard that this incident actually happened at the construction
> site of the pyramids in Egypt way back when...

With Sammy Amen-Hotep doing 'Here Come de Judge'.

999. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:12:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409061203.08013.00002310@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40166

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3c@fast.net

>Hans ... nice attempt at "guilt by association," but as you well know,
>both I and the other leadership of NCI has repeatedly repudiated
>anything inplying that NCI has an agenda to eliminate (or gut) the
>written tests. I can also state with some confidence that the NCI
>Board would vote to oppose any "NTI" initiatives filed with the FCC.

As you know, your work with NCI entails, as does any organization, a LOT of
that work. I think it pretty unlikely that this post would grow into any such
organization, and I don't expect that the poster is willing to do more than
stir the pot.

Congratulations on your new call! First SSB, now a vanity call -- next comes
"CQ Contest" and dah-di-dah-dit dah-dah-di-dah! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1000. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:14:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409061437.08013.00002311@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40167

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Like it or not, the NTI -- if and when formed, would/will always be
>seen as a logical extension of NCI, whether or not that is actually
>true.

It would not be seen as a logical extension of NCI by any of those associated
with NCI that have posted here.

It would be seen as a logical extension of NCI by those who do not care whether
it is actually true or not. That DOES fit some posters here.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1001. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:19:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409061940.08013.00002312@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40168

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

> But, no, we're just getting off the
>ground, and not only that, all the ARRL wants from us is our money.

Can you think of any other way that ARRL can accomplish the goals of the
organization?

>Folks, Ham Radio needs a media consultant, a good one, BAD!

Those cost money...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1002. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:21:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409062109.08013.00002313@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40169

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>>Did you send this jeremiad to someone who has influence
>>in the matter, like your Division Director?

>When can I expect to see the Black Helicopters?

You believe that communicating your views about ARRL policy to the person who is your direct representative to creating such policies causes black helicopters to circle overhead?

How odd.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1003. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:23:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409062305.08013.00002314@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40170

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>However, I admit that I should have NOT have said that "no one"
>wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur" today.

Amateur atheletes are quite proud of the distinction. I am proud of the
contributions of Amateur Radio and pleased to be a part of them.

It seems that you, not ARRL, are trying to demean the term...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1004. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:25:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409062550.08013.00002315@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40171

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

> Hey, I
>think
>the word "amateur" has a wonderful meaning when used with "radio," BUT,
>to large sections of the general public it can have unfortunate
>connotations.

Can you provide any examples of places where this large section of the public have expressed those unfortunate connotations? I have never run across them. The term "amateur athelete" or "amateur astronomer" don't conjure up any negative connotations in my mind.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1005. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:29:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409062917.08013.00002316@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40172

From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com

>BTW, Why is it called "American Radio _Relay_ League"?
>A relay is an electromechanical switch driven by a coil, yes?
>And radios don't use relays anyway....

The ARRL Board has looked to change the name a few times. The members objected. It finally decided that the "official" name of ARRL is ARRL, although it still also uses American Radio Relay League.

If you would like to see a name change, let your Director know, although that will cause Val to see circling helicopters again. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1006. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:36:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409063622.08001.00002604@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40173

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>We share our spectrum. It's bound to happen that we'll lose lots of it here
>in the near future--technology makes it so. Am I going to stand in the way
>when it may mean my job, my livelihood, etc.? Nope...sorry.

I am curious -- in what way would preserving Amateur access to spectrum affect
your livelihood?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1007. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:39:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409063957.08001.00002605@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40174

From: "Richard McCollum" rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net

>You might be surprised. About a week after I got the present call I was
>working on the repeater and got a call using my old 1x3.

KA1CVV told me that he will probably take KA1CV when he upgrades.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1008. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:41:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409064126.08001.00002606@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40175

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Nice call sign, Carl -- sure would sound great in CW! You ought to
>give it a try sometime...

Hey, I asked him first! And he has given CW a try and concluded that he
doesn't like it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1009. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:43:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409064313.08001.00002607@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40176

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Wow, think of it...you can put that 2x1 on a resume and get
>your pick of high-paying industry jobs! I hear that managers
>are really looking for 1x2 and 2x1 ham callsign holders! :-)
>

So THAT is why I can't get a real job -- I have that 1X3! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1010. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:45:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409064545.08001.00002608@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40177

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> And there are a lot of amateurish
>> photos, of guys standing around holding stuff, items that S&T banished a
>> long time ago.

>Same old generalizations from Val. How about several
>specific examples and why those items should be "banished"
>from the pages of QST.

Or better yet, send QST some good photos to use. The Editor prefers good action to grin and grab every time!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1011. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:49:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409064948.08001.00002610@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40178

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Now Hans with the All Good Wishes is simply being a pain in the butt.

>NAILED! on the head, as usual! On BOTH counts! (Good, Kind or whatever)

Hans closes with "all kind wishes" and the guy who tells me to go soak my head
agrees that Hans is being a pain in the butt.

How odd.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1012. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:52:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409065200.08001.00002611@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40179

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>Your long-valued avocation seems to be IN TROUBLE
>and I'm trying to HELP OUT, even if it means pissing
>off guys like you, who seem to have very little clue as to
>exactly, or even fuzzily, what's wrong!

Should THAT quote be on the cover of QST, or do you think that ARRL should
"help out" in a way that does not mean pissing off guys like him?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1013. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:53:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409065351.08001.00002612@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40180

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> Your long-valued avocation seems to be IN TROUBLE
>
>It (ham radio) is in trouble??? Perhaps you can
>tell us WHY you believe that?

This oughta' be good. :-) Val, in responding, keep in mind that ham radio has grown rather steadily over the past 50 years. Not bad for an avocation that is "in trouble."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1014. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 10:58:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409065819.08001.00002613@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40181

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>If you want a
>shocker, check out the difference between color printing and monotone.

I think that part of the decision to go all color was based on the fact that the B&W vs color printing differential has decreased quite a bit. QST was already printing color for some of the ads, so full color was just an extension of the process.

Besides, people want color and are willing to pay for it. How many monochrome computer monitors are sold nowadays?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1015. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 11:00:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409070020.08001.00002614@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40182

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>See, I just saved ARRL a whole bunch of money.

Actually, there are some who would like to be ARRL members without receiving QST. Unfortunately, if most members did not receive QST, the cost of membership would have to increase to pay for the loss of advertising revenues.

A good example of an organization that functions without ad revenues is the IEEE. My dues last year were over $100.00.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1016. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 11:04:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409070450.08001.00002615@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40183

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> I agree, Larry. For as long as I'm interested in ham radio I'll be
> helping hold their toes to the fire.

I wish that more people WOULD speak up about their views on ARRL and its policies. When they are basing those views on a misunderstanding, communication can help bridge that gap. And when there is no such misunderstaning, those views add to the value of ARRL.

Tom Frenaye told me that I am but one of a handful that regularly communicates with him. That is NOT a good thing!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1017. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 11:07:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409070759.08001.00002616@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40184

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> I'll give you this much -- the ARRL has a good track record
>of ignoring the wishes of it's paying members just as much as outsiders.
>They seem to do what they think is good for the organization, whether
>or not it's good for the ARS.

Can you post the specifics that have led you to this conclusion? What ARRL actions have you seen that you believe were done for the good of the organization that were not good for the ARS?

Do post a large enough list to justify the term "good track record."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1018. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 11:15:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409071505.08001.00002618@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40185

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>Hi Val,

> better be careful about showing any QST / ARRL copied or
>related material in public. The Newington bunch might send
>one of their legal attack dogs after you for violating their
>copyright, trademark, etc. ;-0

If anyone wants to use any ARRL material for any such purpose, such as handouts to the public, etc., the League almost invariably gives such permission. Email permission@arrl.org and tell Maty what you want to use and how you want to use it and you will usually get back an email giving you permission to use the copyrighted material.

Sounds a bit easier than arguing with attack dogs, eh? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1019. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 11:19:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409071923.08001.00002621@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40186

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>Did you really have a dozen Elmers trying to talk you into becoming a ham,
>>but waited until you saw Van Dyke to a 30-second TV spot?

>Don't look now, Ed, but the term "a dozen Elmers" was a figure of
>speech. I only had one "Elmer" per se, and I ended up teaching her more
>about ham radio than she taught me. She was, however, instrumental
>in teaching me the code.

Okay. How did Dick Van Dyke figure into this for you?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1020. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 11:27:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409072713.07993.00002647@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40187

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> What I've seen of ARRL HQ strongly suggests that by the time they wake
>up and realize it's time for action it's aleady too late to cure the
>situation that should have created some panic.

Can you provide enough examples of ARRL HQ staff not recognizing problems then taking action too late to do any good to justify your use of "strongly suggests?"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1021. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 12:06:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409080641.09489.00000337@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40188

In article <3CB25D12.B1FE048F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Is any of what I wrote above not true?
>
>It certainly is.

What part? Here's what I wrote

(Cecil claimed): That's about a 7% decline in coded hams.

(N2EY replied): That is only true provided that ALL Technicians on that date
are
assumed to be non-codetested.

True or false?

In fact that is not the case.

As of the end of June 2000, the FCC had been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs for
2-1/2 months.

True or false?

There were also an unknown number of hams who held Tech Pluses but whose
licenses read "Technician" because the FCC took some time after February 1991
to add the Tech Plus license class.

True or false?

>The nocode tech class of license went from 0% of the
>ARS in 1990 to 30% of the ARS in 2000 and all you give them credit
>for is a 4% increase?

In context. The context was that the ARS would have declined without that
license class, that it's all that kept the ARS afloat, and other such
unsubstantiated blather. The fact are:

- 30% growth from 1980 to 1990 (all US hams code tested)
- 34% growth from 1990 to 2000 (most US hams code tested)
- 34% minus 30% equals 4%

True or false?

>Your treatment of the nocode techs reminds me of the treatment of
>black athletes in the 1960's.

Ah, a new twist on the old Hitler/Nazi ad hominem. You cannot refute the simple
facts so you attack the messenger.

Your attacks remind me of how the Church treated Galileo for telling the truth.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1022. Re: Insurance claim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 12:06:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409080642.09489.00000338@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40189

In article <Onps8.16979$QC1.1043511@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Would you believe this came off the old Fred Allen Show pre-WW2. The
>Mighty Allen Art Players strike again.
>
There is a folk song called "Why Paddy's Not At Work Today" or "The Sick Note"
which is essentially the same story about a hod carrier. I posted it some time
back.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1023. Re: New Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 12:30:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204090430.70e6d5d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40190

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CB2145A.BD3E2B3B@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CB1D372.BA695B31@IEEE.org>...
> > > From "Worldradio", new products section:
> > >
> > > "The Art & Skill of Radio-Telegraphy" by N0HFF. Available from:
> > > Dave Clarke, VE6LX, 8607-34A Ave, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6K 0B9
> > > for $14. $4 S&H for US orders. $5.50 S&H for Canadian orders.
> >
> > An excellent book on the subject, now in its 3rd edition.
> > Available for free download in PDF or Word format at:
>
> I have no reason to doubt the article which states: "Portions
> of this book have been available on the internet, but the printed
> version goes further, including input from many expert CW operators
> from all over the world." In other words, the download version is
> NOT same as the book.

There have been at least three download versions. The current (third)
download edition is 211 pages in 34 chapters and 2 appendices. Guess
I'll have to buy one to see how the print/download versions compare.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1024. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 12:55:40 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <FF6E06C5BBE3FC1B.527760D1F93311C6.5ED0FCA604327AFF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40191

On Sun, 7 Apr 2002 09:39:48 -0500, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> wrote:

>What the heck does the current "Big Project" patch SAY to
>people who "stop to look at it?":

It says "This is really going to look like crap when it's embroidered
at the 4" scale." That's what most patch art says to me, though,
since the folks designing it rarely seem to think about that little
aspect.

>It says, first and foremost: AMATEUR RADIO!

Uh, yeah. So does my license.

>Then it doesn't say much else,
>really, since the arcane and indecipherable (to the public) ARRL logo is THE
>BIGGEST THING IN IT, visually speaking.

Most organizational logos are undecipherable to people who have no
experience in the organization's primary focus. How many non-medical
people can explain the link between AMA's caduceus and healing? (For
that matter, how many doctors can explain it off the tops of their
heads?) Most people with any electronic background will recognize the
ARRL's graphic.

>LOOK at that logo, on page 130 of the current QST! What are you getting
>out of it, visually?

Primarily, I'm getting a headache because it's greyscale in the middle
of a color ad.

>If you're the public -- ZIP!

Because the public doesn't see QST ads.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1025. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 13:14:14 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <B02C7A48A8331170.60AD5443AAFA6579.19C69616EA089CDE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40192

On Fri, 5 Apr 2002 11:41:32 -0600, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> wrote:

>A garish red box at the bottom is combined with a very
>unattractive blue type to state that the (crude) display above concerns:
>"6-meter Dxing from the Galapagos." Folks, it doesn't get much worse.

That's because it mentions six meters. For some reason, the folks at
ARRL seem to think that anything even remotely related to six meters
must be made to look like it was done by a five year old.

>In closing, if you're passing a newsstand over the next few days, take a
>look at S&T and see the way a specialty magazine SHOULD look. Then go to
>page 92 of the current QST and look at the way your QST * USED * to look! I
>think you'll be amazed!

Why not approach this from the angle of what's inside? This one's
certainly better than some, but I could still do with a lot less
pedantic details of somebody's DXpedition to some third-world country
and more howto information.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1026. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 13:28:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8uqf1$50e$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40193

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020409065351.08001.00002612@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >> Your long-valued avocation seems to be IN TROUBLE
> >
> >It (ham radio) is in trouble??? Perhaps you can
> >tell us WHY you believe that?
>
> This oughta' be good. :-) Val, in responding, keep in mind that ham radio
has
> grown rather steadily over the past 50 years. Not bad for an avocation
that is
> "in trouble."
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

Don't expect any reply...Val when confronted with the
challenge to provide specifics to his usual sweeping generalizations
has simply choosen to not respond.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1027. Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 14:09:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8usqu$57o$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40194

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> Two examples of what I would consider to be highly illegal transmissions,
> yet done every single day here in the Dallas area on 146.880:
>
> One: For anyone who's listening, there's a big pileup on XXXX (where
> X=highway of choice), so don't go that way. A better way might be for you
> to take XXXX and get around this stuff because it's pretty bad.
>
> What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a
broadcast,
> addressing his/her comments to no one in particular.

The same thing happens in many places during "drive times".
Here in Morris County, NJ someone usually responds to such a
"broadcast" to make it an official two way QSO. That's bending the
rules a bit, but it's a far cry from anything that constitues true
broadcasting which we believe is the intent of the prohibition.

> Now, I've even seen it
> happen that the person making the broadcast then ends their transmission
> without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.

Again, probably just a slip up as opposed to any deliberate
behavior.

> Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place. These
people
> check with each other often about traffic flow and route. Truckdrivers
will
> also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere.

> Sorry folks, but both
> examples here are those that involve communication with pecuniary
interest:
> namely employment.

How does the first involve any pecuniary interest?

Are you saying that if hams help
each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?

As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
prove it to be illegal.

> There's pretty much only two repeaters I really ever listen to with any
> regularity. One is the most popular repeater in Dallas, the 146.880
> machine. The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine. At dinners and
other
> get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine have pretty much agreed we will
not
> discuss traffic on our repeater.

WHY? Traffic is NOT forbidden as a subject, regardless of the benefits to
any individual as to saving time on their individual commute. IF I visited
your area andwas looking for an address, would you NOT want other
area hams to respond to my query?

> We also chide people who come on and do
> so...it's not good hamming at all.

Sorry Kim, I strongly disagree that there's anything about it that
is "not good". If it was, the FCC would have spoken to it
years ago.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1028. Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 14:38:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8uuh7ijc1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40196

Moved to a new subject line and thread:

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> Two examples of what I would consider to be highly illegal transmissions,
> yet done every single day here in the Dallas area on 146.880:
>
> One: For anyone who's listening, there's a big pileup on XXXX (where
> X=highway of choice), so don't go that way. A better way might be for
> you to take XXXX and get around this stuff because it's pretty bad.
>
> What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a
> broadcast, addressing his/her comments to no one in particular.

The same thing happens in many places during "drive times".
Here in Morris County, NJ someone usually responds to such a
"broadcast" to make it an official two way QSO. That's bending the
rules a bit, but it's a far cry from anything that constitues true
broadcasting which we believe is the intent of the prohibition.

> Now, I've even seen it happen that
> the person making the broadcast then ends their transmission
> without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.

Again, probably just a slip up as opposed to any deliberate
behavior.

> Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place.
> These people check with each other often about traffic
> flow and route. Truckdrivers will
> also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere.

> Sorry folks, but both
> examples here are those that involve communication with
> pecuniary interest...namely employment.

How does the first involve any pecuniary interest?

Are you saying that if hams help
each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?

As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
prove it to be illegal.

> There's pretty much only two repeaters I really ever listen to
> with any regularity.
> One is the most popular repeater in Dallas, the 146.880
> machine. The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine. At dinners
> and other get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine have pretty
> much agreed we will not discuss traffic on our repeater.

WHY? Traffic is NOT forbidden as a subject, regardless of the benefits to
any individual as to saving time on their individual commute. IF I visited
your area andwas looking for an address, would you NOT want other
area hams to respond to my query?

> We also chide people who come on and do
> so...it's not good hamming at all.

Sorry Kim, I strongly disagree that there's anything about it that
is "not good". If it was, the FCC would have spoken to it
years ago.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1029. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 15:27:36 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <ILDs8.18505$QC1.1157160@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40198

>> Kim, W5TIT, posted (about traffic info on the repeaters):
>> What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up
>> and made a broadcast, addressing his/her comments to
>> no one in particular....

> Larry Roll, K3LT, responded (in part):
> ... It just so happens that discussing local traffic
> conditions is a perfectly legal and very reasonable
> and practical use of an amateur repeater....

Not only that, Larry, but I believe it comes under the
umbrella of being amateur-radio-related.

Every vehicle with a licensed amateur radio station
installed in it could, in the event of a man-made or
natural disaster, become a mobile, emergency-communications
facility. It is important that these potential
emergency assets remain free of traffic entanglements
so as to be instantly available in case of need.
Traffic advisories moved over the local V/UHF repeater
systems serve this purpose well, in addition to being
practice sessions for "the real thing".

I wrote the above with a big sh*t-eating grin on my
face. But upon re-reading it, and re-thinking the premise,
I'm not so sure I can be facetious about it. In a real
emergency, traffic and road conditions *would* be a prime
concern of mobile stations involved. And establishing
protocols for getting that information from hard sources
and out to the field units, as well as getting "ground
truth" information back, might be a very good preparation
for such eventualities.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1030. Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 15:28:13 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <hMDs8.2262$CA6.186370@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40199

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> At dinners and other get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine
> have pretty much agreed we will not discuss traffic on our repeater.

That's certainly your prerogative.

> We also chide people who come on and do
> so...

That behavior is anal. Go to http://westid.com/amateur.htm. There, for $59.95 plus a boxtop from any 2M HT, you can get a lovely gold anodized official Radio Kop ID Badge.

>...it's not good hamming at all.

On one of our W0EF club repeaters, we have a roundtable gathering called the "Afterwork Net" which typically consists of up to 20-30 homeward bound commuters over the course of any given evening drive-time. Since many of us use the same highways and freeways, we freely share information about traffic conditions, including suggestions for alternate routes. Please explain, citing pertinent FCC rules, why that is "not good hamming".

Good luck on this one now!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1031. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 15:30:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB30905.679E2ADB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40200

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> You say you don't want to upgrade because you don't think you can
> "use" your upgraded privileges. Don't look now, Kim, but that is the
> mindset of a loser.

Is that why you have never upgraded to PhD?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1032. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 15:34:35 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <fSDs8.18508$QC1.1158571@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40302

(reposted to Bill Sohl's new thread)

>> Kim, W5TIT, posted (about traffic info on the repeaters):
>> What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up
>> and made a broadcast, addressing his/her comments to
>> no one in particular....

> Larry Roll, K3LT, responded (in part):
> ... It just so happens that discussing local traffic
> conditions is a perfectly legal and very reasonable
> and practical use of an amateur repeater....

Not only that, Larry, but I believe it comes under the
umbrella of being amateur-radio-related.

Every vehicle with a licensed amateur radio station
installed in it could, in the event of a man-made or
natural disaster, become a mobile, emergency-communications
facility. It is important that these potential
emergency assets remain free of traffic entanglements
so as to be instantly available in case of need.
Traffic advisories moved over the local V/UHF repeater
systems serve this purpose well, in addition to being
practice sessions for "the real thing".

I wrote the above with a big sh*t-eating grin on my
face. But upon re-reading it, and re-thinking the premise,
I'm not so sure I can be facetious about it. In a real
emergency, traffic and road conditions *would* be a prime
concern of mobile stations involved. And establishing
protocols for getting that information from hard sources
and out to the field units, as well as getting "ground
truth" information back, might be a very good preparation
for such eventualities.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1033. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 15:46:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB30CE4.C71BE416@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40303

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >The nocode tech class of license went from 0% of the
> >ARS in 1990 to 30% of the ARS in 2000 and all you give them credit
> >for is a 4% increase?
>
> In context. The context was that the ARS would have declined without that
> license class, that it's all that kept the ARS afloat, and other such
> unsubstantiated blather. The fact are:
>
> - 30% growth from 1980 to 1990 (all US hams code tested)
> - 34% growth from 1990 to 2000 (most US hams code tested)
> - 34% minus 30% equals 4%
>
> True or false?

True but your conclusion is false. The truth is that the population
of the ARS went from 0% nocode techs in 1990 to 30% nocode techs in
2000. The great majority of the growth in the ARS for 1900-2000 was
directly attributable to the nocode techs. Denying that fact
won't make it false.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1034. Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part One

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 15:53:44 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub62ibk55qvk8b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40301

Promotional Campaigns for Amateur Radio -- Part One.
Val Germann,
KC0MUB

Five years ago this spring I represented our local amateur astronomy club at several "hobby fairs" for kids here in Boone County, Missouri. The target group was middle school and junior high kids and my main function was to deliver a slide show and talk on amateur astronomy, and our club. I also had a couple of tables and a homemade telescope, along with sample star charts and a couple of other "handouts" aimed at kids (and, indirectly, at their parents!). We had some stiff competition since the state conservation department, which was promoting fishing (!), and had a tank with some bass in it as well as an owl, and "WHOO" knows what else. But, all of that helped draw a crowd.

For one of these fairs our group was set up directly adjacent to the local amateur radio club and what they did was set up a temporary station at this location and begin to operate from it. They had some handouts available but they were not aimed at kids, or even the parents of the target kids, really. And they did not truly and actively engage the passers-by at this event but rather waited for one of them to come up and ask something. And, quite frankly, they looked too busy (with operating) to be bothered most of the time they were on the scene. I could see right there, without any doubt, that amateur radio operators, a lot of them, were public-relations-challenged.

I had that homemade telescope, a kid-sized one, right out front at our booth and used it as talking point as people passed by. I had a designed-for-that-event handout ready to give away, with our club's logo and information about it attached. One of the handouts was a star chart that I explained was good into the indefinite future and should be kept. On that handout was a list of our upcoming "star parties" where kids could get a look at the night sky, from a location known to be safe for the general public. Also on the handout were the names and phone numbers of three of our members.

I've been doing this kind of thing for about 20 years here in Columbia and over the years I think I have done a lot of good, both for our individual club and for amateur astronomy. However, one of the things that I am also responsible for is changing our name from "Something-Something Amateur Astronomers," which had been in place for 49 years, to "Something-Something Astronomical Association." In marketing, LITTLE things (and no one but me had even thought about the connotations of our name) mean a LOT. Let's keep that in mind as we move along.

The consensus today seems to be that amateur radio needs a lift, needs some publicity, needs some kind of promotional campaign, in spite of the fact that without any such campaign there are now about 650,000 amateur operators in the United States. And those operators have all passed at least one written exam, which is impressive, I think. So, in one respect I have to question all the angst about the demise of amateur radio, in general. That is, I cannot see any threat, even long range, to the existence of SOME kind of ARS, complete with FCC licensing and at least SOME allocation of radio frequencies. However, I can certainly understand concerns about what KIND of ARS will exist in the future, and how MANY frequencies will be allocated to it. THAT is certainly understandable.

So, in that Op-Ed piece in the March QST, of article length, we read that "the future of amateur radio is at stake" in connection with the "Big Project" and its associated elements. Well, anything and everything affects "the future" of everything, in some respect or another. This expression is called, in advertising, a "preemption," meaning that anyone can say it without proof, as long as you say it about your product FIRST!

So, the concern HAS to be, more usefully, about the NATURE of the FUTURE of amateur radio, about what KIND of amateur radio will exist down the road, and how much "airspace" it will have. That is, it's about the QUALITY of amateur radio's future, that quality depending in part on the QUANTITY of amateur operators and their public visibility, since the "airwaves" are public property and only used in behalf of the public by the ARS. "Democracy at work."

Therefore, what we have here is a POLITICAL problem, in part or in all, and as we know politics is about mobilization, either of numbers of people (voters) or amounts of money (influence). So, how should amateur radio proceed, since we don't really have either?

Well, right off I see a huge problem which is not directly related to either money or numbers: There is NO such THING as "amateur radio" as an entity. There are only amateur radio operators, licensed by the government and buying their equipment from (mainly) overseas producers. That's it, to a great degree, and that ain't good.

Some of these operators are organized into local clubs but many are not. Some of these operators belong to a national organization, the ARRL, but most do not. However, in spite of a "minority position" within amateur radio, the ARRL seems to have this quasi-governmental function in that FCC minions turn to it, in large part, to act as a mediator, organizer and enforcer with amateur operators in general. It's all a bit strange, in some ways, as has been pointed out from time to time.

This mystical relationship could be the subject of a LONG research paper, which would cost a lot of time and money to write. However, it would hardly repay the effort, most likely, since no one's career would be advanced thereby, not even the author's. So, lacking such material I will have to proceed without it.

To continue, the overwhelming problem with "amateur radio" is that it is only partially organized to defend its "airspace," which is a political construct supported by the whims of a government agency acting for "the public." Unfortunately, this public will never know what amateur radio is about, no matter HOW much work amateurs do to promote themselves. Not only that, other entities, most of them large corporations, are also in the arena, with BIG MONEY (influence with government), casting covetous eyes on sections of said "airspace." And they, too, have a claim on behalf of the public.

So, in military terms, the "threat analysis" could be seen as dire, in some respects. And it likely is.

In view of all of the above, our promotional campaign will in large part be concerned about the brochure, about appearances, about how it looks, and NOT about how it actually WORKS across the nation. We don't have time for that and we don't have the control. The clubs will do what they want, most of the time, and that may or may not be what the national organization desires. And the individual amateurs will do what they want, BIG TIME, and on average that will have little to do with what the national organization and its staff desires. And with most of these unconnected people what the FCC's Bob Cross wants is total terra incognito, and that's being charitable!

As for the politicians, they come and go, are elected and de-elected, with dizzying speed. Not only that, it costs time and money to keep up THEIR interest in YOUR interests. That's a treadmill that never stops.

So, where are we? Well, if amateur radio depended on the general run of taxpayers to vote its meager allocation of government attention, it might get it and it might not, probably NOT these days. It would likely be a closely run train! And there are NOWHERE near enough hams in each Congressional district to change that outcome based on sheer numbers. Yes, it is indeed: Democracy at Work!

Therefore, it's about influence, not voters. Yes, it's about influence with a very few people, the people who holding a few elected or appointed positions in Washington and environs. And now we can understand, I think, the "Big Project."

End, Part One.

1035. Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part Two

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 17:30:15 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ub687cic0necc4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40304

Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part Two
"Amateur" Radio and Little Projects
Val Germann
KC0MUB

In Part One I made a case for the inherent vulnerability of "amateur radio" to the not-so-anonymous "forces of history" which operate in the political realms where the service actually exists. That is, the ARS is a creature of government, primarily appointed government, and is subject to buffeting from a dozen different directions. And it is not truly organized and can even be said not to exist. And so, in partial response to an intensification of several old political problems, the ARRL has cranked up the "Big Project," its very name signifying its importance, at least to some.

But it's really about the ARRL, and an increase in its influence in Washington, and not about "education," or "technology" or "the public" or even "amateur radio." Oh, sure, it's partially about these things and no doubt will do some good. But, the logo says it all: The ARRL is at the center of things, and the meta-purpose is to preen the beautiful plumage of the flagship organization for whatever it is that amateur radio has become. What effect, nationally, will the "Big Project" have? Well, one thing for SURE it better do is raise the good-vibe quotient for the ARRL inside the Beltway. If it doesn't do that, well, it's a loser, no matter what happens out in the Flyover Zone.

Quite frankly, I've always been skeptical of Big Projects cooked up at great distances, funded by foundations and corporations, and then visited upon the masses. And this is especially true if those Big Projects demand, one way or another, a commitment of significant time and money on the part of that mass. That is, what is called The Rockefeller Method (copied by nearly all foundations since 1910) uses money to in effect co-opt the time and effort of others for the goals and needs of the foundation, at dime-to-the-dollar rates. It is not about anything else, really, except as a by-product.

That is, look at the exact opposite of this, the Carnegie Library Program. This thing just builds libraries and gives them to cities, mostly small ones, period. Now, that is more like what people are really thinking about when they hear the word "philanthropy." But what is actually going on, most of the time, these days, is something very like social control. Or, at a minimum, a thinly disguised special interest is using the public weal (a tax write-off) to advance it's own special interests. Ho-Hum!

So, in the Big Project, supplying material to schools is fine, I guess, but who is going to teach the material and who is going to pay that person? Well, the material will be taught for free, as an additional task, won't it? Sure it will. And some very small "grants" will be made, to people who have

already spent a lot of their own (or their school's) money on amateur radio. What is THAT, I wonder? It's NOT what St. Paul would call "charity," I don't think. Finally, I suppose there will be amateur stations set up in a few schools, with some of the equipment donated (for a tax write-off), mostly in the larger cities. And no doubt those stations will do some good. But they're likely to be few, very few, compared to the brochures, and statements to officaldom, which WILL be many.

However, in all of this big-ness and in all of this project-ness, the bottom of the food chain, the most important part, is just plain missing. And why is it missing? Well, it's missing because it advances no one's direct or even indirect interests, that's why. No, real EDUCATION is too diffuse for that, which is why it is funded, almost exclusively, by the poor old taxpayer.

What I do here in Columbia, is "little project" stuff. I attempt to educate people, mainly kids, about science and astronomy, FIRST, and then let them ask me, if they want, about our local organization. I try to put no additional burdens on teachers or librarians because, well, they have a lot on their plates already. In fact, I try to GIVE to them, up front and with no strings attached, something of value to them. I do this because I believe that, sooner or later, some of that gift will return. And it will return, and be compounded, not to me or by me but BECAUSE of me. And others will benefit in ways that I will never know. At least that is my HOPE. Like St. Paul, I usually don't let one hand know what the other is doing when it comes to this work. It's about GIVING, not about getting.

Is THIS related somehow to the "benefit to the public?" I think so. That is, the word "amateur" means you are doing something out of "love" for the thing itself, and not for what you might get out of it economically or in political influence. THIS is something I think "amateur radio" (if it exists) might think about with some "profit," though perhaps not of a monetary kind.

What does it matter if one gains the world but loses one's soul? And I'm NOT talking about heaven and hell.

Val
KC0MUB

1036. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 17:58:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204090958.62489a7d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40305

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a8uuh7ijc1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>...
> Moved to a new subject line and thread:
> ----------
> "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > Two examples of what I would consider to be highly illegal transmissions,
> > yet done every single day here in the Dallas area on 146.880:
> >
> > One: For anyone who's listening, there's a big pileup on XXXX (where
> > X=highway of choice), so don't go that way. A better way might be for
> > you to take XXXX and get around this stuff because it's pretty bad.
> >
> > What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a
> > broadcast, addressing his/her comments to no one in particular.

One-way transmissions are not necessarily against the rules.

Amateur repeaters exist in large part to increase the range and
coverage of
mobile amateur stations. A traffic advisory from a mobile amateur
station is
therefore quite relevant to the amateur radio purpose of the repeater.

A repeater or mobiles used to gather traffic info for broadcast by
actual
broadcast stations is a different situation.

> The same thing happens in many places during "drive times".
> Here in Morris County, NJ someone usually responds to such a
> "broadcast" to make it an official two way QSO. That's bending the
> rules a bit, but it's a far cry from anything that constitues true
> broadcasting which we believe is the intent of the prohibition.

Here in the Philly area, the repeaters are busy during drive time and
there is
no opportunity to make a "one way" transmission anyway. Hams simply
mention the
traffic conditions as part of the conversation. Often the observations
of one
amateur will save others from being stuck in traffic.
>
> > Now, I've even seen it happen that
> > the person making the broadcast then ends their transmission
> > without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.
>

> Again, probably just a slip up as opposed to any deliberate
> behavior.

Lack of proper identification IS definitely against the rules.
>
> > Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place.
> > These people check with each other often about traffic
> > flow and route. Truckdrivers will
> > also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere.
>
> > Sorry folks, but both
> > examples here are those that involve communication with
> > pecuniary interest...namely employment.
>
> How does the first involve any pecuniary interest?
>
> Are you saying that if hams help
> each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
> jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?

I agree with Bill 100%. Unless you are "on the clock" while commuting,
there is no pecuniary interest.
>
> As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
> activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
> prove it to be illegal.

This one's a bit sticky, since the business activity of a truck driver
IS
getting from origin to destination, and he/she IS "on the clock" while
driving.
One determining factor is whether it's an emergency-type situation or
an everyday occurrence.

> > There's pretty much only two repeaters I really ever listen to
> > with any regularity.
> > One is the most popular repeater in Dallas, the 146.880
> > machine. The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine.

So other machines may be quite different.

> > At dinners
> > and other get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine have pretty
> > much agreed we will not discuss traffic on our repeater.

Who, exactly, made this decision, Kim? The owners of the machine? Is
it a formal policy? Was it put to a vote of the membership at a formal
meeting?
>
> WHY? Traffic is NOT forbidden as a subject, regardless of the benefits to
> any individual as to saving time on their individual commute. IF I visited
> your area andwas looking for an address, would you NOT want other

> area hams to respond to my query?

Sounds like it, Bill.
>
> > We also chide people who come on and do
> > so...it's not good hamming at all.

I think Hans described your attitude on this issue perfectly, Kim.
>
> Sorry Kim, I strongly disagree that there's anything about it that
> is "not good". If it was, the FCC would have spoken to it
> years ago.

Yup. I don't think Riley would say that discussing traffic was moving
amateur radio one step closer to extinction.

So all we have is one definite illegality (not identifying) and one
possible
sticky situation (truckers).

--

It seems to me that using amateur radio to help other hams find their
way, save
time and fuel, improve highway safety and avoid traffic congestion is
a good thing and not in violation of Part 97 in any way. Kim's overly
restrictive interpretation of the rules opens up other questions:

- If my car breaks down outside of cellphone coverage, is it OK to use
the autopatch to call AAA? After all, some tow-truck outfit is going
to get paid
to help me. (FCC has specifically said this is OK, btw).

- If I'm in an unfamiliar town, is it OK to ask the locals on the
repeater for
directions, good places to eat, visit or stay, etc.? Those businesses
stand to make money from my patronage.

- How about talk-in to a hamfest? The group running the 'fest stands
to make
money from attendees....

What DO you folks talk about on the repeater, Kim?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1037. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 18:07:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409140704.26511.00000026@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 40306

In article <h5ks8.11607$Rw2.969537@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0204080821.466f6568@posting.google.com...
>> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:<WN8s8.9955$QC1.931552@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
>> > "Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
>> > news:a8r2pb$2vc4$1@heap.juniper.net...
>>
>> There is also the "resurrection" factor. There may be a sizable block
>> of hams
>> out there who have all but lost interest, and even let their licenses
>> lapse.
>> But upon hearing about the restructuring, they renew and then upgrade
>> because
>> it's so much easier now.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>That little bit of Ham Metaphysics is basically why I gave up reading tea
>leaves. There was a Tech from 1976 who had dutifully renewed since show
>up on another group wanting to know how to be a General. How does one
>determine death?? So what falls under Resurrection and what under
>ReKindling? Intent I guess.

HAW, those are good ones!!!!

I know similar examples locally.
>
>There is a ham very familiar to people of our vintage, Leo Myerson Wï¿½GFQ,
>originally W9GFQ that has dutifully renewed a Class A under its various
>permutations for well over 60 years. He ran World Radio Labs home of the
>infamous Globe Scout, Globe King etc.

Yup. Still kicking, too. One of the locals, born in 1910, has a "vintage"
Advanced/Class A. To him and many others the 15 years 10 months (Feb 1953 - Nov
1968) when Generals got it all was but the blink of an eye.
>
>For that matter my dad Kï¿½CHK hasn't been on the air since he had all
>amateur privleges but renews like a clock. I get him near CW now and
>again but usually get a blast of 'Goddam Computer CW'. FWIW he also
>favors dropping the code test for exactly the reasons we have mentioned,
>it destroys the ability to do it right.

Exactly. A test that helps instill bad habits is worse than no test at all.
>
>You can count licenses till Argentina becomes a creditor nation and all
>you really have is a count of licenses.

Yup. What really matters is what's done with them.
>
>The right way to do it is to track August expirations thru their path to
>oblivion, Sept, etc. You will never get them to balance exactly and will
>tear your hair trying. This is, BTW, a common problem in insurance
>reserving. On Private Passenger Auto you will maintain development
>triangles based on accident month, report month, policy issue month, and
>the sales guys will storm in and show you the accounting calendar month
>proving all their new biz is so good you should reduce rates. You, of
>course, knowing that this will develop for years had been writing a report
>recommending the drawing and quartering of your sales and underwriting
>staff for putting that crap on the books. And you thought the Ins biz was
>uneventful.

awgeez!

1038. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 18:15:11 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <5624b2151f4d8274ae52b6ca29c46a45.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40307

Certainly we could start arguing about EXACTLY what is legal and illegal, but common sense should prevail. I doubt anyone would get in trouble over assisting motorists in avoiding problem areas on the road. Years ago, whilst on Guam, we had a typhoon which knocked the coast guard tower down on Rota. We sent a chief petty officer over to re-establish communications. Apparently the coast guard station was damaged and the chief happened to be a ham - and used the ham shack. Sure, military comms on 75 meters are prohibited, but there it was - 'sparkplug one this is sparkplug'. The guys at the commsta had the rf gain up too high for the local oscillator, so the ssb copy was poor. 'sparkplug one this is sparkplug, you are loud, but garbled'. Hearing this, we gave a call 'sparkplug1, sparkplug, this is KG6AAY standing by'. Inside of 15 minutes, KG6AAY was handling all relief traffic and passing it directly to Commander, Naval Forces, Marianas. Captain Delany made an appearance to secure the amateurs from all other duties and to man the ham shack 24/7 until otherwise ordered. Illegal? Military comms to an amateur station? On 75 meters? Getting the hams relieved from duty (work)? Captain Delany was happy; the FCC liaison officer was only a lieutenant. Besides, the Captain was in charge and I doubt anyone on Rota would have argued the decision.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim - ps ... this story is getting old. I'll try to avoid any reposts.

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message news:fSDs8.18508$QC1.1158571@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

>
> Every vehicle with a licensed amateur radio station
> installed in it could, in the event of a man-made or
> natural disaster, become a mobile, emergency-communications
> facility. It is important that these potential
> emergency assets remain free of traffic entanglements
> so as to be instantly available in case of need.
> Traffic advisories moved over the local V/UHF repeater
> systems serve this purpose well, in addition to being
> practice sessions for "the real thing".
>
> ----------------
>
> I wrote the above with a big sh*t-eating grin on my
> face. But upon re-reading it, and re-thinking the premise,
> I'm not so sure I can be facetious about it. In a real
> emergency, traffic and road conditions *would* be a prime
> concern of mobile stations involved. And establishing

> protocols for getting that information from hard sources
> and out to the field units, as well as getting "ground
> truth" information back, might be a very good preparation
> for such eventualities.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1039. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 18:24:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cb331c4_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 40308

> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> >Wow, think of it...you can put that 2x1 on a resume and get
> >your pick of high-paying industry jobs!

Er, Len ... I already HAVE a high-paying industry job ... have had for years and it just keeps getting better.

> I hear that managers are really looking for 1x2 and 2x1
> ham callsign holders! :-)

Er, Len ... I am a manager ... a senior level one at that. Most of the people I've interviewed and recommended for hire in the past 5-10 years have had at least a MSEE, most a PhD in EE, and a number of years of experience (I have to be VERY impressed to be willing to undertake to train a "fresh-out," though I have done so on occasion ... I tend to let someone else break them in first :-)

Amateur call, of any class, would not be a significant factor in hiring considerations, though it would generate some conversation that would help me to evaluate someone's open-mindedness and technical abilities in areas that might be a bit outside of their mainstream career experience.

Carl - wk3c

1040. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 18:56:25 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <tPGs8.2618$CA6.220237@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40309

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote
.
> Years ago, whilst on Guam, we had a typhoon which knocked the coast
> guard tower down on Rota. We sent a chief petty officer over to
> re-establish communications. Apparently the coast guard station was
> damaged and the chief happened to be a ham - and used the ham shack.

You got most of it right. The location was Saipan, not Rota, and the
Chief didn't use the ham shack, he (we) set up comms using a Swan
500C and a Drake TR4 at Kobler Field. One of our antennas was
the chain link fence surrounding the passenger terminal at Kobler.

You can get more details in the September 1968 issue of QST in
the public service column. I still have the letters of commendation
from Capt Delaney, Admiral McCain (yes, the Senators dad), and
the Commissioner of TTPI.

73, de Hans, K0HB ex-KG6AQI

1041. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:03:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB33B1E.2020D11D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40310

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Er, Len ... I am a manager ... a senior level one at that.
> Most of the people I've interviewed and recommended
> for hire in the past 5-10 years have had at least a MSEE,
> most a PhD in EE, and a number of years of experience

What was interesting at Intel was that the nocode Techs
tended to be upper level managers. The designers tended
to be generals and advanced. The IT people tended to be
the ones with Extra licenses. For the Extra license, the
correlation to IT engineers/technicians was uncanny. Of
course, that was before restructuring. I retired from
Intel in 1998. But the correlation at that time was
clear - the lower the ham license class, the higher
the grade level at Intel. In fact, the highest grade
levels didn't have a ham license at all. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1042. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152441.04302.00000494@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40312

In article <20020409064313.08001.00002607@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>Wow, think of it...you can put that 2x1 on a resume and get
>>your pick of high-paying industry jobs! I hear that managers
>>are really looking for 1x2 and 2x1 ham callsign holders! :-)
>
>So THAT is why I can't get a real job -- I have that 1X3! :-)

True. :-)

Try to keep that job at the ARRL without the callsign.

1043. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152443.04302.00000496@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40320

In article <20020409002912.13747.00002932@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>You aren't accomplishing anything other than being obnoxious.
>
> AND...bringing to light your numerous and glaring inadequacies in what YOU >perceive as your "place" in the radio world as it's Mentor and Soverign Leader.

:-) Tsk, tsk, tsk. Obsession by the clench-fisted monkey coming out.

> Where's the answer to your assertion that there are radio services >created for "strictly recreational" applications, Your Wrongfulness?

Amateur radio is defined as a non-pecuniary radio activity engaged in for personal reasons by the FCC. In the ITU-R it is further defined as a "trivial" communications activity where it isn't done over commercial carriers.

To any but those into strong sado-masochism, the above is another way of defining a recreational hobby. HOBBY. Recreation.

Wrapping oneself in patriotic bunting and shouting "service!" as the "real reason" for engaging in such an activity is delusional. While delusions may be rewarding emotionally to an individual, they are still delusions and unuseable as definitions applying to all.

In Part 95, Title 47 CFR, there are no strict connotations on NOT being recreational in GMRS, FRS, CB, or R/C radio services but to deny their primary aspect as being recreational is also delusional. They were all created for individual citizens for their personal use and not as any "service" aspect. Public safety radio services are covered under Part 90, Title 47 CFR.

1044. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152443.04302.00000495@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40322

In article <20020409004052.13747.00002935@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Convenient: One can pull out of the Ralph's and Sav-On combined
>>parking lot onto Victory Boulevard going northeast...(SNIP)
>
> Been there...Done that...got the shirt...

Been to Burbank, California, and at that particular major street intersection? I don't think so. Feel free to describe it and we will all test your memory, lack of memory, or untruthfulness.

>>Legal use: Quite a bit of HRO resold products are quite legal to
>>use without a license...antennas of all kinds from simple wire kits
>>to mobile antennas to....(SNIP)
>
> I know what's there, Lennie. The question is, what are YOU doing there?
>That's kinda like sending a blind man to a video store...

Both Wherehouse and Blockbuster (near that intersection) carry audio-only tapes for the sight-impaired. Why do you make fun of blind people?

I described why I was there. It was a convenient place to examine the contents of periodicals without having to drive another three miles to Barnes & Noble (next to Media City Mall) to do the same thing. It was also convenient to examine the LCDs of various manufacturers in the presence of incident daylight for another purpose; Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom, and Alinco all have different forms of backlighting on their LCDs. That was handier than driving an extra mile to Electronic City which has very few windows or to the closer Fry's Electronics which has no windows.

>>A number of years ago, a whole group of us..(SNIP)
>
> Group of us who..??? More snotty "engineers" sneering at the unwashed
>masses?

I don't recall any of the group having a cold or nasal problems.

At least one-third of the group were already licensed in the amateur radio service. It was a group with a mutual friend who would receive a surprise birthday party and a brand-new ham station.

In the usual sado-masochism exhibited by the monkey boy, birthday parties and ham radio are not enjoyable activities.

> And this comparison was for what..??? You doing research for "Consumer
>Reports" now?

No. For another purpose.

>>You MUST do a break-in to every exchange with another. It's a form
>>of JAMMING and you feel righteous about employing such tactics.
>
> A "form of JAMMING"...???

Absolutely. Obsessive-compulsive behavior is easy to spot.

> Pretty sorry you started this now, aren't you?

I'm not the one suffering delusions nor engaged in obsessive-
compulsive activities.

Unclench the fist or break the jar. Your choice.

1045. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152444.04302.00000497@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40311

In article <a8usus11rl2@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>And also RAIN, SNOW, WIFE are four letter words..... and all usually
>annoying.

I disagree. "WIFE" is not annoying to me, but a delight.

CODE is an annoying four-letter word. :-)

1046. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152445.04302.00000499@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40313

In article <Rhos8.1138$3P4.83849@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
>> It would take a mutant to swear using CW and include
>> the swearing emotions.
>
>Sunuvugun! Somebody once distinctly sent "dididahdit dididah dahdidahdit
>dahdidah dahdidahdah dahdahdah dididah" to me on CW. Do you think maybe
>she was trying to be romantic?

...maybe they were attracted by your "banana-boat swing?"

:-)

1047. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152445.04302.00000498@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40318

In article <20020408234328.07832.00001081@mb-mv.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Kim:
>
>I "use" my college degree each and every day of my life. The things I
>learned, and the experience I had while learning them, have changed
>me in ways that have improved my life considerably.

You have A job.

>Moreover, while
>I am not presently employed in an occupation where I can "use" all of
>the technical knowledge I gained from my major course of study, I have
>learned to appreciate a job that I love to do and do well. The fact that
>it pays well and has great benefits is the icing on the cake. All of the
>"entry level" HR positions I applied for paid 5 - 10 kilobucks a year
>less than what I'm making now.

Ahem...NOT being accepted in those "HR" (human resources, a
more dignified term than the familiar personnel department) jobs
versus being accepted as a bus driver is a different fish kettle.

>If I do take a different job in my
>present company or elsewhere in the transportation industry, it will
>most likely be as a Street Supervisor, Training and Development, or
>Safety.

No doubt "due" to all those high grades you boasted about and
the somma come loud significance. :-)

>So go ahead and keep ragging on how I'm not "using" my
>degree. It just shows that, as usual, you don't know what you're
>talking about.

Larry, you are NOT USING YOUR DEGREE...and WE all know
exactly what you are talking about...yourself.

1048. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152446.04302.00000500@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40314

In article <3CB30CE4.C71BE416@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>True but your conclusion is false. The truth is that the population
>of the ARS went from 0% nocode techs in 1990 to 30% nocode techs in
>2000. The great majority of the growth in the ARS for 1900-2000 was
>directly attributable to the nocode techs. Denying that fact
>won't make it false.

Yes, it does make it false. This is not a reality-based forum.

Rationalization is where it's at. If over 200K new licensees came
in...and stayed at the no-code-Tech level...that isn't "proof" in the
logical sense. It is only "proof" that those Techs are "not 'real'
hams.'" :-)

1049. Re: Insurance claim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152447.04302.00000502@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40316

In article <20020409080642.09489.00000338@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <Onps8.16979$QC1.1043511@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
>"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
>>Would you believe this came off the old Fred Allen Show pre-WW2. The
>>Mighty Allen Art Players strike again.
>>
>There is a folk song called "Why Paddy's Not At Work Today" or "The Sick Note"
>which is essentially the same story about a hod carrier. I posted it some time
>back.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Of course you did, old timer.

Fred Allen died in 1956. To have been familiar with his radio show
meant having lived then and having gone through language school
with at least a novice class rating on speech cognition.

The Internet has been in existance for only 11 years.

"Hod carrying" hasn't been done for decades. Few know what a
"hod" is.

What next? A claim you were O. Henry's proofreader?

1050. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152447.04302.00000501@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40317

In article <3CB21642.F8DB707F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> > That's about a 7% decline in coded hams.
>>
>> That is only true provided that ALL Technicians on that date are
>> assumed to be non-codetested. In fact that is not the case. As of the
>> end of June 2000, the FCC had been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs for
>> 2-1/2 months.
>> There were also an unknown number of hams who held Tech Pluses but
>> whose licenses read "Technician" because the FCC took some time after
>> February 1991
>> to add the Tech Plus license class.
>
>Figures don't lie but liars figure. Give us an ever-loving break, Jim.
>You cannot possibly be that irrational. Must be your agenda speaking.

I disagree. By all that was posted publicly in here, he CAN be
that irrational. The PCTA agenda is reality with him.

The slightest little hint of morsemanship in any form is sufficient
for the "triumph" of morse code on "saving" his ARS. Sigh...

1051. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152448.04302.00000503@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40319

In article <20020409070020.08001.00002614@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
>>See, I just saved ARRL a whole bunch of money.
>
>Actually, there are some who would like to be ARRL members without receiving
>QST. Unfortunately, if most members did not receive QST, the cost of
>membership
>would have to increase to pay for the loss of advertising revenues.
>
>A good example of an organization that functions without ad revenues is the
>IEEE. My dues last year were over $100.00.

Ahem...take a look at the rate card for SPECTRUM, the IEEE membership magazine, and tell me that it "doesn't have advertising revenue." Sorry, but it pays for itself.

You are thinking of the many and varied Transactions plus the Proceedings...but even there they have some advertising in some editions.

Ed, if QST were to exist without any advertising, the ARRL membership fee would have to be OVER $200/year.

1052. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152449.04302.00000504@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40315

In article <20020409065819.08001.00002613@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Besides, people want color and are willing to pay for it. How many monochrome >computer monitors are sold nowadays?

Two weeks ago the local Ralph's supermarket chain sold out the last of its little bargain 5" black-and-white TV priced at $20 each. Not buying any, I got curious and called their PR department (large chain, they can afford one) and they said about 5000 were sold in a week's time.

Color computer displays are motivated by other factors, namely Windows, the Internet and its enormous advertising potential.

On-off keying is comparable to black and white, the "color" rather gone and only in the virtual reality of the telegrapher's head. :-)

1053. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:24:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409152450.04302.00000505@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40321

In article <a8usut21rl2@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Great..... Think I will start All-Code Intl. Anyone using a transciever
>would have to pass the code test amateurs are forced to. Obviously
>television and broadcast am/fm radio would be exempt because that is a
>one-way transmission. If morse code is that important, it obviously would
>be important for others to learn it. Hmmm.... a cop or firefighter gets
>injured somehow and cannot speak, well, they could send for help in morse
>code! As well as other radio services too......
>
>Ryan

Heh. A youngish extra named Eric June tried that with "Know Code
International," even wrote a couple Comments on 98-143, had a
website...and engaged in a lengthy "debate" with several in here
prior to the R&O for restructuring. I can copy his last message in
here if you wish...the KCI website was taken down long ago.

Hans Brakob and I had a long-ago lengthy exchange where he
implied that morse code ability would "help" those with strokes or
similar disabilities regarding personal communication. That over
some local Minnesota research project "looking into" the subject.
My mother was then in a nursing home, a victim of too many TIAs.
I challenged him on being able to teach a stroke victim a new
(and non-natural) method of personal communications but no
viable answers were forthcoming, only vague generalities.

I rather liked "No SSB International" for being outright sarcastic
and mean-spirited, sort of fitting the author, Jim Kehler. It had a
jazzy website, a parody of the NCI format. Totally mean, it
pulled no punches, and had a negative effect on influencing
anyone but an already tried-and-true PCTA. I can't find NSI
anyplace on the Web. It must have failed. :-)

1054. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:33:21 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <ub6gg2eg8ntl70@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40323

Sort of reminds me of the story that the favorite sport of the technicians was basketball, the engineers liked tennis, the managers played handball, and the executives played golf.

Proving, of course, that the higher you rise in an organization, the smaller your balls.

{;-)

Jim

> Intel in 1998. But the correlation at that time was
> clear - the lower the ham license class, the higher
> the grade level at Intel. In fact, the highest grade
> levels didn't have a ham license at all. :-)

1055. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:46:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409154614.27329.00000441@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 40324

In article <3cb331c4_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>
>> >Wow, think of it...you can put that 2x1 on a resume and get
>> >your pick of high-paying industry jobs!
>
>Er, Len ... I already HAVE a high-paying industry job ... have
>had for years and it just keeps getting better.
>
>> I hear that managers are really looking for 1x2 and 2x1
>> ham callsign holders! :-)
>
>Er, Len ... I am a manager ... a senior level one at that.
>Most of the people I've interviewed and recommended
>for hire in the past 5-10 years have had at least a MSEE,
>most a PhD in EE, and a number of years of experience
>(I have to be VERY impressed to be willing to undertake
>to train a "fresh-out," though I have done so on occasion
> ... I tend to let someone else break them in first :-)

Yes, yes. I was making a little comment about OTHERS
in here, launching off your convenient message pad. :-)

>Amateur call, of any class, would not be a significant
>factor in hiring considerations, though it would generate
>some conversation that would help me to evaluate someone's
>open-mindedness and technical abilities in areas that might
>be a bit outside of their mainstream career experience.

Well, the legends exist among those who've never been IN
the industry...including those on the periphery (such as
purchasing agents and personnel-trained folks). I've done
my share of getting the interview buck passed to me to do
the potential-new-hire second interviews... :-)

1056. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 19:55:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB34737.3112702B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40325

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CB30CE4.C71BE416@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >True but your conclusion is false. The truth is that the population
> >of the ARS went from 0% nocode techs in 1990 to 30% nocode techs in
> >2000. The great majority of the growth in the ARS for 1900-2000 was
> >directly attributable to the nocode techs. Denying that fact
> >won't make it false.
>
> Yes, it does make it false. This is not a reality-based forum.

So things are reversed from reality? False means true and true
means false? Give me a few minutes to adapt to that "reality".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1057. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 20:58:54 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204092057200.16348-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 40326

On Mon, 8 Apr 2002, K0HB wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote
>
>> Now, you may think that the original query poster may have
>> meant transmitting, but then gave examples with COMMERCIAL
>> callsigns, so it was clear that he meant broadcasting.
>
>What COMMERCIAL callsigns? The examples given didn't
>resemble callsigns in any radio service, commercial, amateur,
>or otherwise.

Callsigns comprised of all letters and no digits are assigned to commercial broadcasters in the AM (200m) FM (3m) and Television services, excluding low-power TV stations (which have the pattern $*##*$$ where the digits represent the TV channel number).

1058. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 21:00:47 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204092100220.16348-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 40327

On Mon, 8 Apr 2002, CAM wrote:
>Bill Sohl wrote:
>> If I
>> simply transmit a daily traffic report to no intended
>> ham recipient, then I am "broadcasting."
>
>How about if you transmit a daily Morse code practice to
>no intended ham recipient?

That is specifically permitted in the rules as an exception.

1059. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 21:03:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8vkua$36d$0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 40328

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

the ARRL has a good track record
> of ignoring the wishes of it's paying members just as much as outsiders.
> They seem to do what they think is good for the organization, whether
> or not it's good for the ARS.

Aw, Larry, you know how it goes. "Whatever is good for General Motors
is good for the USA". Same principle applies.

1060. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 21:15:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8vllg$36d$1@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 40329

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > What I've seen of ARRL HQ strongly suggests that by the time they wake
> >up and realize it's time for action it's aleady too late to cure the
> >situation that should have created some panic.
>
> Can you provide enough examples of ARRL HQ staff not recognizing problems then
> taking action too late to do any good to justify your use of "strongly
> suggests?"

Going 'way back there, it would take a book. I don't have time to write
it and you don't have time to read it.

1061. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 21:30:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8vmhb$7h4$0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 40330

N2EY wrote:
>
>
> What DO you folks talk about on the repeater, Kim?
>
>

Maybe they titillate each other....

1062. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 21:34:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8vmpg$7h4$1@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 40331

Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> Certainly we could start arguing about EXACTLY what is legal and
> illegal, but common sense should prevail. I doubt anyone would get in
> trouble over assisting motorists in avoiding problem areas on the road.
> Years ago, whilst on Guam, we had a typhoon which knocked the coast
> guard tower down on Rota. We sent a chief petty officer over to
> re-establish communications. Apparently the coast guard station was
> damaged and the chief happened to be a ham - and used the ham shack.
> Sure, military comms on 75 meters are prohibited, but there it was -
> 'sparkplug one this is sparkplug'. The guys at the commsta had the rf
> gain up too high for the local oscillator, so the ssb copy was poor.
> 'sparkplug one this is sparkplug, you are loud, but garbled'. Hearing
> this, we gave a call 'sparkplug1, sparkplug, this is KG6AAY standing
> by'. Inside of 15 minutes, KG6AAY was handling all relief traffic and
> passing it directly to Commander, Naval Forces, Marianas. Captain
> Delany made an appearance to secure the amateurs from all other duties
> and to man the ham shack 24/7 until otherwise ordered. Illegal?
> Military comms to an amateur station? On 75 meters? Getting the hams
> relieved from duty (work)? Captain Delany was happy; the FCC liaison
> officer was only a lieutenant. Besides, the Captain was in charge and
> I doubt anyone on Rota would have argued the decision.
>

Not only that, what you describe would surely be deemed an emergency
where
"the safety of life or property" was at risk, thus anything goes.

1063. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 21:40:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8vn3k$8bg$0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 40332

HAR DE HAR HAR!!!

Jim Weir wrote:
>
> Sort of reminds me of the story that the favorite sport of the technicians
> was basketball, the engineers liked tennis, the managers played handball,
> and the executives played golf.
>
> Proving, of course, that the higher you rise in an organization, the smaller
> your balls.
>
> {;-)
>
> Jim
>
> > Intel in 1998. But the correlation at that time was
> > clear - the lower the ham license class, the higher
> > the grade level at Intel. In fact, the highest grade
> > levels didn't have a ham license at all. :-)

1064. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 22:09:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8vor0$dq6$0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 40333

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> There's already radio services that need no test.
> 1) 11 meter CB
> 2) FRS
> 3) cell phones
>
> All with type accepted (or whatever the term is nowadays)
> equipment.
>
> With the things the FCC lets hams do, like build our own
> equipment, develop new modes (psk31, packet, and such),
> select from many bands a frequency to use, hams need to
> pass a test to be sure that we are aware of various issues
> involved when operating homebrew radios, etc.
>

That would be true if indeed the test did anything meaningful toward
that end.

> Whether if one needs the knowledge required for an extra
> to operate certain subbands vs other subbands the generals
> are allowed, well.... (and I do have an extra). Running a
> linear on 14.300 is not any different than if it's on 14.160
> as far as safety and RFI and other rules and issues are concerned.

That was the main reason for having different levels of licenses with
differing requirements and *an experience qualification* included. The
Extra class was not available to anyone who had not held a general or
higher class license for at elast two years. Of course, with no actual
use requirement that wasn't a perfect solution, but it was assumed that
anyone interested in advancing to Extra would put a station on the air,
and gain experience at using, maintaining and adjusting it.

It is curious that FCC would abandon all this yet retain the separate
license classed. Perhaps it's a prolonged process done in small
increments to keep down protests. Not that it has.

>
> Not really comparable to flying small airplanes, as you need
> more skill to do IFR vs VFR, IIRC. And there are tests to
> get the revalent grade of flying license. Or driving busses
> vs just a 4 door car....

Yep. No pilot ever gained his license on the strength of any battery of
written tests. That only gets you the right to move on to the real

thing, the practical experience phase from which one emerges a licensed pilot only after convincing a hard-nosed FAA examiner that he has indeed learned to actually, safely fly the plane.

1065. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 22:15:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8vp69eoi0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 40334

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> Now Hans with the All Good Wishes is simply being a pain in the butt.
>
> >NAILED! on the head, as usual! On BOTH counts! (Good, Kind or whatever)
>
> Hans closes with "all kind wishes" and the guy who tells me to go soak my head
> agrees that Hans is being a pain in the butt.
>
> How odd.
>

Yep. At odds with your vanilla world where if it's PC it gets a pass,
if not, close scrutiny.

1066. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 23:33:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8vu29ils1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40335

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8vllg$36d$1@208.207.71.173...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > > What I've seen of ARRL HQ strongly suggests that by the time they wake
> > >up and realize it's time for action it's aleady too late to cure the
> > >situation that should have created some panic.
> >
> > Can you provide enough examples of ARRL HQ staff not recognizing
problems then
> > taking action too late to do any good to justify your use of "strongly
> > suggests?"
>
> Going 'way back there, it would take a book. I don't have time to write
> it and you don't have time to read it.

Translation: No, he (Dick) can't even think of 4 or 5.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1067. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 23:37:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB37B1F.F5F4EF11@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40336

He used 5 letter callsigns. Broadcast stations only have 4 or
sometimes 3 letters. I don't know if any radio service uses
5 letter calls without numbers.

>
> >What COMMERCIAL callsigns? The examples given didn't
> >resemble callsigns in any radio service, commercial, amateur,
> >or otherwise.
>
> Callsigns comprised of all letters and no digits are assigned to commercial
> broadcasters in the AM (200m) FM (3m) and Television services, excluding
> low-power TV stations (which have the pattern $##$$ where the digits represent
> the TV channel number).

1068. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 23:46:12 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <322f01ca90bca8169a980e0b106ba2dc.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40337

Geeze, if it's gonna be that easy, would you care to donate to the
M for M fund? Otherwise known as NNI (no nothin' international).
M for M stands for 'Money for Me'. Seriously, I can understand the
non-necessity for Morse; that said, I will state that some testing and
knowlege is necessary. We don't need shoot-outs (where we power up
multiple tens of kilowatts and shoot-out the gonads). We need people
with some basic concept of dc, ac, and rf. We need people who have at
least a basic understanding of what is meant by 'tuning' - whether an
antenna or a pi network (or L network or whatever). That said, I'm
still interested if you would care to donate to the M for M fund ...
;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020409001954.02598.00003607@mb-dh.aol.com...

> Agree completely. Why dont we just get it over with, and stop pretending its
> not going to happen.
> NCI opened the Door, and the FCC went right along with NCI Whinning.
> All the Excusses NCI used in regard to CW, can just as easily be used for the
> Written.
> Someone PLEASE start NTI, HELL I will even Donate to this cause, and you dont
> even have to give me some Phoney NTI number.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1069. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 23:48:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8vuoikfi1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40338

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:5624b2151f4d8274ae52b6ca29c46a45.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Certainly we could start arguing about EXACTLY what is legal and
> illegal, but common sense should prevail. I doubt anyone would get in
> trouble over assisting motorists in avoiding problem areas on the road.

Agreed, and
let me be VERY clear. If two or more hams are discussing
traffic conditions on the road, that is 100% legal. I can see
NO way the topic violates ANY rule in Part 97. I don't
care if two of the hams worked for the same company and
talked traffic all day...there's just nothing then that crosses
the line as to a violation.

The "broadcast" to no one in particular probably is a grey area,
but unless it was done repeatedly (e.g. If I did such broadcasts
every day at 8am to no one at all), I'd doubt it would
even be noticed.

> Years ago, whilst on Guam, we had a typhoon which knocked the coast
> guard tower down on Rota. We sent a chief petty officer over to
> re-establish communications. Apparently the coast guard station was
> damaged and the chief happened to be a ham - and used the ham shack.
> Sure, military comms on 75 meters are prohibited, but there it was -
> 'sparkplug one this is sparkplug'.

Sounds like a true emergency and wouldn't be a violation
at all. Then too, the military can pretty much take over
the airwaves anyway if they so need.

> The guys at the commsta had the rf
> gain up too high for the local oscillator, so the ssb copy was poor.
> 'sparkplug one this is sparkplug, you are loud, but garbled'. Hearing
> this, we gave a call 'sparkplug1, sparkplug, this is KG6AAY standing
> by'. Inside of 15 minutes, KG6AAY was handling all relief traffic and
> passing it directly to Commander, Naval Forces, Marianas. Captain
> Delany made an appearance to secure the amateurs from all other duties
> and to man the ham shack 24/7 until otherwise ordered. Illegal?

Not illegal in my book...in fact, the military could have simply
used the ham station as its own without any need to use
amateurs at all. There's no worries about military using
amateur equipment at all. No type acceptance needed.

> Military comms to an amateur station? On 75 meters? Getting the hams
> relieved from duty (work)? Captain Delany was happy; the FCC liaison

> officer was only a lieutenant. Besides, the Captain was in charge and
> I doubt anyone on Rota would have argued the decision.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1070. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 23:53:27 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB37EF7.B38EE848@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40339

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> You would do well to find out who the repeater coordinator is in your
> area. You can't set up a repeater without coordination -- it's possible,
> but it's just not done. Particularly in a high-density usage area (like
> most cities in California), your chance of putting a repeater on the air
> without interfering with someone else is practically nil without
> coordination. And you won't pick your frequency -- the coordinator will
> do that for you.

What you should do is find an existing club with an existing repeater
system and get involved in it. Visit several clubs to find a group
you'll enjoy working with.

>
>
> Keep in mind that you have no HF privileges on the FM/RPT portion of
> 10-meters, so a 10-meter repeater, or one with a cross-band link to
> 10-meters, is verboten for you, unless the 10-meter transmitter is
> running under the call sign of a General, Advanced, or Extra-class
> operator.

That can be fixed. Just upgrade to general or extra.

But you can use such a machine as a tech, as you are transmitting on
a frequency you are permitted (like 2 meters) and the machine
(under the control of a general or extra or advanced) retransmits
your voice onto 10 meters. Let me know if I got this
wrong, but I can't violate this rule as I have an extra and can
use any unused ham frequency appropriate for the mode
I want to do (except that mini-band at 219-220 MHz which
is for IIRC coordinated packet and digital work unless I set up
a station after I get coordinated).

1071. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-09 23:54:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a8vv3t$uh7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40340

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204090958.62489a7d@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a8uuh7ijc1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > Moved to a new subject line and thread:
> > ----------
> > "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > Two examples of what I would consider to be highly illegal
transmissions,
> > > yet done every single day here in the Dallas area on 146.880:
> > >
> > > One: For anyone who's listening, there's a big pileup on XXXX (where
> > > X=highway of choice), so don't go that way. A better way might be for
> > > you to take XXXX and get around this stuff because it's pretty bad.
> > >
> > > What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a
> > > broadcast, addressing his/her comments to no one in particular.
>
> One-way transmissions are not necessarily against the rules.
>
> Amateur repeaters exist in large part to increase the range and
> coverage of
> mobile amateur stations. A traffic advisory from a mobile amateur
> station is
> therefore quite relevant to the amateur radio purpose of the repeater.
>
> A repeater or mobiles used to gather traffic info for broadcast by
> actual
> broadcast stations is a different situation.
>
> > The same thing happens in many places during "drive times".
> > Here in Morris County, NJ someone usually responds to such a
> > "broadcast" to make it an official two way QSO. That's bending the
> > rules a bit, but it's a far cry from anything that constitues true
> > broadcasting which we believe is the intent of the prohibition.
>
> Here in the Philly area, the repeaters are busy during drive time and
> there is
> no opportunity to make a "one way" transmission anyway. Hams simply
> mention the
> traffic conditions as part of the conversation. Often the observations
> of one
> amateur will save others from being stuck in traffic.

> >
> > > Now, I've even seen it happen that
> > > the person making the broadcast then ends their transmission
> > > without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.
> >
> > Again, probably just a slip up as opposed to any deliberate
> > behavior.
>
> Lack of proper identification IS definitely against the rules.
> >
> > > Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place.
> > > These people check with each other often about traffic
> > > flow and route. Truckdrivers will
> > > also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere.
> >
> > > Sorry folks, but both
> > > examples here are those that involve communication with
> > > pecuniary interest...namely employment.
> >
> > How does the first involve any pecuniary interest?
> >
> > Are you saying that if hams help
> > each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
> > jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?
>
> I agree with Bill 100%. Unless you are "on the clock" while commuting,
> there is no pecuniary interest.

What does being "on the clock" have to do with it at all?

> > As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
> > activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
> > prove it to be illegal.
>
> This one's a bit sticky, since the business activity of a truck driver
> IS getting from origin to destination, and he/she IS "on the clock"
> while driving.

Ditto my last...but again, IF the conversation?QSO is only about traffic
conditions, why is it legal for you and I to discuss, but not a trucker
who might happen to be a ham? IF the subject itself is legal for
me, it should be legal for anyone with a ham license.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1072. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:09:35 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <bf7b638ad9b43734c29326e546bba0eb.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40341

Hans, thanks so much for the correction. It has been years. I was in the shack and actually made initial contact; however I had to go on watch. The other guys that were in the shack were the guys that were secured from duty. There is another story after this which I do have straight. e-mail me at aa2qa@frontiernet.net if you want to hear it (it is quite short).

73 and thanks from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA (licensed as WB2OSP, extra class, at that time on Guam)

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:tPGs8.2618$CA6.220237@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote
> .
> > Years ago, whilst on Guam, we had a typhoon which knocked the coast
> > guard tower down on Rota. We sent a chief petty officer over to
> > re-establish communications. Apparently the coast guard station was
> > damaged and the chief happened to be a ham - and used the ham shack.
>
> You got most of it right. The location was Saipan, not Rota, and the
> Chief didn't use the ham shack, he (we) set up comms using a Swan
> 500C and a Drake TR4 at Kobler Field. One of our antennas was
> the chain link fence surrounding the passenger terminal at Kobler.
>
> You can get more details in the September 1968 issue of QST in
> the public service column. I still have the letters of commendation
> from Capt Delaney, Admiral McCain (yes, the Senators dad), and
> the Commissioner of TTPI.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB ex-KG6AQI

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1073. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:15:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb3868b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40342

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020408234328.07832.00001081@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3cb07570_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Now that the licensing requirements
> >> have been significantly reduced, what is *your* excuse for not getting
> >> your "Nickle Extra?" I'm not saying that it is in any way mandatory or
> >> even expected, but it is certainly within your abilities -- as it was
even
> >> in the Pre-Restructuring Era. Just a thought...
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Oh, I look, Larry. You need to realize that *anyone* could do what you
guys
> >have done, with more grace and humility than you have in the tip of your
> >little fingers. Anyone can do what you guys did. However, I'd say that
> >most people who get their college degrees end up using the degree...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I "use" my college degree each and every day of my life. The things I
> learned, and the experience I had while learning them, have changed
> me in ways that have improved my life considerably. Moreover, while
> I am not presently employed in an occupation where I can "use" all of
> the technical knowledge I gained from my major course of study, I have
> learned to appreciate a job that I love to do and do well. The fact that
> it pays well and has great benefits is the icing on the cake. All of the
> "entry level" HR positions I applied for paid 5 - 10 kilobucks a year
> less than what I'm making now. If I do take a different job in my
> present company or elsewhere in the transportation industry, it will
> most likely be as a Street Supervisor, Training and Development, or
> Safety. So go ahead and keep ragging on how I'm not "using" my
> degree. It just shows that, as usual, you don't know what you're
> talking about.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh, not at all, I figure it makes perfect sense Larry. If you can belittle someone for not wanting much more than a Tech/Tech+ license, certainly you can be ridiculed for not using your education.

Kim W5TIT

1074. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:20:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb387aa$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40343

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:YRts8.1573$CA6.103824@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
> > > And did you sign as W5TIT or as W5CAW?
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > >
> >
> > Hans, maybe you should read the FCC Rules and Regulations...
>
> I have read them. That's why I asked you "did you sign as W5TIT or as
> W5CAW?"
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Then, you shouldn't have to ask. However, just to appease your fluffiness, I always ID with "This is W5TIT/XXXXX" where X=the callsign of the control op. Except for Field Days and there I ID with my callsign every 10 minutes, as required.

Kim W5TIT

1075. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:23:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb38892_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40344

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:K2us8.1607$CA6.106526@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> > At dinners and other get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine
> > have pretty much agreed we will not discuss traffic on our repeater.
>
> That's certainly your perogative.
>

Did you find it self-gratifying to mention that, Hans?

> >
> > We also chide people who come on and do
> > so...
>
> That behavior is anal. Go to http://westid.com/amateur.htm. There, for
> $59.95 plus a boxtop from any 2M HT, you can get a lovely gold anodized
> official Radio Kop ID Badge.
>

You know, you must be retired. You are, aren't you? I sure hope you didn't
spend much time stretching to get to the thought above. I didn't say we
tell people that they are operating illegally...hell, I don't do that if
they are. There *are* enough of your radio cops out there for that. We
tease and make fun of traffic discussions.

> >
> >...it's not good hamming at all.
>
> On one of our W0EF club repeaters, we have a roundtable gathering called
the
> "Afterwork Net" which typically consists of up to 20-30 homeward bound
> commuters over the course of any given evening drive-time. Since many of
us
> use the same highways and freeways, we freely share information about
> traffic conditions, including suggestions for alternate routes. Please
> explain, citing pertinent FCC rules, why that is "not good hamming".
>
> Good luck on this one now!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

>

Well, that's fine for you. I am one of those who doesn't like discussing traffic on the air. In fact, when I am asked I tell them it's the same shit, different day. And lunatic who thinks they are going to get onto a highway around Dallas at drive times and find good traffic isn't worth my time on the air.

Kim W5TIT

1076. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:32:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb38a8e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40345

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020409031536.07832.00001106@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a
broadcast,
> >addressing his/her comments to no one in particular. Now, I've even seen
it
> >happen that the person making the broadcast then ends their transmission
> >without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.
>
> Kim:
>
> Incorrect. An "announcement" of such a nature is perfectly legal, as
> long as it is properly identified.
>

I quite disagree. However, I doubt the infraction is serious enough to
warrant a report to the FCC.

> >
> >Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place. These
people
> >check with each other often about traffic flow and route. Truckdrivers
will
> >also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere. Sorry folks, but
both
> >examples here are those that involve communication with pecuniary
interest:
> >namely employment.
>
> Also incorrect. The fact that there are professional drivers involved
does
> not make such transmissions illegal in the ARS.
>

Well, DUH. What does make their transmission illegal (in my opinion) is
that their questions are either "where is [company name] and does anyone
know how to get there?" That is a direct question related to getting them
where they need to be to discuss business. I err on the side of caution and
will not get involved in such discussions. It's their ticket...and I think
they are stretching the rules when they do that. The only reaction I have
to it is that I would find it surprising at all *if* they were ever to be
brought into question for it.

>
> This use of amateur
> radio is certainly falls within limits of Public Interest, Convenience, or
> Necessity, and are thus perfectly legal, even if the parties involved are
> engaged in commercial activity at the time.
>

Then you are stretching what I believe to be a rule that says absolutely no transmissions may be made if any party has a pecuniary interest in the conversation. Getting to your office, getting to your truck terminal, getting to your delivery site, are all examples of items where a pecuniary interest is primary to the discussion. I have a CB radio in my truck specifically for the purpose of discussing those things.

>
> What they are NOT
> doing is actually advertising, dispatching, or otherwise directly
facilitating
> the day-to-day operation of their business.
>

A part of dispatch is getting around in traffic, Larry.

>
> They are just promoting
> traffic safety by operating their vehicles in a manner which not only
> ensures the safe operation of the vehicles involved, but others on the
> highways.
>

Uh huh.

> >
> >There's pretty much only two repeaters I really ever listen to with any
> >regularity. One is the most popular repeater in Dallas, the 146.880
> >machine. The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine. At dinners and
other
> >get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine have pretty much agreed we will
not
> >discuss traffic on our repeater.
>
> So, you not only get it wrong, but you encourage othes to get it wrong
> as well?
>

Oh, is that what you call it when people are like-minded? There is someone who encouraged them to think that way, eh?

>
> It just so happens that discussing local traffic conditions is a
> perfectly legal and very reasonable and practical use of an amateur
> repeater.
>

May be. But I don't like it. I will either drop from discussion or never even key up where I know that those kinds of conversations dominate. I will rarely, if ever, key up on the '88 machine for that reason.

>
> Well, nothing new here -- just another example of W5TIT
> not knowing what she's talking about, but attempting to be seen as
> an authority in Amateur Radio Public Service while spewing nonsense.
>
> >We also chide people who come on and do so...it's not good hamming
> >at all.
>
> How charming. You get on the air, and "chide" people who are actually
> using ham radio for a practical, useful, public service purpose -- and
then
> you have the nerve to call yourself a Public Service expert within the
> ARS. You also infer that your "inner circle" of ham friends do likewise.
> Fools sure do love company! It's just a question of whether you found
> them, or they found you!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Kim W5TIT

1077. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:44:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb38d4f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40346

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a8usqu$57o$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > Two examples of what I would consider to be highly illegal
transmissions,
> > yet done every single day here in the Dallas area on 146.880:
> >
> > One: For anyone who's listening, there's a big pileup on XXXX (where
> > X=highway of choice), so don't go that way. A better way might be for
you
> > to take XXXX and get around this stuff because it's pretty bad.
> >
> > What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a
> broadcast,
> > addressing his/her comments to no one in particular.
>
> The same thing happens in many places during "drive times".
> Here in Morris County, NJ someone usually responds to such a
> "broadcast" to make it an official two way QSO. That's bending the
> rules a bit, but it's a far cry from anything that constitues true
> broadcasting which we believe is the intent of the prohibition.
>

Well, I wouldn't do it...put it that way. I guess I just don't believe in
bending the rules. However, you must realize that the same people who do
things like this are very quick to jump down the throats of a new
operator--or, hell, even a seasoned one--that uses "10-4" or some such thing
on ham radio. Now, there's absolutely, 100% no illegality there, yet those
same people who "bend the rules" every day will do just that.

> >
> > Now, I've even seen it
> > happen that the person making the broadcast then ends their transmission
> > without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.
>
> Again, probably just a slip up as opposed to any deliberate
> behavior.
>

There's one operator in particular who does this all the time. I doubt
seriously that it is any other than purely forgetful that he does it.
However, a rules violation is a rules violation.

> >
> > Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place. These
> people
> > check with each other often about traffic flow and route. Truckdrivers
> will
> > also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere.
>
> > Sorry folks, but both
> > examples here are those that involve communication with pecuniary
> interest:
> > namely employment.
>
> How does the first involve any pecuniary interest?
>

It is asking how traffic is and your interest is directly related to getting to the office on time, job site on time, whatever. That is a pecuniary interest.

>
> Are you saying that if hams help
> each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
> jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?
>

No. I am saying that is the way I *interpret* the rules in Part 97. Other hams can do whatever they'd like, but I'll not be discussing topics like that because I believe they are rules violations.

>
> As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
> activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
> prove it to be illegal.
>

Wait a minute, Bill. If I steal something from a store, yet no one "catches" me--how could it ever be said that I did something illegal? A discussion of traffic related to getting to your place of employment (a pecuniary interest) is--to me--a rules violation.

> >
> > There's pretty much only two repeaters I really ever listen to with any
> > regularity. One is the most popular repeater in Dallas, the 146.880
> > machine. The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine. At dinners and
> other
> > get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine have pretty much agreed we will
> not
> > discuss traffic on our repeater.
>
> WHY? Traffic is NOT forbidden as a subject, regardless of the benefits to
> any individual as to saving time on their individual commute. IF I
visited
> your area andwas looking for an address, would you NOT want other

> area hams to respond to my query?
>

That's quite different. If you are "just looking" for how to get somewhere, that certainly isn't related in any way to a direct pecuniary interest you have in getting there (unless it is to get to a business meeting).

> > We also chide people who come on and do
> > so...it's not good hamming at all.
>
> Sorry Kim, I strongly disagree that there's anything about it that
> is "not good". If it was, the FCC would have spoken to it
> years ago.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Oh, I don't think it's all that great a deal to them. Nor is really all that great a deal to stir up so much conversation. However, my opinion stands that it's breaking the rules. If not, where's the harm in my erring on the side of caution?

Kim W5TIT

1078. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:45:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb38db0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40347

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:ILDs8.18505$QC1.1157160@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> >> Kim, W5TIT, posted (about traffic info on the repeaters):
> >> What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up
> >> and made a broadcast, addressing his/her comments to
> >> no one in particular....
>
> > Larry Roll, K3LT, responded (in part):
> > ... It just so happens that discussing local traffic
> > conditions is a perfectly legal and very reasonable
> > and practical use of an amateur repeater....
>
> Not only that, Larry, but I believe it comes under the
> umbrella of being amateur-radio-related.
>
> Every vehicle with a licensed amateur radio station
> installed in it could, in the event of a man-made or
> natural disaster, become a mobile, emergency-communications
> facility. It is important that these potential
> emergency assets remain free of traffic entanglements
> so as to be instantly available in case of need.
> Traffic advisories moved over the local V/UHF repeater
> systems serve this purpose well, in addition to being
> practice sessions for "the real thing".
>
> ----------------
>
> I wrote the above with a big sh*t-eating grin on my
> face. But upon re-reading it, and re-thinking the premise,
> I'm not so sure I can be facetious about it. In a real
> emergency, traffic and road conditions *would* be a prime
> concern of mobile stations involved. And establishing
> protocols for getting that information from hard sources
> and out to the field units, as well as getting "ground
> truth" information back, might be a very good preparation
> for such eventualities.
>
>
> --
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona
>

And, you're absolutely right. You also know that emergency situations are different.

Kim W5TIT

1079. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:46:29 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb38dde$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40348

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB30905.679E2ADB@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > You say you don't want to upgrade because you don't think you can
> > "use" your upgraded privileges. Don't look now, Kim, but that is the
> > mindset of a loser.
>
> Is that why you have never upgraded to PhD?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Better than that, he's never upgraded to a job that matches his degree.

Kim W5TIT

1080. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:56:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb39043_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40350

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a8vuoikfi1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:5624b2151f4d8274ae52b6ca29c46a45.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > Certainly we could start arguing about EXACTLY what is legal and
> > illegal, but common sense should prevail. I doubt anyone would get in
> > trouble over assisting motorists in avoiding problem areas on the road.
>
> Agreed, and
> let me be VERY clear. If two or more hams are discussing
> traffic conditions on the road, that is 100% legal. I can see
> NO way the topic violates ANY rule in Part 97. I don't
> care if two of the hams worked for the same company and
> talked traffic all day...there's just nothing then that crosses
> the line as to a violation.
>

And, that's your interpretation, Bill. I think different. I also don't like it. I think it cheapens ham radio. This is pointed up by the fact that many people who are near enough to my equipment in the office and listen will respond to my "would you be interested in ham radio" with "why would I want to talk about traffic, the weather, and how sick I've been?"

>
> The "broadcast" to no one in particular probably is a grey area,
> but unless it was done repeatedly (e.g. If I did such broadcasts
> every day at 8am to no one at all), I'd doubt it would
> even be noticed.
>

It is. And I don't like to get myself into gray areas, either. Remember, I don't think I made any comment about reporting violations. I simply said I believe these types of conversations are stretching the rules. Gray areas are the test waters, and you probably know that.

> >
> > Years ago, whilst on Guam, we had a typhoon which knocked the coast
> > guard tower down on Rota. We sent a chief petty officer over to
> > re-establish communications. Apparently the coast guard station was
> > damaged and the chief happened to be a ham - and used the ham shack.
> > Sure, military comms on 75 meters are prohibited, but there it was -
> > 'sparkplug one this is sparkplug'.
>
> Sounds like a true emergency and wouldn't be a violation

> at all. Then too, the military can pretty much take over
> the airwaves anyway if they so need.
>

Getting to work is not an emergency...unless, say, you were a doctor and
someone's life depended on you getting through the traffic quickly. :)

> > The guys at the commsta had the rf
> > gain up too high for the local oscillator, so the ssb copy was poor.
> > 'sparkplug one this is sparkplug, you are loud, but garbled'. Hearing
> > this, we gave a call 'sparkplug1, sparkplug, this is KG6AAY standing
> > by'. Inside of 15 minutes, KG6AAY was handling all relief traffic and
> > passing it directly to Commander, Naval Forces, Marianas. Captain
> > Delany made an appearance to secure the amateurs from all other duties
> > and to man the ham shack 24/7 until otherwise ordered. Illegal?
>
> Not illegal in my book...in fact, the military could have simply
> used the ham station as its own without any need to use
> amateurs at all. There's no worries about military using
> amateur equipment at all. No type acceptance needed.
>
> > Military comms to an amateur station? On 75 meters? Getting the hams
> > relieved from duty (work)? Captain Delany was happy; the FCC liaison
> > officer was only a lieutenant. Besides, the Captain was in charge and
> > I doubt anyone on Rota would have argued the decision.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Kim W5TIT

1081. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 00:59:47 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb390fc$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40351

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a8vv3t$uh7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> Ditto my last...but again, IF the conversation?QSO is only about traffic
> conditions, why is it legal for you and I to discuss, but not a trucker
> who might happen to be a ham? IF the subject itself is legal for
> me, it should be legal for anyone with a ham license.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

I shudder to mention that we've all been discussing "gray" areas, "bending"
the rules, "ifs", and "whatifs," etc. I shudder twice to mention that it
leads me to thinking that we are very defensive about our gray areas...

'Nuff said

Kim W5TIT

1082. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 01:01:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb39163$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40352

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:VaMs8.3894$3P4.317161@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> > You know, you must be retired. You are, aren't you?
>
> Nope, I'm too young, and I'm having too much fun.
>
> What would being retired have to do with this conversation?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

I figure it took an inordinate amount of time to come with your reaction to
my post.

Kim W5TIT

1083. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 01:02:45 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <VaMs8.3894$3P4.317161@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40349

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> You know, you must be retired. You are, aren't you?

Nope, I'm too young, and I'm having too much fun.

What would being retired have to do with this conversation?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1084. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 01:22:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a90457$g80$0@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 40353

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a8vllg$36d$1@208.207.71.173...
> >
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > > > What I've seen of ARRL HQ strongly suggests that by the time they wake
> > > >up and realize it's time for action it's aleady too late to cure the
> > > >situation that should have created some panic.
> > >
> > > Can you provide enough examples of ARRL HQ staff not recognizing
> problems then
> > > taking action too late to do any good to justify your use of "strongly
> > > suggests?"
> >
> > Going 'way back there, it would take a book. I don't have time to write
> > it and you don't have time to read it.
>
> Translation: No, he (Dick) can't even think of 4 or 5.

Maybe YOU can't, but that would be no surprise. I know that Ed could,
though of course he'd never let on.
```

1085. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 01:35:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <wFMs8.6598$N01.1316456591@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40354

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020408234327.07832.00001079@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3cb1db4a_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >> OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI (No Test
> >International)!
> >>
> >> Make a note of it.
> >>
> >> With all kind wishes,
> >>
> >> de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >Hans ... nice attempt at "guilt by association," but as you well know,
> >both I and the other leadership of NCI has repeatedly repudiated
> >anything inplying that NCI has an agenda to eliminate (or gut) the
> >written tests. I can also state with some confidence that the NCI
> >Board would vote to oppose any "NTI" initiatives filed with the FCC.
> >
> >Have a nice day ...
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> Like it or not, the NTI -- if and when formed, would/will always be
> seen as a logical extension of NCI, whether or not that is actually
> true. IMHO, the NCI had a great deal to do with bringing the ARS
> to the precipice of the slippery slope -- and giving a good, firm push.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Like it or not Larry, I will always associate you with "My Favorite Black on
the Bus..., Knuckle dragging No-coder with a Southern Accent, Don't let the
door hit you on the ass..." because those are the things you've actually
said about amateur radio.

Sorry, but you not associate whatever you call "NTI" with No-Code
International because there is no association.

1086. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 01:37:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <yHMs8.6599$p61.1316821193@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40355

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0204071706.3822b9fc@posting.google.com...
> "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<_a_r8.24007$ml2.1886154@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> > Val,
> >
> > Did you send this jeremiad to someone who has influence in the matter,
like
> > your Division Director?
> >
> > In case it slipped your mind, I've done so for you.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> >
> . . . the code test war in this NG at least had some relevance, now
> it's down to WHAT??
> >
> >
> BLEH. This NG is gone to hell. Back to radio.
> >
> >
> w3rv

Sayonara Baby!

1087. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 01:40:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mKMs8.6601$S91.1317047518@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40356

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020409062550.08013.00002315@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> > Hey, I
> >think
> >the word "amateur" has a wonderful meaning when used with "radio," BUT,
> >to large sections of the general public it can have unfortunate
> >connotations.
>
> Can you provide any examples of places where this large section of the
public
> have expressed those unfortunate connotations? I have never run across
them.
> The term "amateur athelete" or "amateur astronomer" don't conjure up any
> negative connotations in my mind.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

How about "The Intramural Radio League?"

1088. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 01:43:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <MMMs8.6602$xj1.1317667982@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40357

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020409063957.08001.00002605@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net
>
> >You might be surprised. About a week after I got the present call I was
> >working on the repeater and got a call using my old 1x3.
>
> KA1CVV told me that he will probably take KA1CV when he upgrades.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, now that you've broadcast it, someone will spend a few bucks and take it.

I once said across a repeater that I would setup a juno email account using my callsign. Less that two hours later I tried and found that it had already been taken. There are some very mischevious people in amateur radio.

1089. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 01:46:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a905ib$jo9$0@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 40358

Can't beileve no one has commented on this one.... What the hey....

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >
> > >Wow, think of it...you can put that 2x1 on a resume and get
> > >your pick of high-paying industry jobs!
>
> Er, Len ... I already HAVE a high-paying industry job ... have
> had for years and it just keeps getting better.
>

Lessee, now, you moved to PA to work for Lucent. And the stock promptly started to tank, a trend which continues to the last closing of the stock market.....
Should we draw a corollary here? What happened to all those neat spread spectrum cordless phones Lucent was selling? Hey, they *were* pretty good-I even bought one a couple years ago and it really is a good one. But they have

> > I hear that managers are really looking for 1x2 and 2x1
> > ham callsign holders! :-)
>
> Er, Len ... I am a manager ... a senior level one at that.
> Most of the people I've interviewed and recommended
> for hire in the past 5-10 years have had at least a MSEE,
> most a PhD in EE, and a number of years of experience
> (I have to be VERY impressed to be willing to undertake
> to train a "fresh-out," though I have done so on occasion
> ... I tend to let someone else break them in first :-)
>

So lets recap a bit here... You got an engineering job even though you have no engineering degree.(you had experience designing cordless phones). Now you're the authority who passes judgment on MSEE and PHDEE job hunters. You couldn't be bothered to finish your own degree but by gawd you're the most competent of the competent when it comes to passing judgment on those who did. Who did you know -or whatever- to fall into that one? Oh, you're going to tell us it was all skill and your glowing personality that did it. Right.

My, My. You and Cecil are sure doing all you can to give engineers a really *bad* name.

> Amateur call, of any class, would not be a significant
> factor in hiring considerations,

You sure have that right. A ham license today is a real laugher when it comes to any sort of proof of technical ability of any sort. Don't let anyone fool you into believing it was always that way. I imagine you already do believe it.

though it would generate
> some conversation that would help me to evaluate someone's
> open-mindedness and technical abilities in areas that might
> be a bit outside of their mainstream career experience.

AAHHHH........ The minute he mentions his CW contact from last night he gets the "don't let the door hit you in the butt on your way out" treatment, regardless of what else he might be involved in. We know, Carl. You poor fella.

1090. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 01:57:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB39C1E.4FED998A@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40359

ROAR!! Thanks, Jim - I needed that!

- Mike - KB3EIA

Jim Weir wrote:
>
> Sort of reminds me of the story that the favorite sport of the technicians
> was basketball, the engineers liked tennis, the managers played handball,
> and the executives played golf.
>
> Proving, of course, that the higher you rise in an organization, the smaller
> your balls.

1091. Re: Insurance claim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 02:06:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409220626.09489.00000354@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40360

In article <S%ys8.18290$QC1.1130209@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:3CB27948.FEE10DC0@ix.netcom.com...
>> I heard that this incident actually happened at the construction
>> site of the pyramids in Egypt way back when...
>
>With Sammy Amen-Hotep doing 'Here Come de Judge'.
>
What about Geraldine Jones telling the judge "the Devil made me do it"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1092. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 02:06:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020409220627.09489.00000355@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40361

In article <a8vv3t$uh7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> > > Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place.
>> > > These people check with each other often about traffic
>> > > flow and route. Truckdrivers will
>> > > also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere.
>> >
>> > > Sorry folks, but both
>> > > examples here are those that involve communication with
>> > > pecuniary interest...namely employment.
>> >
>> > How does the first involve any pecuniary interest?
>> >
>> > Are you saying that if hams help
>> > each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
>> > jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?
>>
>> I agree with Bill 100%. Unless you are "on the clock" while commuting,
>> there is no pecuniary interest.
>
>What does being "on the clock" have to do with it at all?

A truck driver's job - what they are paid to do - is getting the vehicle from A
to B
safely and efficiently. The use of ham radio for to help get the vehicle from A
to B in a nonemergency by people being paid to do so MAY (heavy emphasis on the
"may") cross the line of "pecuniary interest. I'm not sure.
>
>> > As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
>> > activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
>> > prove it to be illegal.
>>
>> This one's a bit sticky, since the business activity of a truck driver
>> IS getting from origin to destination, and he/she IS "on the clock"
>> while driving.
>
>Ditto my last...but again, IF the conversation?QSO is only about traffic
>conditions, why is it legal for you and I to discuss, but not a trucker
>who might happen to be a ham? IF the subject itself is legal for
>me, it should be legal for anyone with a ham license.

OK, consider this:

Suppose a ham decides to put up a tower and a bunch of locals show up on tower raising day to help out. Everyone brings amateur HTs to help coordinate the activity. The HTs are used extensively, saving lots of time and effort. Is this OK? Of course.

Now suppose some of the hams who helped out form a company and install radio towers commercially. Can they legally use their amateur HTs on the job for the same purpose as when erecting the ham tower for free? I don't think so.

Even though it's the same purpose and the same people, in the first case they are a bunch of friends helping out a fellow amateur and in the second case it's a bunch of professionals doing a job.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1093. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 02:15:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB3A03C.5E07526D@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40362

Hi Ed,

You do know I was in major sarcasm mode there? I think QST is fine, but there were some design issues going on with it. Some think that attractiveness in a magazine will impair content. 8^)

- Mike - KB3EIA

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
> >See, I just saved ARRL a whole bunch of money.
>
> Actually, there are some who would like to be ARRL members without receiving
> QST. Unfortunately, if most members did not receive QST, the cost of membership
> would have to increase to pay for the loss of advertising revenues.
>
> A good example of an organization that functions without ad revenues is the
> IEEE. My dues last year were over $100.00.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

1094. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 03:18:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB3AF24.10166E20@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40363

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message

<Some snippage here>

> > I think you are assuming that hams don't care to see an attractive
> > layout. I want to see good layout and attractive content.
>
> The question is, at what cost? Ed Hare aptly
> noted that if the cost could be justified, it'd be
> spent. Basic business case modeling as I see it.

Let's see what I can do here...

There is presumably an employee of ARRL, or subcontractor who does page layout for the magazine. This person is being paid to put the artwork and articles together.

Since there is someone doing this, there are people with a sensibility and who are trained to do this sort of thing. That is who you look to hire to do the job.

Most successful enterprises hire a person who is trained in their field to do the specific jobs needed. Kind of like if you need an electronic technician or engineer, you hire one. You don't hire an illustrator to do the job of a technician. Or shouldn't

All this probably sounds kinda patronizing and obvious. Bear with me a moment though.

That wonderful device, the computer, has made Engineers and technicians believe that they are also illustrators. And we see the results all too often. The purchase of Adobe Pagemaker and Photoshop no more makes an Illustrator than a full set of Craftsman tools make a person an auto mechanic.

So it is very possible that the accounting department will buy into the argument that if you just have an engineer who has a few hours extra do the layout, you don't have to spend any money on illustrators. They are 100 percent right. They are also 100 percent wrong. It is analogous to deciding that you can save thousands of dollars each year by foregoing medical treatment.

> > But most people do react to proper design, even if unconsiously. That
> > is why it is there.
>

> OK, but if I'm already a ham and ARRL member, what does it
> buy? What's the business case offset that justifies the costs?

I am a Ham and a new member of the ARRL, and I DO want attractive
content. I guess they need to decide how many of each type there are!
8^)

> > In a hobby where
> > so many try to be precise and accurate, they are satisfied with what
> > amounts to a visual typo.
>
> I thought the issue was design, not accuracy?

Yes, the issue IS design. As a person who works in this field, I can
assure you that we consider a poor design as offending as a typo, or a
ham RFI'ing all over the place, or otherwise following poor practice.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1095. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 03:37:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB3B397.A886E4CF@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40364

ROFL! Sounds like a good thread to start!

- Mike - KB3EIA

Bill Sohl wrote:

> That's more on the line of "The end of r.r.a.p. :-) :-)

1096. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 04:07:28 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a91hp201lff@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40413

Hmmm..... last I knew, a dare (regardless of whether it is a wise move or not) is a challenge.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:a8tb4b$3gu$0@208.207.71.129...
>
>
> KC8PMX wrote:
> >
> > Never been challenged eh?
> >
>
> Not what he said. Said he has been intelligent enough to NOT confuse a
> challenge with a stupid dare. Too bad so many posters here are not.
>
> >
> > > Izzat right? I've never had a teacher, clergyman or boss dare me to do
> > > anything. "Friends" and co-workers will often dare one to do something
> > > stupid while keeping a safe distance. They can often be heard saying
> > > afterward, "I can't believe he was stupid enough to do that". Sorry, I
> > > can't buy into your Rod McKuen-ism.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN

1097. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 04:12:41 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a91hp311lff@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40412

Personally.... I would love to see others challenge a record like that. If another person can superceed those achievements and do even more than she has, it is for the betterment of this hobby!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> Kim:
>
> That's truly impressive. I think you should be nominated for the 2002
> Dayton Hamvention "Amateur Radio Operator of the Year." I doubt
> that whomever has already been nominated could provide as a r&#65533;sum&#65533;
> as imposing as yours.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

1098. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 04:17:52 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a91hp421lff@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40411

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020409031537.07832.00001108@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <a8t2al7ku6@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >He may not have a right to bitch about things they way they may be NOW,
but
> >he has every right to complain about situations when he WAS a member.
> >
> >Ryan
>
> Ryan:
>
> Anyone who has cancelled or chosen not to renew their ARRL
> membership certainly has the right to complain about the organization --
> but those complaints carry much more weight when coming from
> actual members in good standing (i.e. dues paid).

Again, for the duration of time that guy was a member he has full right to complain or compliment on what had occurred from the date he became a subscriber till the time he cancelled or the duration of his subscription ended. He doesn't have the right to criticize (according to others statements here in this group) about the time before then, or after, just during.

However, having
> said that, I'll give you this much -- the ARRL has a good track record
> of ignoring the wishes of it's paying members just as much as outsiders.
> They seem to do what they think is good for the organization, whether
> or not it's good for the ARS.
>

That is a statement that has been said here, and to me and I seem to agree with it also. I am just sick of these people that seem to put the ARRL higher than God himself.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

1099. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 04:20:41 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a91hp531lff@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40414

Depends there Len.... some people are fortunate in marriage, some are not.
About ten years ago, I lost about 130 pounds of unsightly fat..... I
divorced her!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020409152444.04302.00000497@mb-bh.aol.com...
> In article <a8usus11rl2@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >And also RAIN, SNOW, WIFE are four letter words..... and all usually
> >annoying.
>
> I disagree. "WIFE" is not annoying to me, but a delight.
>
> CODE is an annoying four-letter word. :-)

1100. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 04:27:04 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a91hp641lff@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40410

Guess I thinking of the time old tactic of "If I had to do it, so does everyone else" mantra cheered on ever so often.... Using the statement from some here, "Anyone can learn the 5 wpm code" then anyone should not have too much problem with it.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020409152450.04302.00000505@mb-bh.aol.com...
> In article <a8usut21rl2@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Great..... Think I will start All-Code Intl. Anyone using a transciever
> >would have to pass the code test amateurs are forced to. Obviously
> >television and broadcast am/fm radio would be exempt because that is a
> >one-way transmission. If morse code is that important, it obviously
would
> >be important for others to learn it. Hmmm.... a cop or firefighter gets
> >injured somehow and cannot speak, well, they could send for help in morse
> >code! As well as other radio services too......
> >
> >Ryan
>
> Heh. A youngish extra named Eric June tried that with "Know Code
> International," even wrote a couple Comments on 98-143, had a
> website...and engaged in a lengthy "debate" with several in here
> prior to the R&O for restructuring. I can copy his last message in
> here if you wish...the KCI website was taken down long ago.
>

1101. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 04:36:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cb3c16b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 40365

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a905ib$jo9$0@208.206.142.93...
> Can't beileve no one has commented on this one.... What the hey....
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > >
> > > >Wow, think of it...you can put that 2x1 on a resume and get
> > > >your pick of high-paying industry jobs!
> >
> > Er, Len ... I already HAVE a high-paying industry job ... have
> > had for years and it just keeps getting better.
> >
>
> Lessee, now, you moved to PA to work for Lucent. And the stock promptly
> started to tank, a trend which continues to the last closing of the
> stock market.....

A little reality here ...

1) the stock of Lucent didn't "promptly start to tank" ... the fall was
quite some time later and unrelated to my division's performance

> Should we draw a corollary here? What happened to all those neat spread
> spectrum cordless phones Lucent was selling? Hey, they *were* pretty
> good-I even bought one a couple years ago and it really is a good one.
> But they have

But they have what? Lucent sold the division that makes the cordless
phones a while back ... I didn't build the phones, I designed the chipsets
that made them possible.

> So lets recap a bit here... You got an engineering job even though you
> have no engineering degree.

Yup been doing it for about 32 years ... my reputation in the industry
speaks for itself.

Yes my "school of hard knocks education" is non-traditional ... so
what? Bill Gates doesn't have a(n earned) degree either to the best
of my knowledge (nor do many others), but he's done pretty well
for himself. (I should do 1/100th as well :-) But I do well and I'm
happy.

> You couldn't be bothered to finish your own degree

No ... I didn't NEED to finish a formal degree, so I didn't waste
the time.

> but by
> gawd you're the most competent of the competent when it comes to passing
> judgment on those who did. Who did you know -or whatever- to fall into
> that one?

Knowledge, experience, and results count for a lot Dick ... that's how
I "got there" ... I didn't "fall into" anything ... I worked my ass off for
it.

> AAHHHH........ The minute he mentions his CW contact from last night he
> gets the "don't let the door hit you in the butt on your way out"
> treatment, regardless of what else he might be involved in. We know,
> Carl. You poor fella.

Don't be absurd, Dick ... I would never discriminate against a competent
applicant (or any ham in any way, for that matter) on the basis that he/she
was a CW user ... I have no problem with CW users ... except when they
insist on trying to force EVERYONE to be CW users.

Carl - wk3c

1102. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 05:15:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020410011503.10062.00000383@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 40371

In article <20020409220627.09489.00000355@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>
>A truck driver's job - what they are paid to do - is getting the vehicle from
>A to B safely and efficiently. The use of ham radio for to help get the
vehicle
>from A to B in a nonemergency by people being paid to do so MAY (heavy
>emphasis on the "may") cross the line of "pecuniary interest. I'm not sure.

Jim:

If it did, I'm sure, as I believe Bill Sohl has already noted, the FCC
would have been required to address that issue -- and I'm sure the
result of such action would be well known among radio amateurs,
if not specifically codified in Part 97. In over twenty years as a ham,
I've not heard any hint of such operation being anything other than
perfectly legal, if not affirmatively sanctioned and encouraged by
the FCC, which I'm sure it would be.

>>> > As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
>>> > activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
>>> > prove it to be illegal.
>>>
>>> This one's a bit sticky, since the business activity of a truck driver
>>> IS getting from origin to destination, and he/she IS "on the clock"
>>> while driving.

Not even close, Jim. Getting that truck *safely* and efficiently to it's
destination is definitely within limits of PICON. If the drivers were
using ham radio to coordinate the pickup of loads, negotiate fees,
or advertise their services, then *that* would be a violation of the
"no-business" rule. However, when they are simply taking advantage
of information related strictly to safe vehicle operation, then they
are perfectly OK. In fact, I've always believed it is a great failing
of amateur radio that there isn't a widespread network of ham
motorists and fixed-station operators specifically dedicated to this
task, as there is on the Citizen's Band. Considering the great
emphasis placed on public service in the ARS, I think we're missing
out on a golden opportunity to serve in such a capacity.

>>Ditto my last...but again, IF the conversation?QSO is only about traffic
>>conditions, why is it legal for you and I to discuss, but not a trucker
>>who might happen to be a ham? IF the subject itself is legal for
>>me, it should be legal for anyone with a ham license.
>

>OK, consider this:
>
>Suppose a ham decides to put up a tower and a bunch of locals show up on
>tower raising day to help out. Everyone brings amateur HTs to help coordinate
>the activity. The HTs are used extensively, saving lots of time and effort. Is
>this OK? Of course.

Apples to oranges, Jim.

>Now suppose some of the hams who helped out form a company and install radio
>towers commercially. Can they legally use their amateur HTs on the job for
>the same purpose as when erecting the ham tower for free? I don't think so.

Of course not. In that case, they should invest in some commercial HT's
which could serve the same purpose, but not on amateur frequencies.

>Even though it's the same purpose and the same people, in the first case they
>are a bunch of friends helping out a fellow amateur and in the second case
>it's a bunch of professionals doing a job.

Exactly, but this example doesn't relate too well to the issue of professional
drivers using amateur radio to give and receive traffic information,
directions,
or report accidents. All of the above serve not only the interest of that
particular driver, but the general public as well, since it is in the interest
of
the safe and efficient movement of traffic. I am sure that if the FCC were
required to specifically address this issue, that they would find it to be
completely within the Basis and Purpose of the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1103. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 05:15:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020410011504.10062.00000384@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 40366

In article <3cb390fc$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Ditto my last...but again, IF the conversation?QSO is only about traffic
>> conditions, why is it legal for you and I to discuss, but not a trucker
>> who might happen to be a ham? IF the subject itself is legal for
>> me, it should be legal for anyone with a ham license.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>>
>
>I shudder to mention that we've all been discussing "gray" areas, "bending"
>the rules, "ifs", and "whatifs," etc. I shudder twice to mention that it
>leads me to thinking that we are very defensive about our gray areas...
>
>'Nuff said
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports by
radio amateurs. Shudder all you want, but this is about as black &
white as any policy discussion we've had here. Traffic reporting is
a perfectly valid and legal amateur radio activity. End of Story. If
you think it is not, provide some convincing proof, or at least a valid
argument. So far, all you've done is to make yourself seem to be
totally unqualified to offer any opinion at all on this subject.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1104. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 05:15:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020410011506.10062.00000386@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 40369

In article <20020409064126.08001.00002606@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>Nice call sign, Carl -- sure would sound great in CW! You ought to
>>give it a try sometime...
>
>Hey, I asked him first! And he has given CW a try and concluded that he
>doesn't like it.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

OK, fair enough, then. I tried yakking into a microphone on HF, and decided I didn't like it, either. I found that it didn't provide any sort of intellectual challenge, and required a higher tolerance for boredom than I possess. Like ham radio in general, I guess it isn't for everyone -- and shouldn't have to be! However, I believe all radio amateurs should be familiar with our simplest, most practical, effective, efficient, and universal mode of communication -- Morse/CW. Like most people that don't "like" CW, I believe what Carl really doesn't like about it is the effort required to achieve a useful level of proficiency at it. Operating a PTT switch is, after all, much easier, and provides a higher level of instant gratification. That seems to be a common factor among those who have whined the loudest about the code testing requirements in the ARS...although they certainly can't, and won't, admit it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1105. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 05:15:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020410011506.10062.00000385@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 40374

In article <3cb39043_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Agreed, and
>> let me be VERY clear. If two or more hams are discussing
>> traffic conditions on the road, that is 100% legal. I can see
>> NO way the topic violates ANY rule in Part 97. I don't
>> care if two of the hams worked for the same company and
>> talked traffic all day...there's just nothing then that crosses
>> the line as to a violation.
>>
>
>And, that's your interpretation, Bill. I think different. I also don't
>like it. I think it cheapens ham radio.

And Kim should know all about things that "cheapen" ham radio,
right, W5TIT?

>This is pointed up by the fact
>that many people who are near enough to my equipment in the office and
>listen will respond to my "would you be interested in ham radio" with "why
>would I want to talk about traffic, the weather, and how sick I've been?"

Kim:

All of the above are perfectly legal and allowed topics of discussion
on amateur radio; the difference is that the traffic and WX discussion is
much more practical and useful than the daily Lumbago reports.

>> The "broadcast" to no one in particular probably is a gray area,
>> but unless it was done repeatedly (e.g. If I did such broadcasts
>> every day at 8am to no one at all), I'd doubt it would
>> even be noticed.

>It is. And I don't like to get myself into gray areas, either. Remember, I
>don't think I made any comment about reporting violations. I simply said I
>believe these types of conversations are stretching the rules. Gray areas
>are the test waters, and you probably know that.

There is nothing remotely "gray" about discussing traffic conditions
on an amateur radio repeater system. The fact that you think so only
demonstrates the fact that you are not qualified to make such judgements.

>Getting to work is not an emergency...unless, say, you were a doctor and
>someone's life depended on you getting through the traffic quickly. :)

Why would traffic information, relayed to people involved in routine commuting, be a "gray area" just because it isn't an "emergency?" Do you possess some weird notion that ham radio must be used strictly for "emergency" communications purposes? One of the best uses I can think of for our VHF/UHF privileges is to establish communications that serve practical purposes -- such as facilitating routine, daily commuting. Perhaps if this was done in a more widespread manner, there would be fewer "emergencies" on our highways! Or don't you think that preventing accidents and helping motorists to avoid delays serves your Ham Hero™ agenda?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1106. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 05:15:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020410011507.10062.00000387@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 40372

In article <20020409152445.04302.00000498@mb-bh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>Larry, you are NOT USING YOUR DEGREE...and WE all know
>exactly what you are talking about...yourself.

Lennie:

What is the problem you and Kim have with my not "using" my degree? Did I miss some fine print in some equally invisible social contract that once I was bestowed my Bachelor of Science Degree in Human Resources Management that I absolutely *had* to take a position as an HR specialist? If so, how do you explain all the other people in the world that are not actively employed in fields directly related to their educational credentials? Flying an airliner is a highly technical task, but I'm sure you'll find a lot of airline pilots who do not hold degrees in Aeronautical Engineering. Most Executive Chefs are college graduates in a variety of majors, but their primary duties have little, if any, direct correlation to what they learned while pursuing their degrees. In every instance, however, the benefits of a higher education exceed the simple learning of purely technical, job-related, task-specific material. My quality of life is much higher for having had the exposure to the humanities, sciences, and arts while pursuing my degree. I chose my particular major mainly because it made the best use of transfer credits; I entered Wilmington College as a junior instead of a Freshman or Sophomore as a result. I also took several additional courses on a purely elective basis, simply because I wanted to take them. If and when I go for a graduate degree, it may not have anything to do with HR, or even business in general. Heck -- the easiest Ph.D for me to get would be in Education! I could probably knock off an MSED with as little as another year's worth of night school courses!

So, you're absolutely right -- I am not "using" my degree, in the sense that I'm not making my living working as an HR specialist. Now -- please tell me how this makes me an inferior person? I'm sure you will enjoy doing so!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1107. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 05:15:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020410011508.10062.00000388@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 40370

In article <3cb38dde$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> > You say you don't want to upgrade because you don't think you can
>> > "use" your upgraded privileges. Don't look now, Kim, but that is the
>> > mindset of a loser.
>>
>> Is that why you have never upgraded to PhD?
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>>
>
>Better than that, he's never upgraded to a job that matches his degree.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

That's correct. And neither have millions of other college graduates.
Do you have the same opinion of people with Ph.D's who are out there
driving trucks for a living? Or MBA's that fly airliners? Or people with
law degrees who serve as police officers? or nearly any concievable
type of college graduate who, for a variety of reasons, does not actually
work in a field related to their major course of study? I also have an
Associate Degree in Liberal Arts, Kim -- but Heaven knows that I'm
not any kind of artist, and I'm nothing even close to a Liberal! (For
everyone else but Kim, that was a joke!) So go ahead and "chide"
me for not having a job that "matches" my degree, Kim -- because
it's nothing more than you making a fool of yourself in your own
unique manner!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1108. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 05:15:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020410011509.10062.00000390@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 40367

In article <3CB37EF7.B38EE848@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>But you can use such a machine as a tech, as you are transmitting on
>a frequency you are permitted (like 2 meters) and the machine
>(under the control of a general or extra or advanced) retransmits
>your voice onto 10 meters. Let me know if I got this
>wrong, but I can't violate this rule as I have an extra and can
>use any unused ham frequency appropriate for the mode
>I want to do (except that mini-band at 219-220 MHz which
>is for IIRC coordinated packet and digital work unless I set up
>a station after I get coordinated).

A peson with a Technician-class license can *use* a cross-band,
on the input frequency that falls within his license privileges. The
fact that it outputs on a band which exceeds his/her privileges does
not matter, since the operation of that repeater has to be under the
control of a higher class licensee authorized to transmit in that
region. However a Technician-class licensee could not be the
trustee of such a repeater, since the output would exceed his
privileges.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1109. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 05:15:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020410011509.10062.00000389@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 40368

In article <20020409061437.08013.00002311@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>Like it or not, the NTI -- if and when formed, would/will always be
>>seen as a logical extension of NCI, whether or not that is actually
>>true.
>
>It would not be seen as a logical extension of NCI by any of those associated
>with NCI that have posted here.
>
>It would be seen as a logical extension of NCI by those who do not care
>whether
>it is actually true or not. That DOES fit some posters here.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

As always, individual opinion will vary depending on individual experiences. When I hear of or see "NTI," I will always associate it with NCI. Perhaps my mistake was in not adding in a specifically-spelled out "IMHO" in my original post. However, I don't always do that, since ALL of my postings reflect my own personal opinion, in addition to simple facts.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1110. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 05:15:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020410011510.10062.00000391@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 40373

In article <20020409071923.08001.00002621@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>Don't look now, Ed, but the term "a dozen Elmers" was a figure of
>>speech. I only had one "Elmer" per se, and I ended up teaching her more
>>about ham radio than she taught me. She was, however, instrumental
>>in teaching me the code.
>
>Okay. How did Dick Van Dyke figure into this for you?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Very simply, he is a celebrity well known to me, whom I respect for his work in movies and television, and who made a PSA extolling the Amateur Radio Service. It is my understanding that he himself was an Extra-class ham, though I can't locate his name in the FCC data-base, most likely due to the fact that he is licensed under his "real" name, whatever that is. (I am not sure about the latter, I've been told that Dick Van Dyke is a stage name, but don't know how to verify this information.) That particular PSA always stayed in my mind, and made me think of amateur radio as a hobby which must be highly worthwhile, if a respected celebrity like Mr. Van Dyke was promoting it. I have no doubt that present-day ham celebrities could have the same impact on prospective amateurs.

I honestly believe that promotion of the ARS by well-known celebrity hams could go a long way toward attracting the kind of people we seek to become involved in this hobby/service. Most teen-agers these days have very little, if any, knowledge and understand of what ham radio is all about. Why not seek the assistance of the celebrities they know and admire to "sell" them on the concept of ham radio?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1111. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:25:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410032530.16876.00002894@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40375

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> That's more on the line of "The end of r.r.a.p. :-) :-)

>ROFL! Sounds like a good thread to start!

I know far more hams who used to participate in rrap than who still do today.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1112. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:26:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410032656.16876.00002896@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40376

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> > What I've seen of ARRL HQ strongly suggests that by the time they wake
>> >up and realize it's time for action it's aleady too late to cure the
>> >situation that should have created some panic.

>> Can you provide enough examples of ARRL HQ staff not recognizing problems
>> then taking action too late to do any good to justify your use of "strongly
>> suggests?"

> Going 'way back there, it would take a book. I don't have time to write
>it and you don't have time to read it.

I didn't think you would be able -- or willing -- to back up your wild claim.
That would take a bit of work.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>
>
>
>
>

1113. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:28:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410032803.16876.00002897@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40377

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>I know that Ed could,
>though of course he'd never let on.

Another conspiracy theory heard from...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1114. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:31:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410033138.16876.00002899@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40378

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>Er, Len ... I am a manager ... a senior level one at that.
>>Most of the people I've interviewed and recommended
>>for hire in the past 5-10 years have had at least a MSEE,
>>most a PhD in EE, and a number of years of experience
>>(I have to be VERY impressed to be willing to undertake
>>to train a "fresh-out," though I have done so on occasion
>> ... I tend to let someone else break them in first :-)

>Yes, yes. I was making a little comment about OTHERS
>in here, launching off your convenient message pad. :-)

I would require any engineers I hire to be experienced hams. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1115. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:34:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410033431.16876.00002901@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40379

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> KA1CVV told me that he will probably take KA1CV when he upgrades.

>Ed, now that you've broadcast it, someone will spend a few bucks and take
>it.

Fine by me. I will want to have a QSO with the new holder, though, just for the
eerie feeling. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1116. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:38:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410033843.16876.00002902@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40380

kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

> Obviously
>television and broadcast am/fm radio would be exempt because that is a
>one-way transmission.

Certain types of one-way transmissions are permitted to Amateur Radio
operators.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1117. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:42:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410034206.16876.00002903@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40381

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>>Like it or not, the NTI -- if and when formed, would/will always be
>>>seen as a logical extension of NCI, whether or not that is actually
>>>true.

>When I hear of or see "NTI," I will always associate it with NCI.

Yes, but at least you do admit that it may may not actually be true. You are welcome to hold beliefs you are not certain are true, if you wish, but you look a bit foolish in the process.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1118. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:47:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410034701.16876.00002904@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40382

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I honestly believe that promotion of the ARS by well-known celebrity
>hams could go a long way toward attracting the kind of people we
>seek to become involved in this hobby/service.

Fair enough. What do you think is wrong with the present ARRL PSAs?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1119. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part One

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:52:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410035215.16876.00002905@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40383

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>However, in spite of a "minority position" within amateur
>radio, the ARRL seems to have this quasi-governmental function in that FCC
>minions turn to it, in large part, to act as a mediator, organizer and
>enforcer with amateur operators in general. It's all a bit strange, in some
>ways, as has been pointed out from time to time.

That is often because ARRL is willing to step up to the plate and do the work. In the case of power-line interference, ARRL has a cooperative agreement with the FCC that the League will try to resolve power-line cases directly with the power companies before asking the FCC to get involved. That has been about 60% effective so far. And if the Commission does have to get involved, the ground work has been done, and the letter to the utility CEO can be easily drafted.

Nothing strange about it at all, if you give it more than a cursory glance.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1120. FCC Requires Positioning Coordinates?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:57:35 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <PfSs8.2739$T_7.1192280264@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40384

I don't know how many of you go to www.QRZ.com, but when you lookup a callsign in their database, it indicates coordinates of the location. Does anyone know how they figure what these coordinates are and how accurate. I'm wondering if the FCC requires or mandates it, or if QRZ just adds it based on the address of the applicant.

Lars

1121. Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 07:59:50 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <WhSs8.2740$Tg.1193133161@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40385

Does anyone know what additional capabilities or privileges a "Tech Plus" or "Advanced" license holder has compared to "Technician"?

Lars

1122. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part Two

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 08:00:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410040038.16876.00002906@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40386

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>And so, in partial response to an intensification of
>several old political problems, the ARRL has cranked up the "Big Project,"
>its very name signifying its importance, at least to some.

The name of the project is "THE ARRL Amateur Radio Education Project." When ARRL President Jim Haynie first started talking about this with the ARRL Board, the project didn't have a name. But by the scope of what it grew into, the Board started calling it "the Big Project" among themselves. When the formal name was adopted, the Big Project just wouldn't go away. It has a nice ring to it.

http://www.arrl.org/FandES/tbp/

>But it's really about the ARRL, and an increase in its influence in
>Washington, and not about "education," or "technology" or "the public" or
>even "amateur radio."

Uh, Val, ARRL *is* about Amateur Radio. You are seeing the Devil behind every bush!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1123. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part Two

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 09:27:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410052723.00696.00002544@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 40387

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>But it's really about the ARRL, and an increase in its influence in
>Washington, and not about "education," or "technology" or "the public" or
>even "amateur radio."

I am curious, Val, on what basis were you able to determine the motives of the ARRL Board of Directors in setting up the Big Project? If you can share your secret for such mind reading, please do. Many of us would find it to be a valuable tool.

As my grammar-school teacher used to say, "Show your work." You have made a pretty bold and sweeping statement there, Val; can you provide the justification for same? Something other than "It could be the reason, so it must be" would be required for a paper to pass peer review in the academic circles...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1124. Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 10:15:51 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <rhUs8.2760$zx.1226976328@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40388

Are amateur radio operators allowed to encrypt or encode if it is data that is being transmitted?

Lars

1125. Re: Insurance claim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 11:03:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410070359.26511.00000091@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 40389

In article <RTns8.1100$3P4.80297@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>An incredibly unlucky man was in a strange accident,

(rest snipped)

See:

http://groups.google.com/groups?q=n2ey+paddy+bricks&hl=en&selm=20000621214223.17424.00003874%40nso-fg.aol.com&rnum=1

or

http://paul.merton.ox.ac.uk/work/bricklayer-song.html

and also:

http://www.snopes.com/humor/letters/bricks.htm

The song goes back to at least 1958 and the basic story to at least 1937 (if not earlier).

73 de Jim, N2EY

1126. Re: FCC Requires Positioning Coordinates?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 11:04:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410070401.26511.00000093@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 40390

In article <PfSs8.2739$T_7.1192280264@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>, "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> writes:

>I don't know how many of you go to www.QRZ.com, but when you lookup a
>callsign in their database, it indicates coordinates of the location. Does
>anyone know how they figure what these coordinates are and how accurate.
>I'm wondering if the FCC requires or mandates it, or if QRZ just adds it
>based on the address of the applicant.
>
They figure out the coordinates based on the supplied mailing address. You don;t have to supply them.

I think that

http://www.mapquest.com

will do the job for you if you supply an address. Mapquest also has aerila photos of many locations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1127. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 11:04:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410070401.26511.00000092@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 40391

In article <20020410011503.10062.00000383@mb-cu.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20020409220627.09489.00000355@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>
>>A truck driver's job - what they are paid to do - is getting the vehicle
>from
>>A to B safely and efficiently. The use of ham radio for to help get the
>vehicle
>>from A to B in a nonemergency by people being paid to do so MAY (heavy
>>emphasis on the "may") cross the line of "pecuniary interest. I'm not sure.
>
>Jim:
>
>If it did, I'm sure, as I believe Bill Sohl has already noted, the FCC
>would have been required to address that issue -- and I'm sure the
>result of such action would be well known among radio amateurs,
>if not specifically codified in Part 97. In over twenty years as a ham,
>I've not heard any hint of such operation being anything other than
>perfectly legal, if not affirmatively sanctioned and encouraged by
>the FCC, which I'm sure it would be.

Larry:

The fact that the FCC has not done any enforcement against hams isn't a
proof of anything. FCC hasn't done near enough enforcement for many years,
and Riley & Co. have much bigger fish to fry.

However, I'm pretty sure that FCC has never had anything negative to say
about amateurs doing traffic reporting to each other.

Thus the heavy emphasis on "may".
>
>>>> > As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
>>>> > activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
>>>> > prove it to be illegal.
>>>>
>>>> This one's a bit sticky, since the business activity of a truck driver
>>>> IS getting from origin to destination, and he/she IS "on the clock"
>>>> while driving.
>
>Not even close, Jim. Getting that truck *safely* and efficiently to it's
>destination is definitely within limits of PICON. If the drivers were
>using ham radio to coordinate the pickup of loads, negotiate fees,

>or advertise their services, then *that* would be a violation of the
>"no-business" rule. However, when they are simply taking advantage
>of information related strictly to safe vehicle operation, then they
>are perfectly OK.

Interesting concept. There are also the issues of less wasted fuel, less
pollution,
less congestion and increased safety brought about by drivers having traffic
information.
(All of these are good things).

>In fact, I've always believed it is a great failing
>of amateur radio that there isn't a widespread network of ham
>motorists and fixed-station operators specifically dedicated to this
>task, as there is on the Citizen's Band. Considering the great
>emphasis placed on public service in the ARS, I think we're missing
>out on a golden opportunity to serve in such a capacity.

Another interesting point.

I recall a time a few years ago when I was picking up a friend from the car
dealership where his
vehicle was being serviced. Normally we'd take the "Blue Route" (I-476) north,
but it appeared to be jammed
northbound when I was on it southbound on the way to dealership. Was it still
clogged? I got on the repeater
(either 147.195 or 147.36), joined the conversation in progress and asked. Sure
enough, there was a ham
stuck in traffic on that very road, and we avoided a lot of wasted time and
fuel by taking another route.

All of this was done courteously and with proper ID of all stations.

My passenger was very impressed by the whole exchange and the quality of
operating displayed by the folks
on the repeater.
>
>>>Ditto my last...but again, IF the conversation?QSO is only about traffic
>>>conditions, why is it legal for you and I to discuss, but not a trucker
>>>who might happen to be a ham? IF the subject itself is legal for
>>>me, it should be legal for anyone with a ham license.
>>
>>OK, consider this:
>>
>>Suppose a ham decides to put up a tower and a bunch of locals show up on
>>tower raising day to help out. Everyone brings amateur HTs to help
>coordinate
>>the activity. The HTs are used extensively, saving lots of time and effort.
>Is
>>this OK? Of course.
>
>Apples to oranges, Jim.

>
>>Now suppose some of the hams who helped out form a company and install radio
>>towers commercially. Can they legally use their amateur HTs on the job for
>>the same purpose as when erecting the ham tower for free? I don't think so.
>
>Of course not. In that case, they should invest in some commercial HT's
>which could serve the same purpose, but not on amateur frequencies.

That's my point.
>
>>Even though it's the same purpose and the same people, in the first case
>they
>>are a bunch of friends helping out a fellow amateur and in the second case
>>it's a bunch of professionals doing a job.
>
>Exactly, but this example doesn't relate too well to the issue of
>professional
>drivers using amateur radio to give and receive traffic information,
>directions,
>or report accidents. All of the above serve not only the interest of that
>particular driver, but the general public as well, since it is in the
>interest
>of
>the safe and efficient movement of traffic.

Ah - the tower folks benefit only themselves, while the truckers/drivers
benefit anyone willing
to listen. An important distinction.

>I am sure that if the FCC were
>required to specifically address this issue, that they would find it to be
>completely within the Basis and Purpose of the ARS.
>
Several years back, FCC issued some clarifications about various uses of
amateur radio that some
might consider "pecuniary", such as the classic "can I order a takeout pizza
via the autopatch?".

FCC said most of them were OK.

Anybody want to look up thoise rulings?
>
>

1128. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 12:09:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB42B8C.B08F0C92@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40392

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Like most people that don't "like" CW, I believe what Carl really
> doesn't like about it is the effort required to achieve a useful level
> of proficiency at it.

Carl, no doubt, doesn't believe that a useful level of CW
proficiency is worth the effort *for him*. You believe it
was worth the effort *for you*. That is as it should be.

Do you use the same approach to sex with your girlfriend as
you use to Morse code in the ARS? Do you advocate a sexual
requirement because she *might* enjoy it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1129. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 12:12:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB42C40.C9F56B24@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40393

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> > You say you don't want to upgrade because you don't think you can
> >> > "use" your upgraded privileges. Don't look now, Kim, but that is the
> >> > mindset of a loser.
> >>
> >> Is that why you have never upgraded to PhD?
> >
> >Better than that, he's never upgraded to a job that matches his degree.
>
> That's correct. And neither have millions of other college graduates.

Kim not upgrading her ham license is like you not upgrading your college
degree, Larry. You can't have it both ways.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1130. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 12:19:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB42DE2.1872B76E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40395

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:
> >Okay. How did Dick Van Dyke figure into this for you?
>
> Very simply, he is a celebrity well known to me, whom I respect for
> his work in movies and television, ...

Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
amateur radio?

> (I am not sure about the latter, I've been
> told that Dick Van Dyke is a stage name, but don't know how to
> verify this information.)

His brother is Jerry Van Dyke. Is that also a stage name?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1131. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 12:30:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB4307C.2D6D2AFB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40394

Lars121 wrote:
> Are amateur radio operators allowed to encrypt or encode if it is data that
> is being transmitted?

Encryption for the purpose of hiding something is prohibited. Encoding
is allowed if the code being used is published and is in the public
domain or if the encoding/decoding hardware/software is readily available.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1132. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 12:38:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204100438.2f2483dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40396

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020410011510.10062.00000391@mb-cu.aol.com>...
> In article <20020409071923.08001.00002621@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>

> It is my understanding that he himself was
> an Extra-class ham, though I can't locate his name in the FCC data-
> base, most likely due to the fact that he is licensed under his "real"
> name, whatever that is. (I am not sure about the latter, I've been
> told that Dick Van Dyke is a stage name, but don't know how to
> verify this information.)

Dick Van Dyke's "birth name" is Richard Wayne Van Dyke

(source: http://www.imdb.com)

> That particular PSA always stayed in my
> mind, and made me think of amateur radio as a hobby which must
> be highly worthwhile, if a respected celebrity like Mr. Van Dyke was
> promoting it. I have no doubt that present-day ham celebrities could
> have the same impact on prospective amateurs.

Exactly. "Image" and first impressions play a big role.
>
> I honestly believe that promotion of the ARS by well-known celebrity
> hams could go a long way toward attracting the kind of people we
> seek to become involved in this hobby/service. Most teen-agers these
> days have very little, if any, knowledge and understand of what ham
> radio is all about. Why not seek the assistance of the celebrities they
> know and admire to "sell" them on the concept of ham radio?

I agree 100%.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1133. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 12:57:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB4369E.35118F8F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40397

N2EY wrote:
> - 30% growth from 1980 to 1990 (all US hams code tested)
> - 34% growth from 1990 to 2000 (most US hams code tested)
> - 34% minus 30% equals 4%

The nocode tech population grew from 0% of the ARS in 1990
to about 30% of the ARS in 2000. It is foolish to attribute
only 4% of the change in growth to nocode techs. It is also
foolish to maintain that 4% value would not have gone negative
without the nocode techs. If the nocode techs had not
existed, where would the 30% growth have come from to
keep the change in growth from going negative?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1134. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 13:24:24 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB43D09.7845E5B9@psu.edu>
Source record: 40398

I think maybe the ulterior motive on some peoples part here is that if enough idiots who know nothing about rf safety get on the air, they will accidentally remove themselves from the gene pool? 8^)

I'm pretty surprised that some hams seem to have such a underlying hatred for their hobby.

- Mike - KB3EIA

Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> Geeze, if it's gonna be that easy, would you care to donate to the
> M for M fund? Otherwise known as NNI (no nothin' international).
> M for M stands for 'Money for Me'. Seriously, I can understand the
> non-necessity for Morse; that said, I will state that some testing and
> knowlege is necessary. We don't need shoot-outs (where we power up
> multiple tens of kilowatts and shoot-out the gonads). We need people
> with some basic concept of dc, ac, and rf. We need people who have at
> least a basic understanding of what is meant by 'tuning' - whether an
> antenna or a pi network (or L network or whatever). That said, I'm
> still interested if you would care to donate to the M for M fund ...

1135. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:00:41 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB4458A.69EDD53F@psu.edu>
Source record: 40399

No wonder people leave! The lifetime of a thread here is usually about five replies. After that, it tends to taken over by the "personalities" and then degenerates into an insult fest. If not that, it becomes a matter of picking at insignificant portions of a post to score some arcane "point". It ends up that the group is more about some person than about amateur policy.

Of course, a person is free to leave if they don't like it. Of course, that ends up leaving just the "mud wrestlers" in the group. Eventually, the group can become irrelevant.

- Mike KB3EIA -

W1RFI wrote:

> I know far more hams who used to participate in rrap than who still do today.

1136. Re: Re-Positioning Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:08:29 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB4475E.74E86EA1@psu.edu>
Source record: 40403

Reminds me of the old Lennie Bruce routine about how that statement should be considered a positive thing. If she was mad at you, she should have prefaced that statement with a dahdit dahdahdah ! 8^)

- mike KB3EIA -

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > It would take a mutant to swear using CW and include
> > the swearing emotions.
>
> Sunuvugun! Somebody once distinctly sent "dididahdit dididah dahdidahdit
> dahdidah dahdidahdah dahdahdah dididah" to me on CW. Do you think maybe
> she was trying to be romantic?
>
> dit dit, de Hans, K0HB

1137. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:13:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a91h9u$1bp$0@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 40400

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> \
> >Getting to work is not an emergency...unless, say, you were a doctor and
> >someone's life depended on you getting through the traffic quickly. :)
>
> Why would traffic information, relayed to people involved in routine
> commuting, be a "gray area" just because it isn't an "emergency?" Do
> you possess some weird notion that ham radio must be used strictly
> for "emergency" communications purposes?

Isn't this just special? She thinks that because ham radio is useful
for emergencies it supposed to be reserved solely for them. Neat!

1138. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:13:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410101321.19127.00003252@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40401

>Subject: Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/09/02 15:46 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020409154614.27329.00000441@mb-bd.aol.com>

>Well, the legends exist among those who've never been IN
>the industry...including those on the periphery (such as
>purchasing agents and personnel-trained folks). I've done
>my share of getting the interview buck passed to me to do
>the potential-new-hire second interviews

I think you meant that the buck was passed when it came to YOUR second
interview.

And who's the purchasing agent, Lennie?

Steve

1139. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:15:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410101500.19127.00003253@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40402

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/09/02 15:24 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020409152444.04302.00000497@mb-bh.aol.com>

>
>I disagree. "WIFE" is not annoying to me, but a delight.

YOUR wife...???

>CODE is an annoying four-letter word.

Only to the lazy or incapable.

1140. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:17:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410101735.19127.00003254@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40404

>Subject: Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/09/02 15:24 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020409152449.04302.00000504@mb-bh.aol.com>

>On-off keying is comparable to black and white, the "color"
>rather gone and only in the virtual reality of the telegrapher's
>head.

Or more appropriately, the lack of imagination in the head of someone who know's NOT what he speaks of.

Like...LENNIE!

BTW, Lennie, still waiting on your answer on WHAT radio service is "strictly recreational"...

1141. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:20:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a91hmp$29v$0@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 40405

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >I know that Ed could,
> >though of course he'd never let on.
>
> Another conspiracy theory heard from...

So it *has* to be a conspiricy if you know of internal ARRL malfeasances but don't wish to acknowledge it. Right. And if you don't know of any, that means you don't pay much attention.

1142. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:20:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a91hob$29v$1@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 40406

mike coslo wrote:
>
> No wonder people leave! The lifetime of a thread here is usually about
> five replies. After that, it tends to taken over by the "personalities"
> and then degenerates into an insult fest. If not that, it becomes a
> matter of picking at insignificant portions of a post to score some
> arcane "point". It ends up that the group is more about some person than
> about amateur policy.

In short, Cecil drives them off.....

1143. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:21:57 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB44A86.C227F81E@psu.edu>
Source record: 40407

Have you ever tried PSK31, Kim? Inasmuch as you are a regular
contributor here, I suspect you might like the mode. And that is a
pretty good reason to upgrade. 20 meter PSK is great fun, and you can
type around the world on a few watts.

There is of course, no rule that a person has to upgrade. But I have to
agree with Larry that doing it just to prove to yourself you can is a
fine motivation. That's a large reason why I moved beyond Technician.

Call it a friendly dare if you like!!!!! ;^)

- mike KB3EIA -

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> You say you don't want to upgrade because you don't think you can
> "use" your upgraded privileges. Don't look now, Kim, but that is the
> mindset of a loser. During the time when I was responsible for
> developing the future enlisted leaders of the Air Force, I've faced that
> same mindset many times, and have had considerable success in
> dispelling it. I would encourage you to do so as well. Whether you
> think you can do it or not, you're right. And I think you *can* do it.
> And the best reason to do it is to prove that you can do it. That's why
> I got my college degree at a great sacrifice of leisure and time spent
> in more "profitable" pursuits. It was something I wanted to do for
> the sake of getting it done. Now, it is something that cannot be
> taken away from me. Perhaps getting your Extra would be the start
> of your own epiphany -- one which could lead you to greater
> achievements in your life.

1144. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:30:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410103010.19127.00003257@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40408

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/09/02 15:24 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020409152443.04302.00000496@mb-bh.aol.com>

>To any but those into strong sado-masochism, the above is another
>way of defining a recreational hobby. HOBBY. Recreation.

Lennie..."strictly recerational" were YOUR words.

NO radio service exisits in the United States for "strictly recreational"
purposes. NONE.

>Wrapping oneself in patriotic bunting and shouting "service!" as
>the "real reason" for engaging in such an activity is delusional.

You DO have a problem with anything patriotic, don't you, Lennie? I am
begining to doubt your status as a veteran of the United States Armed Forces.
At least as an HONORABLE veteran, anyway.

Guess that come from being ashamed of having never done anything of
consequence while in the Army.

>In Part 95, Title 47 CFR, there are no strict connotations on NOT
>being recreational in GMRS, FRS, CB, or R/C radio services
>but to deny their primary aspect as being recreational is also
>delusional. They were all created for individual citizens for their
>personal use and not as any "service" aspect. Public safety
>radio services are covered under Part 90, Title 47 CFR.

NONE of the radio services presently codified in 47CFR or any chapter of
NTIA are for "strictly recreational" services.

You have yet to correct your error, Lennie. Do you intend to correct it?

1145. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:40:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410104047.19127.00003262@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40409

>Subject: Re: Birthplace of NTI
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/09/02 15:24 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020409152450.04302.00000505@mb-bh.aol.com>

>Hans Brakob and I had a long-ago lengthy exchange where he
>implied that morse code ability would "help" those with strokes or
>similar disabilities regarding personal communication.

Already been done. A paper was done many years ago on using Morse Code by Handi-Hams.

>My mother was then in a nursing home, a victim of too many TIAs.

You bandy-about medical terms as loosely as you do your "knowledge" of the purpose of various radio services.

>I challenged him on being able to teach a stroke victim a new
>(and non-natural) method of personal communications but no
>viable answers were forthcoming, only vague generalities.

Hans is a rehabilitative specialist? He was supposed ot have all the answers?

He's NOT a health care professional, to the best of my knowledge....

On the OTHER hand, YOU purport to be a professioanl in radiocommunications matters, yet can't tell me what FCC regulation specifically creates radio services for "strictly recreational" purposes, despite having made the assertion that such exisits.

> I can't find NSI anyplace on the Web. It must have failed.

Try looking in the same place that "Ham Radio" keeps' it's website, Lennie. It failed too.

1146. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 14:53:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410105337.19127.00003266@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40415

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/09/02 15:24 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020409152443.04302.00000495@mb-bh.aol.com>

>Been to Burbank, California, and at that particular major street
>intersection? I don't think so. Feel free to describe it and we
>will all test your memory, lack of memory, or untruthfulness.

Been to that store, Lennie. I can no more reacll all the details of the
intersection as you can recall the radar test target at NADC...Or do you want
your nose rubbed in THAT again?

>It was also convenient to examine the LCDs of various
>manufacturers in the presence of incident daylight for another
>purpose; Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom, and Alinco all have different forms
>of backlighting on their LCDs.

And I asked you WHY you'd have such an interest? You have no license to
operate any of that equipment except to passively receive, and have voiced a
steadfast intent to REMAIN a loser...I mean unlicensed...

>In the usual sado-masochism exhibited by the monkey boy, birthday
>parties and ham radio are not enjoyable activities.

Not if you were there. I can't imagine any group of people I'D enjoy
associating with that would ALSO associate with you.

>> And this comparison was for what..??? You doing research for "Consumer
>>Reports" now?
>
>No. For another purpose.

Well gee-whilikers, Lennie...This VERY day you harrangued Hans (in another
thread) about "vague generalities" about an idea he had but only offered the
same "vague generalities" about how to do it.

YOU are asked a specific question about RADIOS, a topic of which you claim
some initmate knowledge, and all YOU can provide is "vague generalities".

SAME two-faced BS as always, I see.

>Absolutely. Obsessive-compulsive behavior is easy to spot.

Like forcing your opinion on a USENET group involved in the pursuit of an
"avocation" in which you have NO initmate concern?

For YEARS...???

>I'm not the one suffering delusions nor engaged in obsessive-
>compulsive activities.

Neither am I.

>Unclench the fist or break the jar. Your choice.

Neither. I stay in your face as long as you misrepresent the truth and denigrate Amateur Radio. Unless you rather I berak it over your head?

1147. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 15:00:08 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <YrYs8.4977$3P4.438649@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40416

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote

> Does anyone know what additional capabilities or privileges a "Tech Plus"
or
> "Advanced" license holder has compared to "Technician"?

Those licenses are no longer issued. (Current holders can continue to
renew.)

Tech+ holders some limited privileges on HF which are not available to
Technicians.

Advanced holders (without going into detail) have greater privileges
than General class, but less than Extra class.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1148. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 15:11:11 UTC
From: "Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.com>
Message-ID: <3CB45634.50103@dioxine.com>
Source record: 40417

I actually think the FCC would permit the use of encryption
where the intention is to obscure information which is not
the content of the message. What I mean is, if one were to
send signed messages, where the signature is a hash digest of
the message (and thus is a derivative of the clear-text content)
that had been encrypted. In fact, I discussed this exact
topic with a relevant well-known FCC staffer and he alluded to
this conclusion.

Dana K6JQ
dana@dioxine.com

CAM wrote:

> Lars121 wrote:
>
>>Are amateur radio operators allowed to encrypt or encode if it is data that
>>is being transmitted?
>>
>
> Encryption for the purpose of hiding something is prohibited. Encoding
> is allowed if the code being used is published and is in the public
> domain or if the encoding/decoding hardware/software is readily available.
>

1149. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 15:14:26 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <mFYs8.4991$3P4.439122@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40418

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
> facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports by
> radio amateurs.

I agree, so long as those traffic reports are on amateur frequencies.

If memory serves, Riley just recently shut somebody down who was
coordinating a network of amateurs gathering traffic reports and
airing the information on another medium.

Of course the violation was *not* that they were gathering the info
on the ham bands, but rather the commercial reporting of that
info on another radio service.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1150. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 15:25:16 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <wPYs8.5006$3P4.441819@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40419

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Eventually, the group can become irrelevant.

I've tried to use rrap to remind people that they owe me a QSL card. So far
I'm batting .000

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1151. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 16:03:12 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <4nZs8.5059$3P4.446933@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40420

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Rather than the demise of "amateur" radiomen, perhaps we are seeing the
demise of "professional" radiomen.

The US Navy fleets now operate without the following enlisted ratings:

Pigeon Trainer
Sail Maker
Stoker
Radioman

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1152. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 16:11:46 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <6vZs8.16334$Rw2.1284351@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40421

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:WhSs8.2740$Tg.1193133161@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> Does anyone know what additional capabilities or privileges a "Tech
Plus" or
> "Advanced" license holder has compared to "Technician"?
>
> Lars
>
>

The Tech PLus itself is no longer issued but you can get the privleges
simply by passing the code test. It adds CW in four bands and phone at
28.3-28.5 200 watts.

1153. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 17:55:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB47C88.C5933F10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40422

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So it *has* to be a conspiricy if you know of internal ARRL
> malfeasances but don't wish to acknowledge it.

Uhhhhhhh Dick, "malfeasance" is a legal term. It is impossible for ARRL
employees to commit malfeasance since they are not "public officials"
and therefore cannot violate the public trust. The ARRL is not sponsored
by the government. Nobody is forcing anyone to join or to remain a member.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1154. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 17:57:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB47CF3.B994CED8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40423

Dick Carroll wrote:
> In short, Cecil drives them off.....

I don't know of anybody whom I have driven off, Dick. You, OTOH, ...
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1155. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 18:00:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB47DC3.3E18AD21@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40424

"Dana H. Myers" wrote:
> I actually think the FCC would permit the use of encryption
> where the intention is to obscure information which is not
> the content of the message.

Such as the control signals for a repeater.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1156. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 18:02:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB47E29.A7975D9E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40425

K0HB wrote:
> I've tried to use rrap to remind people that they owe me a QSL card. So far
> I'm batting .000

You're tops on my list to receive my first one, Hans.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1157. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 18:06:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410140655.26511.00000109@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 40426

In article <3CB4369E.35118F8F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

Two responses to the same post, Cecil. You must be desperate.

>N2EY wrote:
>> - 30% growth from 1980 to 1990 (all US hams code tested)
>> - 34% growth from 1990 to 2000 (most US hams code tested)
>> - 34% minus 30% equals 4%
>
>The nocode tech population grew from 0% of the ARS in 1990
>to about 30% of the ARS in 2000.

Yes, the percentage of US hams holding Technician licenses at the end of 2000 was about 30%. Nobody denies that.

An unknown number of them are/were codetested.

All US hams were codetested before February of 1991.

>It is foolish to attribute
>only 4% of the change in growth to nocode techs.

Nobody claims that. The change in growth between the 80s and the 90s was 4%. 4% of 4% is 0.16%.

>It is also
>foolish to maintain that 4% value would not have gone negative
>without the nocode techs.

Why? You do not know what would have happened if the FCC had not changed the rules in 1991.

>If the nocode techs had not
>existed, where would the 30% growth have come from to
>keep the change in growth from going negative?

The same place the 30% growth came from in the 1980s.

The facts are simple:

1) The ARS in the USA had growth before the 1991 dropping of the code test for a Tech license.

2) The ARS in the USA had growth after the 1991 dropping of the code test for a Tech license.

3) The growth in the 90s (34%) was 4% more than the growth in the 80s. (30%)

4) Some hams whose licenses say "Technician" are codetested.

5) Predictions of negative growth in the US ARS have all turned out to be false for at least the past 35 years - back to the early days of "incentive licensing"

Is any of the above not true? If not, why can't you accept the simple truth, Cecil?

You appear to keep making two mistakes, Cecil:

1) You assume that all Techs are not code tested

2) You assume that none, or very few, of the hams who got Tech licenses without a code test would have gotten a ham license if the code test had not been ropped for that license in 1991.

Neither of the above is true.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1158. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 18:18:06 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <yl%s8.3059$f52.1332027412@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40427

The FCC permits remote programming of repeater parameters? What types of parameters could be changed this way, and I wonder how the FCC could enforce this because they would not be able to determine what the signal contained.....

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3CB47DC3.3E18AD21@IEEE.org...
> "Dana H. Myers" wrote:
> > I actually think the FCC would permit the use of encryption
> > where the intention is to obscure information which is not
> > the content of the message.
>
> Such as the control signals for a repeater.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1159. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 18:54:00 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <cT%s8.5417$3P4.467663@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40428

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote

> The FCC permits remote programming of repeater parameters? What types of
> parameters could be changed this way, and I wonder how the FCC could
enforce
> this because they would not be able to determine what the signal
> contained.....

So long as the repeater operates within the rules, FCC has no interest in
the parameters, and they may be changed at will by the control operator.

I am trustee for 4 repeaters at two clubs. We have control signals for a
variety of parameters, i.e..,

Power level
Autopatch on/off/speed-dial only
AC power/DC power
CPU reset
Reverse patch on/off
ID mode
PL on/off
Links on/off
Voter priority
Announcements on/off
Announcement selection
Timeout timer length
Timer over-ride
Squelch level
Memory data burst dump
Courtesy tone/message selection
Transmitter disable

etc., etc.....

These control signals are numeric and password protected, with the meanings
known only to our designated control operators. The FCC has no knowledge of
the meaning of those codes.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1160. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 18:56:57 UTC
From: AC6V <ac6v@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <3CB48AFC.AADA48FA@amsat.org>
Source record: 40429

If you have Technician class license and you pass the 5WPM code test --
additional priviledges are:
CW priviliges on 80, 40, and 15 meter bands using CW, and on the
10 meter band using CW, voice, and digital modes.

80 meters -- 3.675-3.725 MHz: CW Only
40 meters-- 7.100-7.150 MHz: CW Only
15 Meters -- 21.100-21.200 MHz: CW Only
10 Meters -- 28.100-28.300 MHz: CW, RTTY/Data--Maximum power 200 watts PEP
10 Meters --- 28.300-28.500 MHz: CW, Phone--Maximum power 200 watts PEP

At all times, transmitter power must be the minimum necessary to carry out
the desired
communications. Unless otherwise noted, the maximum power output is 1500
watts
PEP. All classes are limited to 200 watts PEP in the 80, 40, and 15 meter
Novice/Technician Plus subbands.

These are right from the ARRL pages --- URL:
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/allocate.html#80

So if you take issue with the above -- argue with the ARRL. Many take issue
with sending CW on the so-called
28.300 to 28.500 "Phone Band" but it is perfectly legal although not
customary.

73 From AC6V, Rod In Oceanside, CA
I doubt, therefore I might be!

AC6V Mega Ham Index at http://ac6v.com
AC6V Book For DXers at http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

> "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
> news:WhSs8.2740$Tg.1193133161@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> > Does anyone know what additional capabilities or privileges a "Tech
> Plus" or
> > "Advanced" license holder has compared to "Technician"?
> >
> > Lars

1161. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 19:55:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB498AE.EA8AA29D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40430

N2EY wrote:
> >It is foolish to attribute
> >only 4% of the change in growth to nocode techs.
>
> Nobody claims that.

Huh? Are you denying that you claimed that? I can dig up that posting of yours if you want me to. If you are not attributing only 4% of the change in growth to nocode techs, then the change in growth would have surely been negative without the nocode techs, but you have already denied that possibility.

> >It is also
> >foolish to maintain that 4% value would not have gone negative
> >without the nocode techs.
>
> Why? You do not know what would have happened if the FCC had not changed the
> rules in 1991.

This is claiming essentially the same thing that you denied before. Let me say it again. The nocode tech population grew from zero percent to approximately 30% from 1990 to 2000. If the nocode tech license had not existed, the rate of growth (i.e. the second derivative of the population) of the ARS would have been negative. A second derivative of the population going negative is a red flag for people who track populations of endangered species indicating that the population is in trouble.

> >If the nocode techs had not
> >existed, where would the 30% growth have come from to
> >keep the change in growth from going negative?
>
> The same place the 30% growth came from in the 1980s.

If 30% growth in coded hams had happened, the overall growth would have been 60%. In fact, it didn't happen at all.

> The facts are simple:

That's nice, but you are not discussing the issue. Why can't you accept the simple truth that the sun will rise tomorrow? See, I can do it too.

> You appear to keep making two mistakes, Cecil:
>
> 1) You assume that all Techs are not code tested

Nope, I'm not assuming that. "All" invariably means false. I am assuming that the large majority of nocode techs are not code tested. Do you have any proof

to the contrary? Does a small amount of uncertainty cause your brain to
cease functioning?

If you want, go back to your posted 1997 figures when nocode techs were NOT
code tested. 27% of hams were nocode techs. Didn't think of that, did you?

> 2) You assume that none, or very few, of the hams who got Tech licenses without
> a code test would have gotten a ham license if the code test had not been
> ropped for that license in 1991.

Again, "none" makes it false. I'm assuming that the majority of nocode techs
would not have gotten a license if the nocode tech license has not existed -
a perfectly reasonable assumption based on the set of hams whom I have elmered.
You assumption that all existing nocode techs would have gotten a coded ham
license is simply false. See, I can do it too. Why can't we just be reasonable?

You are making the same mistake as all the other PCTA folk. You are trying to
declare the effect of the nocode techs on the ARS as negligible. Won't work.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1162. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 20:02:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB49A72.9590391F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40431

Lars121 wrote:
> The FCC permits remote programming of repeater parameters? What types of
> parameters could be changed this way, and I wonder how the FCC could enforce
> this because they would not be able to determine what the signal
> contained.....

For instance, mountain top repeaters must be able to be shut down by the control operator so the code to shut a repeater down can be a secret. Otherwise, any Tom, Dick, or Harry could shut the repeater down. Normally, that control function is implemented over a UHF link. I'm not sure the FCC wants to know the parameters of the control code. I actually used a code on which I hold a patent for control of an Intel repeater.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1163. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 20:33:24 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <ok1t8.16640$Rw2.1306843@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40432

Hans, K0HB, wrote:

> The US Navy fleets now operate without the
> following enlisted ratings:

> Pigeon Trainer
> Sail Maker
> Stoker
> Radioman

Just think: When the electromagnetic spectrum
is a churning mass of EMP, ESD and FEC, a message
can still get through on two feathered wings and a
prayer -- IF there are stalwart pigeon trainers at
the ready to release their avian charges into
the troubled skies.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1164. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 20:40:46 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204102040120.16905-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 40433

On Wed, 10 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
>Are amateur radio operators allowed to encrypt or encode if it is data that
>is being transmitted?

Fishing?

Your question has already been answered on one of the packet/digital amateur
radio newsgroups....

1165. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 20:42:34 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204102041190.16905-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 40434

On Wed, 10 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
>Does anyone know what additional capabilities or privileges a "Tech Plus" or
>"Advanced" license holder has compared to "Technician"?

Use of HF frequencies (below 30MHz - but not all than an "Extra" is entitled
to use).

1166. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 20:51:51 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204102044040.16905-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 40435

Control of an automatic and/or auxillary station is a requirement of the rules.

Most repeaters are controlled via DTMF. The FCC (or anyone else) can easily decode these types of transmissions. As for data content, if the FCC were really worried, they could always inspect the repeater site, determine what type of controller was in use, and look up the control sequences (at least for the pre-programmed functions) in the appropriate manual. Certain other functions are self-evident (such as "say current time", bring up remote base interface, etc....). As a last resort, they would simply ask the repeater trustee to identify the nature and/or content of the control signal.

Many repeaters do somehow acknowledge the receipt of a control signal, either by performing an action or responding (CW or voice) with a phrase such as "OK" or "RR". In that context, it is obvious what is going on and the exact content of the message isn't material.

On Wed, 10 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
>The FCC permits remote programming of repeater parameters? What types of
>parameters could be changed this way, and I wonder how the FCC could enforce
>this because they would not be able to determine what the signal
>contained.....
>
>
>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CB47DC3.3E18AD21@IEEE.org...
>> "Dana H. Myers" wrote:
>> > I actually think the FCC would permit the use of encryption
>> > where the intention is to obscure information which is not
>> > the content of the message.
>>
>> Such as the control signals for a repeater.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>>
>>
>> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
>
>
>

1167. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 20:52:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204101252.a45aeed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40436

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<mFYs8.4991$3P4.439122@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>
>
> > There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
> > facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports by
> > radio amateurs.
>
> I agree, so long as those traffic reports are on amateur frequencies.
>
> If memory serves, Riley just recently shut somebody down who was
> coordinating a network of amateurs gathering traffic reports and
> airing the information on another medium.

http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/2000/0830.html

the guy was in Orlando, Florida.

> Of course the violation was *not* that they were gathering the info
> on the ham bands, but rather the commercial reporting of that
> info on another radio service.

He was allegedly using a local repeater to gather the info for his employer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1168. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 21:02:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204101302.8340cd4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40437

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CB30CE4.C71BE416@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >The nocode tech class of license went from 0% of the
> > >ARS in 1990 to 30% of the ARS in 2000 and all you give them credit
> > >for is a 4% increase?
> >
> > In context. The context was that the ARS would have declined without that
> > license class, that it's all that kept the ARS afloat, and other such
> > unsubstantiated blather. The fact are:
> >
> > - 30% growth from 1980 to 1990 (all US hams code tested)
> > - 34% growth from 1990 to 2000 (most US hams code tested)
> > - 34% minus 30% equals 4%
> >
> > True or false?
>
> True but your conclusion is false.

Which conclusion? 34 minus 30 is 4?

> The truth is that the population
> of the ARS went from 0% nocode techs in 1990 to 30% nocode techs in
> 2000.

Sure. Nobody denies that fact.

The context is what would/could/might have happened if the FCC had not
changed the rules. You and others claim the US ARS would have
encountered "negative growth" and other dire predictions, and deny
that reality that there is no
real way to know what would have happened.

> The great majority of the growth in the ARS for 1900-2000 was
> directly attributable to the nocode techs.

How do you know what would have happened without the 1991 rules
change?

> Denying that fact won't make it false.

Stating something with nothing to back it up doesn't make it true,
either.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1169. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 21:24:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410172404.22523.00002942@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 40438

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> >I know that Ed could,
>> >though of course he'd never let on.

>> Another conspiracy theory heard from...

> So it *has* to be a conspiricy if you know of internal ARRL
>malfeasances but don't wish to acknowledge it. Right. And if you don't
>know of any, that means you don't pay much attention.

Dick, that is saying no more than that you believe there is a conspiracy at ARRL HQ because Ed Hare posts on rrap and doesn't tell us about it.

I have seen incompetence, but never once have I seen anyone set out to screw ARRL members. If ARRL became that kind of organization, I would no longer enjoy my job, so I would sing that old country song.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>
>
>
>
>

1170. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 21:28:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410172808.22523.00002944@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 40439

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

> Already been done. A paper was done many years ago on using Morse Code by
>Handi-Hams.

I have seen non-ham stroke patients using Morse code to communicate. Slow, but
it allowed them to be in control.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1171. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 21:31:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410173134.22523.00002945@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 40440

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>> Like most people that don't "like" CW, I believe what Carl really
>> doesn't like about it is the effort required to achieve a useful level
>> of proficiency at it.

>Carl, no doubt, doesn't believe that a useful level of CW
>proficiency is worth the effort *for him*. You believe it
>was worth the effort *for you*. That is as it should be.

Carl told me that when he used to operate CW, he got pretty close to 20 wpm. He still didn't like it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1172. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 22:16:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB4B9C1.95EFBED9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40441

N2EY wrote:
> The context is what would/could/might have happened if the FCC had not
> changed the rules. You and others claim the US ARS would have
> encountered "negative growth" and other dire predictions, and deny
> that reality that there is no real way to know what would have happened.

Is the only real way to know what happens if you put your hand in the
fire is to actually put your hand in the fire? (Hope I didn't say
"negative growth". I think I said, "negative growth rate".)

> > The great majority of the growth in the ARS for 1900-2000 was
> > directly attributable to the nocode techs.
>
> How do you know what would have happened without the 1991 rules
> change?

Same way I know if I stick my hand in the fire, it's going to get
burned. It ain't rocket science, Jim. Virtually nothing is 100%
certain. A lot of things are indeed 90% probability. So let me
ask you: What is the probability that the 1990-2000 ARS growth
rate would have matched the 1980-1990 growth rate without the
addition of the nocode tech license?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1173. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 22:27:08 UTC
From: "Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.com>
Message-ID: <3CB4BC60.8080108@dioxine.com>
Source record: 40442

There's a specific exception for repeater control,
but this is not the situation I described. Repeater
controls are indeed the information. I'm talking
about signatures to permit authentication of content.

Dana K6JQ
dana@dioxine.com

CAM wrote:

> "Dana H. Myers" wrote:
>
>>I actually think the FCC would permit the use of encryption
>>where the intention is to obscure information which is not
>>the content of the message.
>>
>
> Such as the control signals for a repeater.
>

1174. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 22:39:03 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <ba3t8.21944$QC1.1363679@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40443

>> I originally wrote:
>> It may be because it leads to drawing a parallel
>> between amateur radio (legalized "free-banding")
>> and other "legalized" vices (gambling,
>> prostitution, drugs).

> Jim, N2EY, replied:
> I don't see how that parallel can be drawn. The
> reason for all the fuss about gambling, etc., is
> that those activities are thought to be very
> harmful. The same cannot be said for radio operating.

I beg to disagree. Or to expand the definition of
"radio operating" to include having QSO's on air-
traffic-control frequencies, or on top of the 'CQD'
from the Titanic, or to other "extreme free-banding"
activities involving local law-enforcement agencies.
There's "good" recreational gambling and "bad"
compulsive gambling. And "good" radio operating
and "bad" (actually "very, very bad") radio operating.

> ... And the procodetest folks aren't gonna be happy
> to realize that maybe claims like "drop the code
> test and the pirates will all show up on the ham
> bands with licenses" may have given the FCC the idea
> in the first place, and/or reinforced it for them.
>
> Scary, huh?

Not that scary. There are still powerful dis-
incentives to extensive outlaw HF operation --
costs, anti-antenna CC&R's, amateur self-
policing with FCC back-up, technical problems,
available time, boredom and general apathy, more
costs, lack of channelized 'sitting ducks", more
fun on the Internet posting JavaScript loops
and on and on and on.

> Actually, the history is somewhat different.
> Hams were legally authorized and limited to
> "200 meters and down"....

Yeah, my ham radio history is quite fuzzy. I
bow to your much more extensive knowledge on this.
However:

> And the ARRL had to fight all through the 1920s
> and into the 1930s on both the national and
> international fronts in order for amateurs to
> stay on the air.

> That fight continues today.

Indeed it does. I see it as part of that same old anti-freedom whine we've been getting out of the professional law-givers and good-work-doers since the Founding:

"Why do you need a powerful short-wave radio transmitter at your house???"

"Why do you need to bet on sports or cards???"

"Why do you need to drink alcohol or smoke dope??"

"Why do you need to keep pornography on your computer or in your dresser drawer???"

"Why do you need to drive a gas-guzzling SUV???"

"Why do you need to keep a firearm collection in your closet???"

"There ought to be a law!!!"

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1175. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 22:39:04 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <ca3t8.21945$QC1.1363293@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40444

>> I wrote:
>> ..... In a real
>> emergency, traffic and road conditions *would* be a prime
>> concern of mobile stations involved. And establishing
>> protocols for getting that information from hard sources
>> and out to the field units, as well as getting "ground
>> truth" information back, might be a very good preparation
>> for such eventualities.

> "W5TIT - Kim" replied:
> And, you're absolutely right. You also know that
> emergency situations are different.
>
> Kim W5TIT

It seems to me that the most effective handling of
emergencies happens when there is no difference
between that handling and normal, everyday operations.
Having the procedures in place for handling vehicle
information moves the operation closer to that
ongoing state of readiness.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1176. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 23:37:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb4cd0f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40450

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020409220627.09489.00000355@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <a8vv3t$uh7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> > > Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place.
> >> > > These people check with each other often about traffic
> >> > > flow and route. Truckdrivers will
> >> > > also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere.
> >> >
> >> > > Sorry folks, but both
> >> > > examples here are those that involve communication with
> >> > > pecuniary interest...namely employment.
> >> >
> >> > How does the first involve any pecuniary interest?
> >> >
> >> > Are you saying that if hams help
> >> > each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
> >> > jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?
> >>
> >> I agree with Bill 100%. Unless you are "on the clock" while commuting,
> >> there is no pecuniary interest.
> >
> >What does being "on the clock" have to do with it at all?
>
> A truck driver's job - what they are paid to do - is getting the vehicle
from A
> to B
> safely and efficiently. The use of ham radio for to help get the vehicle
from A
> to B in a nonemergency by people being paid to do so MAY (heavy emphasis
on the
> "may") cross the line of "pecuniary interest. I'm not sure.
> >

Precisely. And, as I've tried to say, I don't really care whether someone,
or others, wish to have such discussions on the air. I don't. For the
reasons that a) I believe it *has the potential* for abuse (and is abused in
my opnion) and, b) it just sounds crappy when all people can do to drum up
conversation about traffic, weather, and how sick they've been.

> >> > As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
> >> > activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
> >> > prove it to be illegal.
> >>

> >> This one's a bit sticky, since the business activity of a truck driver
> >> IS getting from origin to destination, and he/she IS "on the clock"
> >> while driving.
> >
> >Ditto my last...but again, IF the conversation?QSO is only about traffic
> >conditions, why is it legal for you and I to discuss, but not a trucker
> >who might happen to be a ham? IF the subject itself is legal for
> >me, it should be legal for anyone with a ham license.
>
> OK, consider this:
>
> Suppose a ham decides to put up a tower and a bunch of locals show up on
tower
> raising day to help out. Everyone brings amateur HTs to help coordinate
the
> activity. The HTs are used extensively, saving lots of time and effort. Is
this
> OK? Of course.
>
> Now suppose some of the hams who helped out form a company and install
radio
> towers commercially. Can they legally use their amateur HTs on the job for
the
> same purpose as when erecting the ham tower for free? I don't think so.
>
> Even though it's the same purpose and the same people, in the first case
they
> are a bunch of friends helping out a fellow amateur and in the second case
it's
> a bunch of professionals doing a job.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yeah, and I think those examples are reasonable. Asking for directions to a hamfest, a friend's house, a hotel, a restaurant, whatever, doesn't seem to get near anything questionable...again, in my opinion. But, if you have just gotten hired by the hotel, restaurant, whatever and you are asking directions to the place (say it's a chain and you've never been to the location you'll be working at), then to me you are violating the rules. If you're going to your friend's house to conduct some work you'll be getting paid for...well, ya shouldn't be using ham radio to enhance your ability to earn that money by asking for directions over ham radio. Hamfests are another matter altogether. I *believe* the FCC has written opinion that selling radios/ham equipment is OK, as long as it's not your regular business. Heck, even cities allow a couple/few yardsales a year without having to charge sales tax.

Kim W5TIT

1177. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 23:37:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410193729.22569.00000627@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 40449

In article <20020410101321.19127.00003252@mb-fm.aol.com>,
another@aol.com (someone) writes:

>>Well, the legends exist among those who've never been IN
>>the industry...including those on the periphery (such as
>>purchasing agents and personnel-trained folks). I've done
>>my share of getting the interview buck passed to me to do
>>the potential-new-hire second interviews
>
> I think you meant that the buck was passed when it came to YOUR second
>interview.

No. I've not failed any interview. I've been the interviewer more often
than I've been interviewed.

To explain for other readers: It is common practice in the electronics
industry to have personnel departments do the initial screening of all
engineering applicants...then to have engineering staff members do
a detailed personal interview of those selected by personnel people.
That's the "second interview" mentioned previously.

Personnel departments cannot possibly be a judge of ALL technical
skills in a corporation. There are too many. Engineering staff can
do a better evaluation of an applicant insofar as knowledge and skills
for the particular tasks necessary in a corporate engineering group.
Staff are already familiar with work planning of the group and which
specialists or non-specialists are needed (they requested personnel
for specific job assignments to begin with). From experience they
already know which people can handle a task, which ones are the
most flexible and least flexible, which ones are the poseurs and
which ones can do a job.

"Testing" an applicant is usually subtle, few applicants aware that a
"test" is proceeding. Some sharper applicants (and those with some
experience) already know this and are psychologically prepared.
Answers in the usual give-and-take of an in-person interview must be
honest and direct, including specialties where the applicant has no
prior experience. Engineering staff interviewers can spot the fakers
a long ways off, the boasters coming equipped with a virtual neon
sign composed of banal generalities. Not a problem. Interviewers
know damn well that they will have to work with applicants that are
accepted and will judge all applicants on a myriad of interpersonal
qualities that go beyond technical skills.

There exist a few rare cases where some applicants are hired solely
on their credentials, more likely for having their "name in the papers

(trade papers)" and those are done mainly for having stock prices boosted or to acquire warm bodies for some future contract. When a contract is acquired, the corporation is obliged to perform or lose money. Credentials alone do NOT guarantee any success. Knowledge and experience and some ability to adapt to new conditions is far more important.

The one thing nice about electronics engineering is that everyone is obliged to meet electrons, fields and waves on their terms. All the credentials, boasts, titles, fakery and assorted bullshit used by some folk on other people just can't cut it. Never could.

Personnel people are fine to screen applicants, explain general requirements to applicants, tell about job benefits, and to handle post-interview processing of accepted applicants. If an engineering group's work task is, for example, to make low L-band equipment (900-1200 MHz) for telecommunications, they will know far better about the technical qualifications for that job than any personnel person who has to initially interview dozens of different trades and skills. Guitar amplifier designers probably won't make a second interview level (even if their surname is Fender), but some AM BC "engineer" might (but would probably not be accepted by the engineering staff interviewers). Those from a competing telecomm company would be welcomed with open arms on both levels. In between there are thousands of shades of grey which have to be examined in detail, each person unique.

It's generally not a "fun" thing to interrupt regular work to do some second-interview, but it is a break in the routine. In my experience the first ten minutes of conversation are enough to let me know whether or not the interviewee is worth spending another twenty minutes to get more detail. The interviewer must be civil, polite, and be able to communicate with other people...not everyone is suited to that task. Knowledge depth and flexibility-of-association of facts about certain specialties is important...an applicant may have skills and knowledge in specialties very close to what is required and that may be an advantage to the company in the near future. All of electronics is still constantly evolving, advancing, and a profit-making company has to keep up to date to continue making a profit.

There are continual periodic "tests" performed in the workplace every paycheck period. If you pass, you get one. If you fail, you get only one of them and a wave goodbye. That's not a credential to hang on a wall, but it makes it possible to have a wall (in a home) on which to hang other things.

1178. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 23:37:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410193731.22569.00000628@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 40448

In article <20020410105337.19127.00003266@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Been to Burbank, California, and at that particular major street
>>intersection? I don't think so. Feel free to describe it and we
>>will all test your memory, lack of memory, or untruthfulness.
>
> Been to that store, Lennie. I can no more reacll all the details of the
>intersection as you can recall the radar test target at NADC...Or do you want
>your nose rubbed in THAT again?

I spent four months total in five trips to Naval Air Development Center in Warminster, PA, in 1971-1972, while working for RCA Corporation. Having a good memory, I can recall a lot of accurate details about NADC that was, many of the labs, both cafeterias, the centrifuge, the outside HF log-periodic antenna, revelie being loudspeakered well _after_ sunup, the road bisecting NADC main from the one-runway NAS adjacent, the assembly jig tracks in the first (factory) floor left over from the old Brewster Aircraft original owner, the C-117 that was the main aircraft for the SECANT test, the little S-2 and Douglas RA that were secondary on that flight testing, two Orions whose APU screamings were almost deafening if working within the C-117, the metal fitting room where the phototheaters were made, one of the two hangars where a couple of nights were spent resolving an antenna problem with the RA, the NAS Ops room and flight briefing room (upstairs), how the aircraft parking area was below the level of the runway, the three different entrances to NADC main, the photo lab where the flight camera film was processed and where the NADC engineering group got the single-frame projectors to study the flight instrument images, the CDC computer room which would later process the flight tapes of the second-go-around of SECANT and Minne-Honey collision avoidance system testing, Mike Raditz, Jim Hinds, and Oscar Shames of NADC, the flight crew equipment room at the NAS that had helmets, masks, one-piece flight suit coveralls, etc., the "Yellow Bread Truck" that was a ground vehicle with a built-in AN/ARC-27 and a generator for comm, the flights to PAX River for theodolite-range flight path confirmation and Key West deployment to get out of the Philly area air traffic, the "sports car" feel of the S-2 sitting in either of the forward seats and being able to look straight down through the side bubble window. Oh, yes, and "Street Road" which was the name of the highway immediately adjacent to NADC that started that old exchange, mentioned by me just because it was a funny name for a highway.

NADC was dissolved some time later, some projects and tasks dropped altogether, most transferred to Naval Air Systems Command. Whatever became of the Warminster NAS or the old NADC buildings is not important to me personally since I never went back there again, not the nearby Willow Grove NAS, nor the Warrington Inn that was a place to sleep for three months. The testing effort of SECANT was successful, the system worked, the R&D project generating over a dozen patents assigned to RCA Corporation, one of mine being one of those.

What STEVIE has to supply is the year where he "visited the HRO" outlet I described in Burbank, CA. This will let everyone know whether he is or isn't telling an untruth. While the HRO stores share a somewhat common arrangement across the country, they are all somewhat independent and unique. There are apparent differences in geographic locations which should be easily recalled.

> And I asked you WHY you'd have such an interest?

If you want to grill someone you have to get a fire marshall's permit and show your FDA badge. Even so, a blue-uniform with a BPD or LAPD badge will show up. :-)

>You have no license to
>operate any of that equipment except to passively receive, and have voiced a
>steadfast intent to REMAIN a loser...I mean unlicensed...

Wrong again, STEVIE. I have no problem legally transmitting on several EM bands according to the FCC. HRO sells two manufacturer's civil aviation comm band transceivers (hand-helds from Alinco and Icom). While I have no reason to get one of those, both the FCC and FAA will allow me to use such to transmit according to their regulations. No further testing required.

Without looking it up in the Fall 2001 HRO catalog, I think HRO quit retailing CB sets. There's all kinds of competition in those from Target, K-Mart, Sears, Fry's, and Wal-Mart.

What I am actively pursuing right now is noneyerdambusiness.

You have to figure out WHY I was interested in comparing LCDs of many OEM suppliers in incident daylight. You won't get an answer with your line of grilling. You aren't law enforcement, you aren't even for lawn order.

> YOU are asked a specific question about RADIOS, a topic of which you
>claim some initmate knowledge, and all YOU can provide is "vague generalities".

Yaesu, Kenwood, Icom, and Alinco radios ALL have LCDs on their front panels. Half of one whole wall in the Burbank HRO has stacks of them on shelving, connected, turned on. (it's on the west wall of that store). All of those LCDs appear to be of different manufacture.

Some within one manufacturer's line appear to be from different
sub-contractors. It's a good way to compare different LCDs.

> SAME two-faced BS as always, I see.

No. I explained what I was doing in detail. My first task on visiting
that HRO was to check content of periodicals. That store is
convenient since those periodicals aren't viewable unless I visit a
Barnes and Noble (approx. four miles further) or a Border's (ten
miles further). Neither Fry's nor Electronic City carries ham
periodicals.

No one questioned my presence in the HRO. It is a store like all
the others nearby.

> Like forcing your opinion on a USENET group involved in the pursuit of
>an "avocation" in which you have NO initmate concern?

Follow the link provided by Hans Brakob to have your very own
gold-anodized Radio Kop badge. You can flash it to your computer
screen next time you write one of those messages. :-)

>>I'm not the one suffering delusions nor engaged in obsessive-
>>compulsive activities.
>
> Neither am I.

Sure you are. You aren't aware of how obsessive your activity has
become. You have a bad case of it. QED.

>>Unclench the fist or break the jar. Your choice.
>
> Neither. I stay in your face as long as you misrepresent the truth and
>denigrate Amateur Radio. Unless you rather I berak it over your head?

;-) What I find interesting in compulsive-obsessive rage-induced
behavior is the high S:N ratio on motor control neurons. Those
invariably result in typos such as "berak" above or the often-done
typos of "amatuer."

1179. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 23:37:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410193732.22569.00000629@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 40445

In article <a91hp641lff@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Guess I thinking of the time old tactic of "If I had to do it, so does
>everyone else" mantra cheered on ever so often.... Using the statement from
>some here, "Anyone can learn the 5 wpm code" then anyone should not have too
>much problem with it.

The "anyone can learn the 5 WPM code" phrase is side-stepping
the issue, a way to "answer" something without answering it.

The No-Code-Test Advocates are simply questioning the need to
have any code test at all.

Since the code test has never been eliminated in amateur radio
testing for HF privileges, and that amateur radio is a personal
activity, the "I had to do it so you have to also" is more than a
mantra. It is a Way Of Existance in testing. It must be kept for
a variety of reasons -

Some who passed a code test had to put forth considerable
effort in order to pass. Having done so, they could "recall"
passing it with "ease" although it must have been difficult for
them...just like everyone claims to have "aced" written tests.
:-)

Some were military service trained in morse code. Those were
preselected for that aptitude. If they graduated military morse
training they could already do 20+ WPM and had sufficient
skill and experience to easily pass amateur radio morse tests.

Most of the morse-successful seemed to have learned morse
while still teen-agers. That is a time when the mind is still a
dry sponge ready to absorb anything. It is also a time when
they won't necessarily recall their trials and efforts in learning.
Those probably were "guided" by parents or close family
members; normal eagerness to please family is a stronger
motivation than the impersonal environment of enforced learning
in a classroom of strange beepers.

Some relish the virtual reality of a radio of Long Ago, a time now
long in the past, of pioneering when radio was "new" and
exciting. That was certainly a simpler time in technology, less
flexible, more rigid, and intellectual demands were very low.
Since on-off keying was the ONLY communications mode in
radio of long ago, code was king. Then.

Some need the "military" type of environment where "others in authority" make all the decisions and they simply follow those orders. There's emotional security there. They can be "proud" of their "service" and following orders. They can even "rise in rank" to act like dill sergeants (disapproving pursed lips types who run lesser ranks through centuries-old close order drill and demand discipline and order).

Those that Made It seem to take great delight in putting down those who did not or those who didn't care to do it or those who don't see any sense in doing it. It's a taunting, immature "I'm better than you are" behavior. That's human nature, but it's not an attractive part of humankind.

1180. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 23:37:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410193734.22569.00000630@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 40447

In article <20020410104047.19127.00003262@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Hans Brakob and I had a long-ago lengthy exchange where he
>>implied that morse code ability would "help" those with strokes or
>>similar disabilities regarding personal communication.
>
> Already been done. A paper was done many years ago on using Morse Code
>by Handi-Hams.

Incorrect. This was a research project carried out by a group of universities.

>>My mother was then in a nursing home, a victim of too many TIAs.
>
> You bandy-about medical terms as loosely as you do your "knowledge" of
>the purpose of various radio services.

TIA = Transient Ischemic Attack, also known as a "micro-stroke."

There are various kinds of such "attacks," all caused by hemorrhages of blood vessels in the brain. Some are momentary, some have effects lasting several days. A general condition is that several of them over a year or two will lead to debilitation. Anyone with a close relative suffering those will find such things out. Anyone with a close relative undergoing such will know that is NOT a good thing. Doctors will explain all the details to patients' family members. Not a good way to get an education in that particular subject.

I KNOW various radio services because I been IN them, have had both self-teaching and formal education in them as well as on-the-job training. Anyone can do that if they apply themselves...and live long enough.

> On the OTHER hand, YOU purport to be a professioanl in
>radiocommunications
>matters, yet can't tell me what FCC regulation specifically creates radio
>services for "strictly recreational" purposes, despite having made the
>assertion that such exisits.

Wrong again. I've explained it all in public.

A professional accepts a fee, monetary compensation, for services rendered. That is the definition of "professional." I am a professional in radio-electronics. I'm also a hobbyist in radio-electronics.

The regulations for US amateur radio specifically state that it is a personal radio activity without pecuniary interest (no monetary compensation), therefore it is "amateur." In that case the FCC has, for a long time, "explained" the difference between amateur and professional. It is codified, it is law.

There are a great number of different radio services in the USA, all civil radio services regulated by the FCC. There are so many that a full bound set of Title 47 CFR is five soft-cover volumes and cost a bit over $120 from the Government Printing Office. (check with USGPO for current price, branch bookstores in all major urban areas, free shipping of USGPO orders)

Except for IVDS, Part 95 personal radio services were created for personal recreational use. The language of the regulations was so worded that professionals could ALSO use radios regulated under Part 95. CB is one of those, the old "Class D" created in 1959. Radio-control or "R/C" is the old "Class C" CB which still retains the old 27 MHz band frequencies and had the many 72 MHz channels added to please modelers, both contest flyers and the occasional "park flyer." While there are no exact details, there are at least a quarter million such R/C users in the USA, all able to use rather exclusive frequencies for recreational pursuits without any license whatsoever.

While there are professional R/C users (I know of two of them here in the center of movie land) those are distinct rare cases. All those extra, exclusive 72 MHz channels were lobbied for by recreational users and user groups. The FCC worded the regulations so as not to discriminate between recreation and occupation or amateur and professional. No license is required.

The FRS or Family Radio Service was created to give individuals a short-range communications radio capability that includes some measure of privacy. Again, the language of the regulations does not discriminate between recreation and occupation nor amateur and professional. No license is required.

FRS transceivers on the market range from as low as $30 the pair to $80 for a single unit. No doubt some professionals use FRS transceivers for very low-cost operations, but Part 90, the HUGE 350+ page Private Land Mobile Radio Services section has the following radio services for professionals in: Power, Petroleum, Forest Products, Film and Video Production, Relay Press, Special Industrial, Business, Manufacturers, Telephone Maintenance, Motor Carrier, Railroad, and Taxicab. All of those frequency assignments are done by industry organizations for minimum interference. All those professional groups have the advantage of PLMRS for greater flexibility and range in radio use.

Part 95 is specifically named PERSONAL Radio Services. Four out of the five radio services in there were specifically created for recreational radio use. To argue anything else is

a stupid exercise akin to picking fly shit out of pepper.

>> I can't find NSI anyplace on the Web. It must have failed.
>
> Try looking in the same place that "Ham Radio" keeps' it's website,
>Lennie. It failed too.

Actually, no. HR was SOLD to CQ Communications, Inc, along with the Bookstore. CQ still has the first-rights in copyright, also obtained in the sale. The Bookstore of HR merged with CQ's own bookstore. Parts of HR were incorporated into Communications Quarterly. CQ publishes the complete 22-year content of HR on three CD-ROMs, available from them directly or through the ARRL (shipping extra from ARRL) for only $150.

NSI and KCI are no longer. Period. They did NOTHING. NSI was simply an outlet for sarcasm and bigotry of an individual and his cronies. NSI didn't last 3 years, let alone 22 years, had no technical content. KCI was a small special-interest group for lobbying the continued existance of the code test; it was dissolved in 1999 after a very short existance.

1181. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 23:37:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410193736.22569.00000631@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 40446

In article <20020410011507.10062.00000387@mb-cu.aol.com>,
MasterChef@paratransit net (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20020409152445.04302.00000498@mb-bh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>Larry, you are NOT USING YOUR DEGREE...and WE all know
>>exactly what you are talking about...yourself.
>
>What is the problem you and Kim have with my not "using" my degree?

You can't have it both ways. You can't talk down "nickel extras"
or charge "dumbing-down" and still try to elevate yourself as
somehow "superior" in radio with a terrific amount of self-centered
braggadoccio. You don' got no technical smarts, Larrah.

>Did I miss some fine print in some equally invisible social contract that
>once I was bestowed my Bachelor of Science Degree in Human
>Resources Management that I absolutely *had* to take a position as
>an HR specialist?

You've missed the "fine print" in interpersonal behavior.

Back when you were soma come loud you were making a lot
of rude noises on how "good" you were and how you were always
good (teaching your officers how to do their thing, etc.) and all
those high-paying management jobs you were going to get.

You wound up DRIVING A BUS. Geez, Larrah, that's something
a "woman of color" can do...and they do by the hundreds, perhaps
thousands. I see them regularly.

Do you have an AA degree or a BS degree? Is either one from
an accredited educational organization?

>If so, how do you explain all the other people in
>the world that are not actively employed in fields directly related to
>their educational credentials?

If they are like you, Larrah, they have lots of BS credentials.
The difference is that the acronym does NOT mean "bachelor of
science."

>Flying an airliner is a highly technical
>task, but I'm sure you'll find a lot of airline pilots who do not hold
>degrees in Aeronautical Engineering.

Noooo, Larrah, flying, even in a complicated commercial air carrier,
is a SKILL acquired after long practice and already possessing the
aptitude and physical attributes necessary for flying.

DESIGNING a commercial air carrier requires knowledge and skill
of highly technical intellectual matters with basic engineering best
obtained through an accredited educational institution leading to a
degree.

>Most Executive Chefs are
>college graduates in a variety of majors, but their primary duties have
>little, if any, direct correlation to what they learned while pursuing
>their degrees.

Oh, my, I will forward your comment to Emeril and the Naked Chef,
maybe the execs of the Food Channel.

I'll congratulate the Master Chef at the next Taco Bell for not
correlating what they've learned while pursuing their degrees.

>In every instance, however, the benefits of a higher
>education exceed the simple learning of purely technical, job-related,
>task-specific material.

Beautiful boilerplate pasties you made there, master chef!

>wanted to take them. If and when I go for a graduate degree, it may
>not have anything to do with HR, or even business in general. Heck --
>the easiest Ph.D for me to get would be in Education! I could
>probably knock off an MSED with as little as another year's worth of
>night school courses!

Yawn...here come da Soma Come Loud stuff again.

>So, you're absolutely right -- I am not "using" my degree, in the
>sense that I'm not making my living working as an HR specialist.

Cut the BS on fancy names. "HR" as in Human Resources is still
PERSONNEL. "Paratransit operators" are BUS DRIVERS.

Not a damn thing wrong with using the conventional titles. Everybody
knows what they do, are whether they have fancy titles or not.

>Now -- please tell me how this makes me an inferior person?

"HR" in this newsgroup is Ham Radio.

You keep demanding that others "be as good as you" in all the
BS about "applying yourself" and showing "dedication and
motive" and such. You've bragged all over this newsgroup on
how "good" you are, "qualified" and all that...and wind up
DRIVING A BUS.

>I'm sure you will enjoy doing so!

I really don't...but some inflated egoes have grown so large that
the needle to puncture them is simply irresistable.

Now, WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED ABOUT RADIO in all the time
you've been hitting on all those "dumbed down" no-code types?
Apply yourself. Lots of stores have crazy glue.

1182. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 23:44:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb4cedd_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40501

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a91hp311lff@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Personally.... I would love to see others challenge a record like that.
If
> another person can superceed those achievements and do even more than she
> has, it is for the betterment of this hobby!
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
>
> www.qsl.net/w8kea
>
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>

Well, thanks Ryan. However, I really gotta tell you that it isn't all that difficult and there's loads more hams doing a whole helluva lot more than I. For instance, it seems to me I've heard of many hams who traveled to NYC and will travel to most other major emergencies, to help out. I would, but I can't. That's just one example.

Here's another thing...LOL I have been a volunteering pretty much since I was a teen-ager: was a Girl Scout Counselor, then Girl Scout Leader, always did camp, in my stupider days (heh heh) I was a member of the TARS (Teen Age Republicans) and did a lot with them, etc., etc. Worked some soup kitchens, worked on the streets with homeless, have often thought about but never did Meals-on-Wheels, then got involved with ham radio and it's just served as an adjunct to what I like to do.

HOWEVER...in all capital letters...here a while back I realized that every single moment of my free time was spent on volunteering. WHEW...I mean every moment! And, I was even making extra time (staying up late, to travel, etc.) to do this stuff. I says to meself, "Self, what the Hell are you doing?" and pretty much brought it *all* to a screeching halt. Plus, I've really had to devote some more time to work.

So, the minute you stop or take a moment to realize what you're doing...it puts a lid on it...LOL However, I'll be back out there again. About the middle/end of Summer I'll get back into mentoring the ARECC.

Kim W5TIT

>
> > Kim:

> >
> > That's truly impressive. I think you should be nominated for the 2002
> > Dayton Hamvention "Amateur Radio Operator of the Year." I doubt
> > that whomever has already been nominated could provide as a r&#65533;sum&#65533;
> > as imposing as yours.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >
>
>

1183. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 23:52:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb4d0b2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40503

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020410011503.10062.00000383@mb-cu.aol.com...
>
> Not even close, Jim. Getting that truck *safely* and efficiently to it's
> destination is definitely within limits of PICON. If the drivers were
> using ham radio to coordinate the pickup of loads, negotiate fees,
> or advertise their services, then *that* would be a violation of the
> "no-business" rule. However, when they are simply taking advantage
> of information related strictly to safe vehicle operation, then they
> are perfectly OK. In fact, I've always believed it is a great failing
> of amateur radio that there isn't a widespread network of ham
> motorists and fixed-station operators specifically dedicated to this
> task, as there is on the Citizen's Band.
>

What a huge, huge waste of ham radio. There are broadcast stations all over
the place, with helicopters, motorists who call in on cellular phones, etc.,
to do the job you describe above. Ham radio is more aptly used to report
directly to the police items such as accidents, and even to assist motorists
with getting roadside help. But, to have hams as a major contributor to
traffic reporting is just not good use of spectrum.

>
> Considering the great
> emphasis placed on public service in the ARS, I think we're missing
> out on a golden opportunity to serve in such a capacity.
>

The emphasis on public service in ham radio is specifically to fill a void
for our public service agencies and volunteer groups--*NOT* to provide
competition for already-in-use commercial ventures of broadcast radio
stations!

>
> Exactly, but this example doesn't relate too well to the issue of
professional
> drivers using amateur radio to give and receive traffic information,
> directions,
> or report accidents. All of the above serve not only the interest of that
> particular driver, but the general public as well, since it is in the
interest
> of
> the safe and efficient movement of traffic. I am sure that if the FCC
were
> required to specifically address this issue, that they would find it to be

> completely within the Basis and Purpose of the ARS.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

The magic word you said above is "professional." If you are using ham radio in any way to enhance your ability to make money, then I believe you could be called into question on the rules. As I said, have at it...but I won't be involved in the discussions, nor will I answer those questions if I feel you're asking for those reasons...

Kim W5TIT

1184. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-10 23:56:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb4d192$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40504

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020410011508.10062.00000388@mb-cu.aol.com...
>
> Kim:
>
> That's correct. And neither have millions of other college graduates.
> Do you have the same opinion of people with Ph.D's who are out there
> driving trucks for a living? Or MBA's that fly airliners? Or people with
> law degrees who serve as police officers? or nearly any concievable
> type of college graduate who, for a variety of reasons, does not actually
> work in a field related to their major course of study? I also have an
> Associate Degree in Liberal Arts, Kim -- but Heaven knows that I'm
> not any kind of artist, and I'm nothing even close to a Liberal! (For
> everyone else but Kim, that was a joke!) So go ahead and "chide"
> me for not having a job that "matches" my degree, Kim -- because
> it's nothing more than you making a fool of yourself in your own
> unique manner!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Your ending kind of flopped there, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

1185. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 00:00:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020410200013.19503.00000517@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40502

In article <3CB498AE.EA8AA29D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes to another in here:

>Again, "none" makes it false. I'm assuming that the majority of nocode techs
>would not have gotten a license if the nocode tech license has not existed -
>a perfectly reasonable assumption based on the set of hams whom I have
>elmered.
>You assumption that all existing nocode techs would have gotten a coded ham
>license is simply false. See, I can do it too. Why can't we just be
>reasonable?
>
>You are making the same mistake as all the other PCTA folk. You are trying to
>declare the effect of the nocode techs on the ARS as negligible. Won't work.

Ahem, Cecil...did I tell you this was a different "reality" than the real world? You are trying to argue against that virtual reality with real reality and un-spun logic. That won't work either. :-)

1186. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part Two

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 00:03:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb4d33a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40505

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020410040038.16876.00002906@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >And so, in partial response to an intensification of
> >several old political problems, the ARRL has cranked up the "Big
Project,"
> >its very name signifying its importance, at least to some.
>
> The name of the project is "THE ARRL Amateur Radio Education Project."
When
> ARRL President Jim Haynie first started talking about this with the ARRL
Board,
> the project didn't have a name. But by the scope of what it grew into, the
> Board started calling it "the Big Project" among themselves. When the
formal
> name was adopted, the Big Project just wouldn't go away. It has a nice
ring to
> it.
>

Well, c'mon!! It was Jim's baby from the start, and his callsign is W5JBP. Hence "Jim's Big Project." I think it's got a nice ring as well. Gosh, I am trying to remember the school down here...the kids are on the air all the time and it's great! A result of the Big Project and we need lots more of it. This is one of Jim's greatest pushes, I think...and I don't particularly agree with Jim most of the time. But, on this he's done an excellent job.

> http://www.arrl.org/FandES/tbp/
>
> >But it's really about the ARRL, and an increase in its influence in
> >Washington, and not about "education," or "technology" or "the public" or
> >even "amateur radio."
>
> Uh, Val, ARRL *is* about Amateur Radio. You are seeing the Devil behind
every
> bush!
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

Val, you get down here immediately and listen to the 30-40 or so kids who either already have their tickets or are studying for them. It's *all* about education, kids, and amateur radio. On this, you're more wrong than you've ever been.

Kim W5TIT

1187. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 00:06:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb4d3e1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40506

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB42C40.C9F56B24@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >> > You say you don't want to upgrade because you don't think you can
> > >> > "use" your upgraded privileges. Don't look now, Kim, but that is
the
> > >> > mindset of a loser.
> > >>
> > >> Is that why you have never upgraded to PhD?
> > >
> > >Better than that, he's never upgraded to a job that matches his degree.
> >
> > That's correct. And neither have millions of other college graduates.
>
> Kim not upgrading her ham license is like you not upgrading your college
> degree, Larry. You can't have it both ways.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Uh, the college graduate can't figure that one out, Cecil...ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

1188. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 00:08:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb4d467$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40507

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a91h9u$1bp$0@208.206.142.90...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > \
> > >Getting to work is not an emergency...unless, say, you were a doctor
and
> > >someone's life depended on you getting through the traffic quickly. :)
> >
> > Why would traffic information, relayed to people involved in routine
> > commuting, be a "gray area" just because it isn't an "emergency?" Do
> > you possess some weird notion that ham radio must be used strictly
> > for "emergency" communications purposes?
>
>
> Isn't this just special? She thinks that because ham radio is useful
> for emergencies it supposed to be reserved solely for them. Neat!

You still jumping to conclusions, eh, Little Dick?

Kim W5TIT (being ignored by Dickie)

1189. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 00:12:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb4d558_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40508

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CB44A86.C227F81E@psu.edu...
> Have you ever tried PSK31, Kim? Inasmuch as you are a regular
> contributor here, I suspect you might like the mode. And that is a
> pretty good reason to upgrade. 20 meter PSK is great fun, and you can
> type around the world on a few watts.
>
> There is of course, no rule that a person has to upgrade. But I have to
> agree with Larry that doing it just to prove to yourself you can is a
> fine motivation. That's a large reason why I moved beyond Technician.
>
> Call it a friendly dare if you like!!!!! ;^)
>
> - mike KB3EIA -
>

Hi Mike:

No, I've never used PSK31. My husband started using it some time ago...and I laughed because it reminded me of being in a chat room--Heaven forbid! I am pretty much a FM person, mostly for the local stuff and don't even really get on the air much any more. I go through stages like that.

I empathize with your "proving it to myself" theory, though I don't feel I have anything to prove to myself, or anyone else for that matter. I've got the 10M rig in the truck (as soon as I work on radio installations some more) and have fun about twice a year with that. It's enough...

Kim W5TIT

1190. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 00:15:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb4d5f6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40509

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:6vZs8.16334$Rw2.1284351@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
> news:WhSs8.2740$Tg.1193133161@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> > Does anyone know what additional capabilities or privileges a "Tech
> Plus" or
> > "Advanced" license holder has compared to "Technician"?
> >
> > Lars
> >
> >
>
> The Tech PLus itself is no longer issued but you can get the privleges
> simply by passing the code test. It adds CW in four bands and phone at
> 28.3-28.5 200 watts.
>

A huge "however" here, though: if you ever intend to upgrade to General
after passing your 5wpm test, you *must* do it within one year of passing
the CW test or you must do it all over again.

Kim W5TIT

1191. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part Two

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 01:05:11 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <bj5t8.5912$3P4.529435@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40510

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> A result of the Big Project and we need lots more of
> it. This is one of Jim's greatest pushes, I think...and I don't
> particularly agree with Jim most of the time. But, on this he's done an
> excellent job.

On this I agree 100% with Kim. I just sent in an additional
donation to this project today.

73, Hans, K0HB

1192. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 01:25:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QB5t8.1198$0k.62310927@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40511

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB4307C.2D6D2AFB@IEEE.org...
> Lars121 wrote:
> > Are amateur radio operators allowed to encrypt or encode if it is data
that
> > is being transmitted?
>
> Encryption for the purpose of hiding something is prohibited. Encoding
> is allowed if the code being used is published and is in the public
> domain or if the encoding/decoding hardware/software is readily available.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Perhaps the FCC could publish the encoding/decoding schema for Morse Code so
as to make it legal.

Ditto the ARRL and Farnsworth Code.

1193. Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 01:33:29 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <JJ5t8.6713$3P4.535699@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40512

courtesy AF2C

Some Q signals have never made it to the ARRL's official
list. Here are some that many agree would be useful in
appropriate situations. As with regular Q signals, each
can be a statement or a question, depending on whether
a question mark follows it.

QBA - My antenna is BIG!
QBA? - How big is your antenna?

QBO - Don't sit next to that guy in the meeting.
QBO? - Buddy, can you spare some soap?

QBS - It's getting deep in here.
QBS? - Did I tell you about the one that got away?

QCP - I am using Cat Power(From Rotary Cat Power Wheel)
QCP? - Are you using Cat Power?

QCW - I am going to whistle Morse Code on FM (or SSB)
QCW? - Why are you whistling Morse?

QDR - Damn Right the frequency is busy! (In response to QRL)
QDR? - Do you have a Receiver? (In response to QRL)

QET - Phone home.
QET? - Has anyone called me from another planet?

QFH - This frequency is MINE! - go elsewhere.
QFH? - Is this frequency hogged?

QHI - I am jumping in quick to say hi, then going QRT.
QHI? - Are you leaving after only one transmission?

QLF - I am sending with my left foot.
QLF? - Are you sending with your left foot?

QOK - Your last transmission was Okie Dokie.
QOK? - Was my last transmission OK?

QPM - Your signal is purr modulated.
QPM? - Is my signal purr modulated?

QRC - Warning, rag chewer on frequency.
QRC? - Are you a rag chewer?

QWC? - Who cares?
QWC - I don't care

```
QZZ - I fell asleep at the mike.
QZZ? - Is that a 60Hz hum, or are you snoring?
```

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"If people concentrated on the really important things of
life, there'd be a shortage of fishing rods."

1194. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 01:33:30 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <KJ5t8.1201$Ls.62865645@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40513

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020408234328.07832.00001080@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <8Rjs8.479$3P4.45874@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >> So I believe it is very much a necessity to make the
> >> ARS as accessible as possible to as many people as
> >> possible. I am not so sure that having an operator's
> >> license for the service is a good thing. Station
> >> licenses, yes, but nothing that requires a test.
> >
> >OK, Folks, you saw it here first! The birth of NTI (No Test
International)!
> >
> >Make a note of it.
> >
> >With all kind wishes,
> >
> >de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hansl:
>
> This is supposed to come as some sort of surprise? The NCTA
> (soon to be simply the NTA) was heading in precisely this direction
> all along. The whole point is to have a microphone, a "legal" high-
> power amplifier, a VFO knob and a bandswitch in hand, without the
> bother of having to actually learn any useful communications skills.
> We started down the slippery slope with the No-Code Tech in '91 --
> and we are picking up more speed as we get closer to the bottom.
> All I can say is -- fasten your seat belts!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Yep, the sky is still falling after 12 years. I wonder when its going to
crash?

1195. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 01:37:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qN5t8.1209$uv.63042947@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40514

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020409001954.02598.00003607@mb-dh.aol.com...
> >This is supposed to come as some sort of surprise? The NCTA
> >(soon to be simply the NTA) was heading in precisely this direction
> >all along. The whole point is to have a microphone, a "legal" high-
> >power amplifier, a VFO knob and a bandswitch in hand, without the
> >bother of having to actually learn any useful communications skills.
> >We started down the slippery slope with the No-Code Tech in '91 --
> >and we are picking up more speed as we get closer to the bottom.
> >All I can say is -- fasten your seat belts!
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> Agree completely. Why dont we just get it over with, and stop pretending
its
> not going to happen.

We?

> NCI opened the Door,

NCI wasn't around when all the other services dumped code.

> and the FCC went right along with NCI Whinning.
> All the Excusses NCI used in regard to CW, can just as easily be used for
the
> Written.

Such as?

> Someone PLEASE start NTI, HELL I will even Donate to this cause, and you
dont
> even have to give me some Phoney NTI number.

OK Larry, since all your doomsaying isn't doing it, you might as well start
the organization that will fufill your prophesy.

1196. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 01:40:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <VP5t8.1213$By.63245497@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40515

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CB43D09.7845E5B9@psu.edu...
> I think maybe the ulterior motive on some peoples part here is that if
> enough idiots who know nothing about rf safety get on the air, they will
> accidentally remove themselves from the gene pool? 8^)
>
> I'm pretty surprised that some hams seem to have such a underlying
> hatred for their hobby.
>
> - Mike - KB3EIA

Not so much a hatred for their hobby as much as an unreconcilable loss of stature. The only way to save face is to destroy it.

1197. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 01:43:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%S5t8.1218$2C.63449555@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40516

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CB27C9B.30C483F9@ix.netcom.com...
> There's already radio services that need no test.
> 1) 11 meter CB
> 2) FRS
> 3) cell phones
>
> All with type accepted (or whatever the term is nowadays)
> equipment.
>
> With the things the FCC lets hams do, like build our own
> equipment, develop new modes (psk31, packet, and such),
> select from many bands a frequency to use, hams need to
> pass a test to be sure that we are aware of various issues
> involved when operating homebrew radios, etc.
>
> Whether if one needs the knowledge required for an extra
> to operate certain subbands vs other subbands the generals
> are allowed, well.... (and I do have an extra). Running a
> linear on 14.300 is not any different than if it's on 14.160
> as far as safety and RFI and other rules and issues are concerned.

That's always been my point. If there must be divisions within the service,
PLEASE make them relavent.

> Not really comparable to flying small airplanes, as you need
> more skill to do IFR vs VFR, IIRC. And there are tests to
> get the revalent grade of flying license. Or driving busses
> vs just a 4 door car....

Obviously! Thanks for providing the voice of reason.

1198. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 01:50:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1_5t8.1226$uJ.63916274@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40517

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8vor0$dq6$0@208.207.71.173...
>
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
> > With the things the FCC lets hams do, like build our own
> > equipment, develop new modes (psk31, packet, and such),
> > select from many bands a frequency to use, hams need to
> > pass a test to be sure that we are aware of various issues
> > involved when operating homebrew radios, etc.
>
> That would be true if indeed the test did anything meaningful toward
> that end.

The exam today is more difficult than anything you took back in '06.

> > Whether if one needs the knowledge required for an extra
> > to operate certain subbands vs other subbands the generals
> > are allowed, well.... (and I do have an extra). Running a
> > linear on 14.300 is not any different than if it's on 14.160
> > as far as safety and RFI and other rules and issues are concerned.
>
> That was the main reason for having different levels of licenses with
> differing requirements and *an experience qualification* included.

You're saying that operating an amplifier at 14.300 is substantially
different than operating an amplifier at 14.160 Mhz?

Is this "new math" or something?

The
> Extra class was not available to anyone who had not held a general or
> higher class license for at elast two years. Of course, with no actual
> use requirement that wasn't a perfect solution, but it was assumed that
> anyone interested in advancing to Extra would put a station on the air,
> and gain experience at using, maintaining and adjusting it.

Some just want the license plate.

> It is curious that FCC would abandon all this yet retain the separate
> license classed. Perhaps it's a prolonged process done in small
> increments to keep down protests. Not that it has.

Wait. Are you saying that all the divisions -are- superflous?

> > Not really comparable to flying small airplanes, as you need
> > more skill to do IFR vs VFR, IIRC. And there are tests to

> > get the revalent grade of flying license. Or driving busses
> > vs just a 4 door car....
>
> Yep. No pilot ever gained his license on the strength of any battery of
> written tests. That only gets you the right to move on to the real
> thing, the practical experience phase from which one emerges a licensed
> pilot only after convincing a hard-nosed FAA examiner that he has indeed
> learned to actually, safely fly the plane.

Are you saying that receiving Morse Code coming across a battery operated
tape player is like operating an amateur radio station?

Good grief

1199. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 01:53:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <706t8.1227$UL.64072972@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40518

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a8usut21rl2@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Great..... Think I will start All-Code Intl. Anyone using a transciever
> would have to pass the code test amateurs are forced to. Obviously
> television and broadcast am/fm radio would be exempt because that is a
> one-way transmission. If morse code is that important, it obviously would
> be important for others to learn it. Hmmm.... a cop or firefighter gets
> injured somehow and cannot speak, well, they could send for help in morse
> code! As well as other radio services too......
>
> Ryan

Ryan, nope. When you see that GQ in front of the White House telling you what they are supposed to be saying inside, how do you think that image and audio gets from 1600 PA avenue to the TV station? Everyone get a test.

1200. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 02:01:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <E76t8.1233$kT.64513151@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40519

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb0f391$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:ub1k5c3eubb4c3@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> >
> > >As Tonto was heard to say, "Speak for yourself, white guy!"
> >
> > I thought I was!
> >
> > However, I admit that I should have NOT have said that "no one"
> > wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur" today. I certainly
> > should have qualified that. But time was short and this IS UseNet.
> >
> > Val
> >
>
> So, uh, Val....when you gonna start making money at ham radio and how you
> gonna do it?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim, its possible that he'll come up with a revolutionary new method of learning code so that it truly can be learned by everybody. He'll call it "Code Sudden" and three tapes will take you from 0 to 60WPM.

Then the code copying exam will truly go away (as did the code sending exam) because "everyone passes it."

Brian

1201. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 02:37:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a92su0$4lb$0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 40520

K0HB wrote:
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> > Eventually, the group can become irrelevant.
>
> I've tried to use rrap to remind people that they owe me a QSL card. So far
> I'm batting .000
>

You'll be batting .001 before long. Mine is nowhere near as colorfull
as yours, though.

1202. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 02:46:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a92ter$62c$0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 40521

K7JEB wrote:
>
> Hans, K0HB, wrote:
>
> > The US Navy fleets now operate without the
> > following enlisted ratings:
>
> > Pigeon Trainer
> > Sail Maker
> > Stoker
> > Radioman
>
> Just think: When the electromagnetic spectrum
> is a churning mass of EMP, ESD and FEC, a message
> can still get through on two feathered wings and a
> prayer -- IF there are stalwart pigeon trainers at
> the ready to release their avian charges into
> the troubled skies.

So true....But just think how much more confidence you can have that the message will actually arrive at its destination (and consider the fact that you will know it instantly since the recipient will immediately acknowledge it) when you use radio's most basic mode- Radiotelegraphy!
And you won't have to worry about contracting histoplasmosis from those smelly, nasty birds.....

Gung Ho!

1203. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 03:12:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a92v4i$q8q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40522

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a91hp421lff@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020409031537.07832.00001108@mb-mv.aol.com...
> > However, having
> > said that, I'll give you this much -- the ARRL has a good track record
> > of ignoring the wishes of it's paying members just as much as outsiders.
> > They seem to do what they think is good for the organization, whether
> > or not it's good for the ARS.
>
> That is a statement that has been said here, and to me and I seem to agree
> with it also. I am just sick of these people that seem to put the ARRL
> higher than God himself.
> Ryan, KC8PMX

Ryan,

I am equally sick of people who make "generic" statements of
complaint and fail to offer even a minimun list of items that
constitute ARRL actions or inactions that reflect ARRL
ignoring the wishes of it's paying members.

Perhaps YOU can offer such examples since Dick, Larry
and Val haven't taken a shot at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1204. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 03:27:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9305s$5nc$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40523

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020410011506.10062.00000386@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <20020409064126.08001.00002606@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
> >Hey, I asked him (Carl) first!
> >And he has given CW a try and concluded that he
> >doesn't like it.
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed:
> OK, fair enough, then. I tried yakking into a microphone on HF, and
> decided I didn't like it, either. I found that it didn't provide any sort
of
> intellectual challenge, and required a higher tolerance for boredom
> than I possess.
> Like ham radio in general, I guess it isn't for
> everyone -- and shouldn't have to be!

No problem....to each his own.

> However, I believe all radio
> amateurs should be familiar with our simplest, most practical,
> effective, efficient, and universal mode of communication -- Morse/CW.

No problem in principle. The difference is in what you believe
constitutes "an amateur being familiar with ....." It is quite
easy to be familiar with CW as a mode and NOT know how
to code/decode morse characters at any minimum speed.
Of that, I am sure, Larry will disagree as I am sure Larry
will state that "an amateur being familiar with CW...."
requires some minimum code speed knowledge.

> Like most people that don't "like" CW, I believe what Carl really
> doesn't like about it is the effort required to achieve a useful level
> of proficiency at it.

Even if true, it is of no value or impact as to the justification
of a morse test requirement. "Effort" at learning anything
is NOT a goal of amateur Part 97 FCC rules.

> Operating a PTT switch is, after all, much easier,
> and provides a higher level of instant gratification. That seems to be
> a common factor among those who have whined the loudest about
> the code testing requirements in the ARS...although they certainly
> can't, and won't, admit it.

Same old PCTA whining.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1205. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 04:03:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB50AF4.B4B6E443@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40524

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
> > We started down the slippery slope with the No-Code Tech in '91 --
> > and we are picking up more speed as we get closer to the bottom.
> > All I can say is -- fasten your seat belts!
>
> Yep, the sky is still falling after 12 years. I wonder when its going to
> crash?

Wonder when they're gonna realize that an empty sky can't fall?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1206. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 04:03:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9322q$in0$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40525

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb38d4f_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a8usqu$57o$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > Two examples of what I would consider to be highly illegal
> transmissions,
> > > yet done every single day here in the Dallas area on 146.880:
> > >
> > > One: For anyone who's listening, there's a big pileup on XXXX (where
> > > X=highway of choice), so don't go that way. A better way might be for
> you
> > > to take XXXX and get around this stuff because it's pretty bad.
> > >
> > > What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a
> > broadcast,
> > > addressing his/her comments to no one in particular.
> >
> > The same thing happens in many places during "drive times".
> > Here in Morris County, NJ someone usually responds to such a
> > "broadcast" to make it an official two way QSO. That's bending the
> > rules a bit, but it's a far cry from anything that constitues true
> > broadcasting which we believe is the intent of the prohibition.
> >
>
> Well, I wouldn't do it...put it that way. I guess I just don't believe in
> bending the rules. However, you must realize that the same people who do
> things like this are very quick to jump down the throats of a new
> operator--or, hell, even a seasoned one--that uses "10-4" or some such
thing
> on ham radio. Now, there's absolutely, 100% no illegality there, yet
those
> same people who "bend the rules" every day will do just that.
>
> > >
> > > Now, I've even seen it
> > > happen that the person making the broadcast then ends their
transmission
> > > without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.
> >
> > Again, probably just a slip up as opposed to any deliberate
> > behavior.

> >
>
> There's one operator in particular who does this all the time. I doubt
> seriously that it is any other than purely forgetful that he does it.
> However, a rules violation is a rules violation.
>
> > >
> > > Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place. These
> > people
> > > check with each other often about traffic flow and route.
Truckdrivers
> > will
> > > also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere.
> >
> > > Sorry folks, but both
> > > examples here are those that involve communication with pecuniary
> > interest:
> > > namely employment.
> >
> > How does the first involve any pecuniary interest?
>
> It is asking how traffic is and your interest is directly related to
getting
> to the office on time, job site on time, whatever. That is a pecuniary
> interest.

Kim,
That is...in my not so humble opinion, a crock. I totally
disagree with you and I'd suggest that IF it ever came up
with the FCC, they (FCC) wouldn't have a problem with it either.

> > Are you saying that if hams help
> > each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
> > jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?
>
> No. I am saying that is the way I *interpret* the rules in Part 97.
Other
> hams can do whatever they'd like, but I'll not be discussing topics like
> that because I believe they are rules violations.

Then you ARE saying such discussion is NOT permitted by
part 97.

> > As to the second, if there is NO discussion of actual business
> > activites, just how is that illegal...much less how would anyone
> > prove it to be illegal.
>
> Wait a minute, Bill. If I steal something from a store, yet no one
> "catches" me--how could it ever be said that I did something illegal? A
> discussion of traffic related to getting to your place of employment (a
> pecuniary interest) is--to me--a rules violation.

Again, I totally disagree...and so does the majority of
repeater users. I have NEVER been turned down by anyone
when I have asked for traffic help or directions.

> > > There's pretty much only two repeaters I really ever listen to with
any
> > > regularity. One is the most popular repeater in Dallas, the 146.880
> > > machine. The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine. At dinners and
> > other
> > > get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine have pretty much agreed we
will
> > not
> > > discuss traffic on our repeater.
> >
> > WHY? Traffic is NOT forbidden as a subject, regardless of the benefits
to
> > any individual as to saving time on their individual commute. IF I
> visited
> > your area andwas looking for an address, would you NOT want other
> > area hams to respond to my query?
> >
>
> That's quite different. If you are "just looking" for how to get
somewhere,
> that certainly isn't related in any way to a direct pecuniary interest you
> have in getting there (unless it is to get to a business meeting).

Just HOW do you or anyone else KNOW why I want to get to
a particular location. If I said I'm going to pick up a friend
would you give me directions? If I added that we are on our way
to work and I'm giving the friend a ride would you NOT give
me directions?

> > > We also chide people who come on and do
> > > so...it's not good hamming at all.
> >
> > Sorry Kim, I strongly disagree that there's anything about it that
> > is "not good". If it was, the FCC would have spoken to it
> > years ago.
>
> Oh, I don't think it's all that great a deal to them. Nor is really all
> that great a deal to stir up so much conversation. However, my opinion
> stands that it's breaking the rules. If not, where's the harm in my
erring
> on the side of caution?

No harm at all to have your own opinion. I still
disagree with it, however.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1207. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 04:10:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a932lp$5u4$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40527

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb390fc$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a8vv3t$uh7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Ditto my last...but again, IF the conversation?QSO is only about traffic
> > conditions, why is it legal for you and I to discuss, but not a trucker
> > who might happen to be a ham? IF the subject itself is legal for
> > me, it should be legal for anyone with a ham license.
> >
>
> I shudder to mention that we've all been discussing "gray" areas,
"bending"
> the rules, "ifs", and "whatifs," etc. I shudder twice to mention that it
> leads me to thinking that we are very defensive about our gray areas...
>
> 'Nuff said

You are free to believe what you wish. I totally disagree that
there is anything "grey" about my comment above.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1208. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 04:13:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a932lq$5u4$2@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40526

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204101252.a45aeed@posting.google.com...
> "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<mFYs8.4991$3P4.439122@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
> >
> >
> > > There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
> > > facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports
by
> > > radio amateurs.
> >
> > I agree, so long as those traffic reports are on amateur frequencies.
> >
> > If memory serves, Riley just recently shut somebody down who was
> > coordinating a network of amateurs gathering traffic reports and
> > airing the information on another medium.
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/2000/0830.html
>
> the guy was in Orlando, Florida.
>
> > Of course the violation was *not* that they were gathering the info
> > on the ham bands, but rather the commercial reporting of that
> > info on another radio service.
>
> He was allegedly using a local repeater to gather the info for his
employer.

Was the "guy" a ham? If not, what was the violation
if all the "guy" did was listen to a repeater conversation
and report what he heard?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1209. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 04:24:36 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <8e8t8.9832$3P4.573677@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40528

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> Was the "guy" a ham? If not, what was the violation
> if all the "guy" did was listen to a repeater conversation
> and report what he heard?
>

Here's an excerpt --

"The FCC wrote Tech Plus licensee Joseph E. Mattern, WW4WJD, on August 22, 2000, citing Commission evidence alleging that the licensee had been using amateur repeaters in his area to solicit traffic reports for his employer, a company that markets the reports. "Such use of an amateur station would be a violation of ?97.113(a) of the Commission's rules," FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth wrote."

If you can find any of your famous "grey area" in the above, then have your proctologist give you an eye exam.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1210. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 04:27:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a933fq$7jc$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40529

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:8e8t8.9832$3P4.573677@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > Was the "guy" a ham? If not, what was the violation
> > if all the "guy" did was listen to a repeater conversation
> > and report what he heard?
>
> Here's an excerpt --
> "The FCC wrote Tech Plus licensee Joseph E. Mattern, WW4WJD, on August 22,
> 2000, citing Commission evidence alleging that the licensee had been using
> amateur repeaters in his area to solicit traffic reports for his employer,
a
> company that markets the reports. "Such use of an amateur station would be
a
> violation of ?97.113(a) of the Commission's rules," FCC Special Counsel
for
> Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth wrote."
>
> If you can find any of your famous "grey area" in the above, then have
your
> proctologist give you an eye exam.

Nope...seems pretty clear that it goes well beyond
any "grey area".

Thanks & Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1211. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 04:42:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9347s$l1j$0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 40530

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > He was allegedly using a local repeater to gather the info for his
> employer.
>
> Was the "guy" a ham? If not, what was the violation
> if all the "guy" did was listen to a repeater conversation
> and report what he heard?
>
>

No way he could be in violation by listening only. It's the same principle as owning a transmitter while not transmitting on it when unlicensed is not a violation.

1212. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 05:23:48 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <1A75323B240E7628.53CC1CCF7E7393FE.FFB0192A66A3627A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40531

On 08 Apr 2002 12:23:13 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
>>No wonder amateur radio seems to be tanking. Would
>>you trade a couple of VTVMs for a cover you could READ?
>
>If you think that the price of the changes you suggested be made to QST is "a
>couple of VTVMs," you are completely unrealistic.

How much does it cost to get a layout guy to go away?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1213. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 05:29:25 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <28F193B9C487CDC9.7E6518775A5808EB.A0B11DC7D4619915@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40532

On 07 Apr 2002 18:07:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>As mentioned by others, we also have Ronnie Milsap, Jon Bon Jovi, Joe Walsh,
>Walter Cronkite and of course many current and past astronauts.

There's an interesting point; why don't we ever see a PBS special on
ARISS? For that matter, why don't we ever see a PBS special on
Amateur Radio? They've got them for everything (and I do mean
*every*damn*little*thing*) else.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1214. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 05:34:51 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <442400E659C4E909.001288B0145E70FB.E7BB63667BB63632@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40533

On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 16:03:12 GMT, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:

>The US Navy fleets now operate without the following enlisted ratings:
>
> Pigeon Trainer
> Sail Maker
> Stoker
> Radioman

Do they still have someone trained in flag semaphore and the use of
the signalling lights, or are those covered under other
specializations?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1215. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 05:44:32 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <51049F4B0651BA00.C3EC301A37C0FAF0.51F8269A75A71B89@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40534

On Mon, 8 Apr 2002 22:20:28 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine.

Oh really? So, where are you at 22:30 every night? We're still
looking for volunteers for NCS and ANCS spots :)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1216. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 05:50:52 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <540528AEB5F278FE.ED83B1FF3DBF5655.B5318AF2736A6E6F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40535

On Tue, 9 Apr 2002 19:45:42 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>And, you're absolutely right. You also know that emergency situations are
>different.

Well, I suppose we could create some emergencies so that our practice
is just like the real thing. OTOH, I suspect the FCC wouldn't back us
up on claims that it was necessary to Teflon-coat I-35 so we could get
realistic practice for a multi-car pileup.

Because of that, we go through the routine as often as possible, so
that it becomes a habit, and so that it will stay a routine when all
hell breaks loose around it.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1217. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 05:58:46 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <3C9057983F3F4EFC.DB28823F33FDF148.D6611FDD3FECF89F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40536

On Tue, 09 Apr 2002 19:53:27 -0400, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>Let me know if I got this
>wrong, but I can't violate this rule as I have an extra and can
>use any unused ham frequency appropriate for the mode
>I want to do (except that mini-band at 219-220 MHz which
>is for IIRC coordinated packet and digital work unless I set up
>a station after I get coordinated).

Isn't there also a similar chunk somewhere in the rather large piece
of bandwidth that comprises 70cm?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1218. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 06:48:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a93bklddd0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 40537

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 16:03:12 GMT, "K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:
>
> >The US Navy fleets now operate without the following enlisted ratings:
> >
> > Pigeon Trainer
> > Sail Maker
> > Stoker
> > Radioman
>
> Do they still have someone trained in flag semaphore and the use of
> the signalling lights, or are those covered under other
> specializations?

Such embarrassing questions! The answer is "They are *supposed* to
have". But
evidently you missed the news a couple years ago where some large ships
were on night combat training mission under blackout and radio silence
conditions using Morse code with signal lights when something went
seriously awry.
Evidently a no-coder was assigned watch duty on one of the ships
because he totally missed a message from the ship ahead of his which
said "We are in the process of backing up, stand clear" or something to
that effect. The result of his malfeasance (yes, Cecil, it's a good
word) was that his ship continued in forward mode and struck the backing
ship creating a big repair bill for the taxpayers of some $1 million
plus. Neato.

1219. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 07:28:58 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <ED3AAB0DA59B779F.F2E0F5E930325431.D9DA063A351A9751@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40538

On 9 Apr 2002 10:58:23 -0700, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>I agree with Bill 100%. Unless you are "on the clock" while commuting,
>there is no pecuniary interest.

If I'm on the clock while driving, it best serves my pecuniary interest to have a legitimate excuse to rack up overtime getting across town. If the paid drive takes three hours each way, then I only have to do two hours of actual work that day. When I want traffic information in the middle of the day, it's so I don't waste my entire lunch break sitting on a backed-up freeway. When I want it at the end of the day, it's because I have better things to do with my personal time.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1220. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 07:39:05 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <2743784E26F06A64.EFC6A6EDF713CB3B.CA4212480AC0D1F8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40539

On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 18:52:35 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>What a huge, huge waste of ham radio. There are broadcast stations all over
>the place, with helicopters, motorists who call in on cellular phones, etc.,
>to do the job you describe above.

No, their job is to maybe, possibly, kind of report that there's a
road somewhere with a car on it. Anything more would cut into the
airtime reserved for the sponsors and the latest gossip report.

Besides which, too many of them space their traffic reports out too
widely; one at 5PM, which is useless unless you turn on your Walkman
before you even get up from your desk, and one at 5:20, after you're
already sitting in the backup.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1221. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 07:43:26 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <9889002DFC785634.DFC6B05816B0BB7D.BD4B5602AB5325D5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40540

On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 18:37:17 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Precisely. And, as I've tried to say, I don't really care whether someone,
>or others, wish to have such discussions on the air. I don't. For the
>reasons that a) I believe it *has the potential* for abuse (and is abused in
>my opnion) and, b) it just sounds crappy when all people can do to drum up
>conversation about traffic, weather, and how sick they've been.

Frankly, (although I am curious to hear how WA5I's back problem turns
out) I'd rather hear people talk about nothing but traffic jams all
day long on VHF than hear the seemingly endless detailed discussions
of prostate/colon/toenail/whatever dysfunction on 80m.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1222. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part Two

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 08:06:00 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <DFB9BB8B1AC090CC.CDB86609DA7D59FF.525E2AC65265347E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40541

On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 19:03:36 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Well, c'mon!! It was Jim's baby from the start, and his callsign is W5JBP.
>Hence "Jim's Big Project." I think it's got a nice ring as well. Gosh, I
>am trying to remember the school down here...the kids are on the air all the
>time and it's great!

K5DES, though that call doesn't get used too often, since most of the
kids in the class who really want to talk have their own licenses
pretty quickly. It has a side benefit in that the DARC has been able
to use the school's facilities for classes and meetings as well.

>Val, you get down here immediately and listen to the 30-40 or so kids who
>either already have their tickets or are studying for them. It's *all*
>about education, kids, and amateur radio. On this, you're more wrong than
>you've ever been.

I keep expecting to see them on the news as one of those 15-minute
special stories. IMO, it would be at least on par with the ones they
run occasionally about people who took in three hundred stray cats or
organized park cleanup efforts.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1223. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 10:07:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411060707.29940.00000377@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40542

In article <a932lq$5u4$2@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0204101252.a45aeed@posting.google.com...
>> "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
>news:<mFYs8.4991$3P4.439122@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>> >
>> >
>> > > There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
>> > > facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports
>by
>> > > radio amateurs.
>> >
>> > I agree, so long as those traffic reports are on amateur frequencies.
>> >
>> > If memory serves, Riley just recently shut somebody down who was
>> > coordinating a network of amateurs gathering traffic reports and
>> > airing the information on another medium.
>>
>> http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/2000/0830.html
>>
>> the guy was in Orlando, Florida.
>>
>> > Of course the violation was *not* that they were gathering the info
>> > on the ham bands, but rather the commercial reporting of that
>> > info on another radio service.
>>
>> He was allegedly using a local repeater to gather the info for his
>employer.
>
>Was the "guy" a ham?

Yes. His call began with "WW4".

>If not, what was the violation
>if all the "guy" did was listen to a repeater conversation
>and report what he heard?

He was actively soliciting the information for rebroadcast by his employer, not
just listening. The enforcement reports (there was followup in later
enforcement letters) make it clear (to me, anyway) that the violation was in
the use of amateur radio to gather info specifically for commercial
rebroadcast, not for the traffic reports themselves.

Take a look and tell us what you think.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

1224. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part Two

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 11:06:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411070649.16868.00003470@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 40543

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>On this I agree 100% with Kim. I just sent in an additional
>donation to <the Big Project> today.

About a year ago, the ARRL Lab guys brought a truckload of fine junque to the Hudson Division Convention flea market. Jim Haynie was there. When he conducted the ARRL Forum, I decided to have some fun. Right in the middle of his spiel about the Big Project, I inturrupted him because I had to get back to the table. I let him know that the Lab guys had decided to donate 100% of the proceeds of the junque sale to the Big Project. He didn't mind the inturruption. :-)

At the end of the day, we had raised about $750.00.

Of course, the next time we did another junque sale, we donated the money to the Lab test-equipment fund. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1225. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 12:07:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40544

In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>Anyway, the
>reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is I've
>done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.

What mode did you use on 30 meters?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1226. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 12:07:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411080713.29940.00000379@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40547

In article <3CB498AE.EA8AA29D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> >It is foolish to attribute
>> >only 4% of the change in growth to nocode techs.
>>
>> Nobody claims that.
>
>Huh? Are you denying that you claimed that?

The growth in the '80s (all hams codetested) was 30%
The growth in the '90s (most but not all hams codetested) was 34%.
The change in growth was 4%. (34-30=4)

All of the above is true and has been posted by me several times.

4% of 4% is 0.16%. So 4% of the change in growth is 0.16%

>I can dig up that posting
>of yours if you want me to.

Go ahead - show a post where I claim that the tech license resulted in only a
0.16% change in growth.

But be sure to quote the whole post so as not to obscure the context.

>If you are not attributing only 4% of
>the change in growth to nocode techs, then the change in growth would
>have surely been negative without the nocode techs, but you have
>already denied that possibility.
>
"4% of the change in growth" is 0.16%. You are the one making that claim, not
me.

>> >It is also
>> >foolish to maintain that 4% value would not have gone negative
>> >without the nocode techs.
>>
>> Why? You do not know what would have happened if the FCC had not changed
>the
>> rules in 1991.
>
>This is claiming essentially the same thing that you denied before.

Nope.

> Let
>me say it again. The nocode tech population grew from zero percent to

>approximately 30% from 1990 to 2000.

That's right. Nobody knows how many of those hams (they ARE "real" hams, btw) would have been licensed if the FCC had left the rules alone in 1991.

>If the nocode tech license had not
>existed, the rate of growth (i.e. the second derivative of the population)
>of the ARS would have been negative.

"Rate of growth" is the first derivative of the population. In plain English, anyway. You do not get to reset the boundary conditions after the statements are made.

>A second derivative of the population
>going negative is a red flag for people who track populations of endangered
>species indicating that the population is in trouble.

Nice try but no cookie.
>
>> >If the nocode techs had not
>> >existed, where would the 30% growth have come from to
>> >keep the change in growth from going negative?

Note the use of the word "growth".
>>
>> The same place the 30% growth came from in the 1980s.
>
>If 30% growth in coded hams had happened, the overall growth would have
>been 60%. In fact, it didn't happen at all.

In the '80s, all growth in US ham radio was due to their being more codetested hams because all hams were codetested. That changed in 1991 because a new option was offered, changing the boundary conditions.
>
>> The facts are simple:
>
>That's nice, but you are not discussing the issue.

You are avoiding the issue by avoiding the facts. Why are you afraid of the facts?

>Why can't you accept the
>simple truth that the sun will rise tomorrow?

The sun will probably rise tomorrow.

>> You appear to keep making two mistakes, Cecil:
>>
>> 1) You assume that all Techs are not code tested
>
>Nope, I'm not assuming that.

Yes, you are. Denial makes three mistakes.

>"All" invariably means false.

Not true. All US hams have licenses issued by the FCC Is that not true?

>I am assuming that
>the large majority of nocode techs are not code tested.

There is no such thing as a "nocode tech" to the FCC or the various license databases. There are "Technicians" and "Technician Pluses" - but some Technicians have passed code tests and others have not.

> Do you have any proof
>to the contrary?

I have posted it several times.

>If you want, go back to your posted 1997 figures when nocode techs were NOT
>code tested.

That is not true.

>27% of hams were nocode techs. Didn't think of that, did you?

Actually, I did.

There is no such thing as a "nocode tech" to the FCC or the various license databases. There are "Technicians" and "Technician Pluses" - but some Technicians have passed code tests and others have not.

The FCC did not immediately create the Tech Plus class in 1991. They dropped the code test but listed both codetested and noncodetested Techs as "Technicians". They left it up to the individual licensee and the VECs to keep track of who was code tested and who wasn't.

FCC did not begin to separate Techs from Tech Pluses until mid-1994. Even after the change, some code-tested Techs who renewed got licenses that said "Technician", not "Technician Plus".
>
>> 2) You assume that none, or very few, of the hams who got Tech licenses
>without
>> a code test would have gotten a ham license if the code test had not been
>> ropped for that license in 1991.
>
>Again, "none" makes it false. I'm assuming that the majority of nocode techs
>would not have gotten a license if the nocode tech license has not existed -
>a perfectly reasonable assumption based on the set of hams whom I have
>elmered.

Not a reasonable assumption for the set of all hams, though. And not a reasonable assumption of what would have happened without the rules change.

>You assumption that all existing nocode techs would have gotten a coded ham
>license is simply false.

I have not assumed that at all.

>Why can't we just be reasonable?

In this case, you equate "being reasonable" with "agree with Cecil without proof".
You gotta do better than that.
>
>You are making the same mistake as all the other PCTA folk.

You're mistaken, Cecil.

>You are trying to
>declare the effect of the nocode techs on the ARS as negligible.

Where am I doing that? I'm simply pointing out basic facts. 30% growth in ten years with all hams code tested, 34% with some hams not codetested. Where do I say any ham's effect is negligible?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1227. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 12:07:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411080714.29940.00000381@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40545

In article <3CB42DE2.1872B76E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:
>> >Okay. How did Dick Van Dyke figure into this for you?
>>
>> Very simply, he is a celebrity well known to me, whom I respect for
>> his work in movies and television, ...
>
>Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
>amateur radio?

I have no problem with having a recovering alcoholic as a spokesperson for amateur radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1228. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 12:07:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411080714.29940.00000380@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40546

In article <28F193B9C487CDC9.7E6518775A5808EB.A0B11DC7D4619915@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On 07 Apr 2002 18:07:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>As mentioned by others, we also have Ronnie Milsap, Jon Bon Jovi, Joe Walsh,
>>Walter Cronkite and of course many current and past astronauts.
>
>There's an interesting point; why don't we ever see a PBS special on
>ARISS? For that matter, why don't we ever see a PBS special on
>Amateur Radio? They've got them for everything (and I do mean
>*every*damn*little*thing*) else.
>
GREAT IDEA, Joe!

Perhaps NOVA could do an episode on ham radio. A version of "Antiques Roadshow"
could visit various radio museums and 'fests like the AWA.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1229. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 12:47:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411084723.00417.00003297@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40548

>Subject: Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/10/02 19:37 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020410193736.22569.00000631@mb-fg.aol.com>

>
>You've missed the "fine print" in interpersonal behavior.

...from the master of the slur and denigrating remark.

Sheesh.

>You wound up DRIVING A BUS. Geez, Larrah, that's something
>a "woman of color" can do...and they do by the hundreds, perhaps
>thousands. I see them regularly.

And now blatant racism and bigotry. No "obfuscation" here. Anyone ELSE
you'd care to offend, Your Creepiness?

>Noooo, Larrah, flying, even in a complicated commercial air carrier,
>is a SKILL acquired after long practice and already possessing the
>aptitude and physical attributes necessary for flying.

Noooo, Your Ignorantness, it's far more than that. Of course, not BEING a
pilot (like not being a licensed Amateur) leaves you wanting for facts and
practical experience. The actual skill of flying is minimal compared to the
academics required of today's ATP licensed pilot. Time spent in classrooms for
most line pilots is 10 times the amount of time spent in simulators or doing
actual flight training.

>I really don't...but some inflated egoes have grown so large that
>the needle to puncture them is simply irresistable.

Too bad you have neither the manhood nor the material to do it, eh Lennie?

>Now, WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED ABOUT RADIO in all the time
>you've been hitting on all those "dumbed down" no-code types?
>Apply yourself. Lots of stores have crazy glue.

Many of which are patronized by Lennie the Sniffer.

1230. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 13:27:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB58F2B.B99A2174@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40549

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The result of his malfeasance (yes, Cecil, it's a good word)

Of course it is when it is properly applied to public officials.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1231. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 13:37:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB591A3.D4ACF8F9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40550

N2EY wrote:
> "Rate of growth" is the first derivative of the population. In plain English,
> anyway. You do not get to reset the boundary conditions after the statements
> are made.

Nope, growth is the first derivative of the population, i.e. the slope of the
population curve. Rate of growth is the second derivative. You do not get to
redefine commonly accepted mathematical principles.

> >You are trying to
> >declare the effect of the nocode techs on the ARS as negligible.
>
> Where am I doing that? I'm simply pointing out basic facts. 30% growth in ten
> years with all hams code tested, 34% with some hams not codetested. Where do I
> say any ham's effect is negligible?

You said that only 4% of the growth could be attributed to nocode techs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1232. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 13:50:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411095011.00417.00003303@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40451

>Subject: Re: Birthplace of NTI
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/10/02 19:37 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020410193734.22569.00000630@mb-fg.aol.com>

>Already been done. A paper was done many years ago on using Morse Code
>>by Handi-Hams.
>
>Incorrect. This was a research project carried out by a group of
>universities.

"...group of universities."...??? I provide specifics and you claim it's incorrect and substitue a generalitiy. Uh huh...we believe you, Your Putziness.

>TIA = Transient Ischemic Attack, also known as a "micro-stroke."

NOT known as a "micro-stroke". Wrong again...Break open a medical terminology text, Your Clammyness.

>There are various kinds of such "attacks," all caused by hemorrhages
>of blood vessels in the brain.

NOT "all caused by hemmorhages of blood vessles of the brain" , Lennie. Again you offer absolutes that are NOT substantiated by facts.

>Doctors will explain all the details to patients' family members.

Either the one who did the explaning to you did a poor job, or you weren't paying attention.

I weigh in on YOUR not paying attention. This is then compounded by your getting in here and crowing about that of which you are obviously unprepared and foolishly ignorant.

>I KNOW various radio services because I been IN them, have had
>both self-teaching and formal education in them as well as on-
>the-job training. Anyone can do that if they apply themselves...and
>live long enough.

Then PLEASE tell us which one is the one that is "strictly recreational", Lennie.

The TWO radio services you have NOT been in are the Amateur and the one you claim is purely recreational...bcause if you HAD been in such a service, you'd KNOW better than to make the ignorant statements you've made here.

>> On the OTHER hand, YOU purport to be a professioanl in
>>radiocommunications
>>matters, yet can't tell me what FCC regulation specifically creates radio
>>services for "strictly recreational" purposes, despite having made the
>>assertion that such exisits.
>
>Wrong again. I've explained it all in public.

You've explained NOTHING. You've treid to RATIONALIZE your excuses for
getting caught with your pants down.

Lennie...WHICH RADIO SERVICE IS "STRICTLY RECREATIONAL"...??? You have
NOT explained WHICH radio service is "strictly recreational"...

>The regulations for US amateur radio specifically state that it is a
>personal radio activity without pecuniary interest (no monetary
>compensation), therefore it is "amateur." In that case the FCC has,
>for a long time, "explained" the difference between amateur and
>professional. It is codified, it is law.

Lennie, CITE THE PARAGRAPH in FCC rules and regulations, In Part 97, 95,
or any other, that states that Amateur Radio or ANY OTHER radio service is
STRICTLY RECREATIONAL.

YOU stated that such a service exisits. However, to date, you cannot cite
such a service by rule or regulation.

>Except for IVDS, Part 95 personal radio services were created for
>personal recreational use.

No they were not.

> The language of the regulations was
>so worded that professionals could ALSO use radios regulated
>under Part 95.

Sheesh, Lennie...Are you a COMPLETE idiot, or is it a transient situation?
CB was created for BOTH "personal" use AND for small businesses that could not
afford the "commercial" equipment of other serices.

This is documented in more than one historical test of the era, most
prolifically by Tom Kneitel of CB-genre periodicals. Still is...

And at NO TIME was CB >>EVER<< intended as a "recreational" radio service.
Until the FCC finally threw it's hands up and "washed them " of the nightmare
IT created, they had spent a great deal of effort trying to enforce the rules
that SPECIFICALLY prohibited "chit chat" or "hobby-like" communications.

They have once again reinforced that concept by refusing to drop the 150
mile limit on CB communications and refused to implement Amateur-like rules for
CB sideband operators.

>Radio-control or "R/C" is the old "Class C" CB which still
>retains the old 27 MHz band frequencies and had the many 72 MHz
>channels added to please modelers, both contest flyers and the

>occasional "park flyer."

This is as close as you will come to being correct, Lennie, but STILL not "strictly" for recreational use. If I want to use one of these frequencies to remotely control a device for my business, I may do so.

>While there are no exact details,...

No problem, Lennie...lack of details seems to be your forte...especially when it "supports" your rants.

>While there are professional R/C users (I know of two of them here
>in the center of movie land) those are distinct rare cases.

Even ONE "case" mitigates your "strictly" assertion. I know of many others. That the rules ALLOW this again mitigates your "strictly" recreational assertion.

>The FCC worded the regulations so as not
>to discriminate between recreation and occupation or amateur and
>professional.

You're wasting a lot of bandwidth to say "Steve has my balls in a vise and I don't want to admit I am wrong".

>The FRS or Family Radio Service was created to give individuals a
>short-range communications radio capability that includes some
>measure of privacy. Again, the language of the regulations does not
>discriminate between recreation and occupation nor amateur and
>professional.

Thanks, Lennie. I knew I was right all along too.

>FRS transceivers on the market range from as low as $30 the pair
>to $80 for a single unit. No doubt some professionals use FRS
>transceivers for very low-cost operations,...(SNIP)

Which mitigates your "strcitly recreational" assertion for FRS. So far We have ruled out Class C and Class D CB as "strictly recreational" since there are glaring examples of those who DO use those services for OTHER than "recreational" purposes.

I also know of persons who obtained an Amateur Radio license because it furthered some other purpose (a friend and ardent storm chaser in Oklahoma is one...)...No 'recreational' intent was ever considered on his part.

That Amateur Radio may be used for NON-recreational purposes at any given moment is also further proof that your asertion is FALSE.

So now we have ruled out most of Part 95 and Part 97.

>... but Part 90, the HUGE
>350+ page Private Land Mobile Radio Services section
>has the following radio services for professionals in: (SNIP)

We can already rule those services out as "strictly recreational". Lennie. What was your point? (Other than to cover your bloody tracks?)

>Part 95 is specifically named PERSONAL Radio Services.
>Four out of the five radio services in there were specifically
>created for recreational radio use. To argue anything else is
>a stupid exercise akin to picking fly shit out of pepper.

No, they were NOT created for "recreational" purposes. They were created for PERSONAL uses, Ignorant One. ONE of the five parts (Class C) is the only one that comes close to matching your assertion, but even YOU cite "exceptions"...therefore it's STILL not "strictly" recreational.

If someone elects to use CB, FRS, GMRS or Class C Part 95 for "recreational" purposes, then that is a PERSONAL choice, but is NOT the ONLY (hence "stictly") one they may exercise.

In no radio service that you cite did the Federal Communications Commission EVER create for "strictly" recreational purposes.

>CQ publishes the complete 22-year content of HR on
>three CD-ROMs, available from them directly or through the ARRL
>(shipping extra from ARRL) for only $150.

If you care to add this to your "library" for nostalgic purposes and have the $150 in discretionary cash, have at it.

"Ham Radio" is no longer published. It failed...defunct...kaput. It's nice that some feel it necessary to "republish" it via CD. But I have no use for 20 year old data...Not at $150, anyway. If I get refered to "HR" as a resource, I will pick up a copy at the next hamfest for 25 cents a copy.

>NSI and KCI are no longer.

And the relevence of this relative to your inability to provide a specific regulatory cite as to which radio service is "strictly recreational" would be...?!?!

More smoke and mirrors, Lennie...But you still have not identified the allegedly "strictly" recreational radio service.

Keep trying. You used 6385 bytes on this pass...Wanna try for more?

1233. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 14:08:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a945c6$8ck$0@208.207.71.153>
Source record: 40452

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CB498AE.EA8AA29D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>

> >You are trying to
> >declare the effect of the nocode techs on the ARS as negligible.
>
> Where am I doing that? I'm simply pointing out basic facts. 30% growth in ten
> years with all hams code tested, 34% with some hams not codetested. Where do I
> say any ham's effect is negligible?
>

Why Jim! Surely you've learned by now that if you don't agree with Cecil
there's no way you can ever be reasonable!

1234. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 14:08:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411100841.00417.00003304@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40453

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/10/02 19:37 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020410193731.22569.00000628@mb-fg.aol.com>

>I spent four months total in five trips to Naval Air Development
>Center in Warminster, PA, in 1971-1972, while working for
>RCA Corporation.

Another trip down CV lane...another dissertation created to marvel at his self-appreciating "career", his presence long forgotten (and in some cases gladly) by all but himself.

And another example that in his 15 years of night school, very little, if any, was spent in Composition or Professional Writing.

Just how many words CAN you pack into one "paragraph", Lennie? At least words that MEAN anything?

>Whatever became of the Warminster NAS or the old
>NADC buildings is not important to me personally since I never
>went back there again, not the nearby Willow Grove NAS, nor...(SNIP)

Of course it's not important to you, Lennie...because that rambling, meaninless trip down Lennie's Nostalgia Lane was NOT germane to the conversation.

You try to make some "point" by discussing things that ALLEGEDLY happened in 1972 when I have clearly stated my presence was a decade later, assuming, I suppose, that you think Pennsylvania simply ceased to stop dead in it's tracks when you left.

How pompus.

>What STEVIE has to supply is the year where he "visited the
>HRO" outlet I described in Burbank, CA.

January 2000, Lennie. Sorry.

>There
>are apparent differences in geographic locations which should
>be easily recalled.

I was more interested in the company and conversation than taking in geographical points of interest so I could do USENET jousting with Your Loserness. But "been there-done that" still applies.

And the traffic and air in SoCal still sucks.

Now...WHICH RADIO SERVICE IS STRICTLY RECREATIONAL..???

Steve

1235. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 14:09:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB5990A.FA79C0D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40454

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> The growth in the '80s (all hams codetested) was 30%
> The growth in the '90s (most but not all hams codetested) was 34%.
> The change in growth was 4%. (34-30=4)
>
> All of the above is true and has been posted by me several times.

Of course, you neglected to repost the untrue part. Here it is again:

> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.

"Creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test" did
NOT bring about "just 4% more growth in a decade". There were many
other factors that you deliberately failed to consider. Since the nocode
techs increased from zero percent of the ARS to 30% in that decade, your
conclusion is ridiculous and irrational. The lack of correlation between
the 30% of all members of the ARS becoming nocode techs and the 4% rate of
growth is obvious. Contrary to what you are trying to imply, the nocode
techs certainly contributed their share to growth. It was all the other
classes of licenses that were approximately flat growth for that decade
and failed to match the previous decade. Your feeble attempt to minimize
the contribution of the nocode techs to the ham population is pretty
transparent.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1236. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 14:10:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a945h1$8ck$1@208.207.71.153>
Source record: 40455

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>

>
> >I really don't...but some inflated egoes have grown so large that
> >the needle to puncture them is simply irresistable.
>
> Too bad you have neither the manhood nor the material to do it, eh Lennie?
>

But he has an ego that was popped long ago, thus his lifetime tepid
rant....

1237. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 14:12:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411101256.00417.00003305@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40456

>Subject: Missing Q signals
>From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 04/10/02 21:33 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <JJ5t8.6713$3P4.535699@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

> Some Q signals have never made it to the ARRL's official
> list.

GREAT! ROTMFFLMMFAO!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1238. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 14:14:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB59A38.A1D752E1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40457

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >You are trying to
> > >declare the effect of the nocode techs on the ARS as negligible.
> >
> > Where am I doing that? I'm simply pointing out basic facts. 30% growth in ten
> > years with all hams code tested, 34% with some hams not codetested. Where do I
> > say any ham's effect is negligible?
>
> Why Jim! Surely you've learned by now that if you don't agree with Cecil
> there's no way you can ever be reasonable!

Here's what Jim said, Dick. Do you think he was being reasonable?

> > So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
> > from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.

Nocode techs grew to be 30% of the ARS in the first decade. Jim would like
for us to believe that is a 4% contribution. No doubt, so would you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1239. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 14:22:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411102229.00417.00003306@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40458

>Subject: Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB
>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>Date: 04/11/02 10:10 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <a945h1$8ck$1@208.207.71.153

> But he has an ego that was popped long ago, thus his lifetime tepid
>rant....

No doubt!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1240. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 15:37:01 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <x4it8.359$3z3.42743@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40459

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote

> OTOH, I suspect the FCC wouldn't back us up on claims that
> it was necessary to Teflon-coat I-35 so we could get realistic
> practice for a multi-car pileup.

Up on our end of I-35 we just ice it down once in a while
for our drills. Much cheaper than Teflon.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1241. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 15:38:46 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <a6it8.363$3z3.42951@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40460

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:442400E659C4E909.001288B0145E70FB.E7BB63667BB63632@lp.airnews.net...
> On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 16:03:12 GMT, "K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:
>
> >The US Navy fleets now operate without the following enlisted ratings:
> >
> > Pigeon Trainer
> > Sail Maker
> > Stoker
> > Radioman
>
> Do they still have someone trained in flag semaphore and the use of
> the signalling lights, or are those covered under other
> specializations?
>

Yes. The rating is Signalman. They communicate via lights,
semaphore, and flaghoists.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1242. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 16:19:44 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <AIit8.413$3z3.48290@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40461

Addendum (courtesy W4FOA, K4HB, W9SZ, HK3CW)

QWD? Who is DX on frequency
QWD I know who DX is but I'm not telling you

QLT? Gimme yer lass too
QLT My lass too is **

QPC Please Copy **
QPC? Which QLT is calling me?

QLH When last hurd
QLH? What was my report when last hurd?

QTU Quit tuning up on the DX frequency!
QTU? Will you PLEASE quit tuning up on the DX frequency?

QLZ? Do you work List Lizards?
QLZ I do not work List Lizards

QWE? Can you copy Morse code?
QWE I am a Welfare Extra - PSE QRS

1243. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 16:53:40 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ocjt8.458$3z3.52285@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40462

Addendum (Courtesy WA2MOE)

QPU? - Did you pass gas?
QPU - (Open VOX condition) Someone passed gas.

1244. EFF CEE CEE Enacts I-Net Morse requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 17:07:18 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <apjt8.483$3z3.54786@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40463

Following provided by WA2MOE

February 30, 1998
FCC Enacts Internet Morse Code Requirement

D.A.P. INDEXES:
TOP STORIES | NEWS | SPORTS | BUSINESS | TECHNOLOGY | ENTERTAINMENT

Filed at 10:26 a.m. EST By The Disassociated Press WASHINGTON (DAP)

The FCC, under pressure to clean up the Internet, especially after the Communications Decency Act provisions regarding Internet content regulation were stricken as violating the U.S. Constitution, has decided instead to require a Morse code requirement for Internet users. Citing the success of the Amateur Radio Service and the general belief that its requirement for operators to pass a Morse code proficiency exam and other technical requirements, has kept the A.R.S. "clean", the FCC will enact a 5 word-per-minute requirement for all Internet users. They are leaving open the issue of whether there should be a "codeless" class of Internet user and are soliciting comments on this proposal. Codeless class users could read but not write to newsgroups.

Persons wishing to develop a web site having only links to other web sites having links to other web sites, and so forth, must pass a 13 word-per-minute test and demonstrate proficiency in HTML, the Internet authoring language.

Persons wishing to develop web sites that have actual content, as compared to just links to other web sites, must pass a 20 word-per-minute Morse proficiency test, demonstrate proficiency in HTML and the Java programming language, and show that they have mastery of at least one human language, such as English.

The FCC, which lacks budgetary authority to implement the testing program, has stated that it intends to create Volunteer Examiner programs for Internet applicants. Whiskey Five Why Eye will mail your application to the FCC for a fee of $500.00.

--30--

1245. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 18:07:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411140725.09489.00000408@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40464

In article <3CB59A38.A1D752E1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> > >You are trying to
>> > >declare the effect of the nocode techs on the ARS as negligible.
>> >
>> > Where am I doing that? I'm simply pointing out basic facts. 30% growth in
>ten
>> > years with all hams code tested, 34% with some hams not codetested. Where
>do I
>> > say any ham's effect is negligible?
>>
>> Why Jim! Surely you've learned by now that if you don't agree with Cecil
>> there's no way you can ever be reasonable!
>
>Here's what Jim said, Dick. Do you think he was being reasonable?
>
>> > So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
>> > from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.

The growth in the '80s (all US hams code tested) was 30%

True or false?

The growth in the '90s (some US hams not codetested) was 34%

True or false?

The difference is 4%

True or false?

>Nocode techs grew to be 30% of the ARS in the first decade.

There is no license class called "nocode tech". However, Technicians
amounted to about 30% of the total number of US hams at the end of 2000.

>Jim would like
>for us to believe that is a 4% contribution.

Nope. You misinterpret what was written. Try reading what I wrote, not what you

think I wrote.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1246. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 18:07:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411140725.09489.00000407@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40465

In article <3CB5990A.FA79C0D5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> The growth in the '80s (all hams codetested) was 30%
>> The growth in the '90s (most but not all hams codetested) was 34%.
>> The change in growth was 4%. (34-30=4)
>>
>> All of the above is true and has been posted by me several times.
>
>Of course, you neglected to repost the untrue part. Here it is again:
>
>> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
>> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.

How is that not true?
>
>"Creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test" did
>NOT bring about "just 4% more growth in a decade".

Is 34% not 4% more than 30%?

>There were many
>other factors that you deliberately failed to consider.

I was simplifying the model for you, Cecil. What are those factors?

>Since the nocode
>techs increased from zero percent of the ARS to 30% in that decade, your
>conclusion is ridiculous and irrational.

How so? What growth numbers would you have us use? Show your work.

>The lack of correlation between
>the 30% of all members of the ARS becoming nocode techs and the 4% rate of
>growth is obvious.

How so? Because it doesn't fit your agenda?

>ontrary to what you are trying to imply, the nocode
>techs certainly contributed their share to growth.

Nobody denies that.

>It was all the other
>classes of licenses that were approximately flat growth for that decade
>and failed to match the previous decade.

So? The boundary conditions changed.

> Your feeble attempt to minimize
>the contribution of the nocode techs to the ham population is pretty
>transparent.
>-
I'm simply stating facts, Cecil. You don't like my facts because they disprove your agenda.

But for some reason, rather than posting relevant facts of your own, you attack me ad hominem
for being electropolitically incorrect and saying Emperor Cecil has no logical nor factual clothes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1247. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 18:15:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB5D2A8.60DFC415@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40466

N2EY wrote:
> True or false?

Why do you keep posting stuff with which I have no disagreement
and ignoring the stuff with which I disagree? Here's your statement
with which I disagree:

> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.

This statement does an injustice to 30% of US hams. It is straight
out of the PCTA Handbook. Techs were responsible for about 30% growth
in the ARS during that decade. All other classes of licenses only
managed an anemic 4% growth.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

1248. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 18:45:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB5D9B1.77B8D070@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40467

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Of course, you neglected to repost the untrue part. Here it is again:
> >
> >> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
> >> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.
>
> How is that not true?

It is obviously not true. Techs accounted for 30% of the growth in the ARS
during the 90's. All other classes of licenses combined were responsible
for that 4% that you attribute to the Techs. You seem to have interpreted
everything backwards and upside down.

> >There were many
> >other factors that you deliberately failed to consider.
>
> I was simplifying the model for you, Cecil.

Why would you choose to simplify it to the point of being ridiculous?

> >Since the nocode
> >techs increased from zero percent of the ARS to 30% in that decade, your
> >conclusion is ridiculous and irrational.
>
> How so? What growth numbers would you have us use? Show your work.

I'm using your numbers against you, Jim. The techs blessed the ARS with
30% growth during the 90's. You want to relegate them to 4%. Not nice.

> >The lack of correlation between
> >the 30% of all members of the ARS becoming nocode techs and the 4% rate of
> >growth is obvious.
>
> How so? Because it doesn't fit your agenda?

No because it is obvious. If you cannot see it, you are deluding yourself.

> > Your feeble attempt to minimize
> >the contribution of the nocode techs to the ham population is pretty
> >transparent.

> I'm simply stating facts, Cecil.

No, you are not "simply stating facts", Jim. You are interpreting facts
in an irrational manner. There is just as much evidence that all licenses

classes besides technician simply gave up on ham radio.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

1249. rec.radio.amateur.policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 20:00:51 UTC
From: crystalannie@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <e784fa9e.0204111200.3831701c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40468

One of my sons is reluctant to produce any good school work, and has turned into a frightful headache for the family's, despite being very intelligent and creative, and a good reader too.
I've tried other alternatives, with psychologists, and psychopedagoges, even private teachers, but nothing seems to work.
Please, has anyone a suggestion to make?

Annie .

1250. Re: EFF CEE CEE Enacts I-Net Morse requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 21:18:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020411171849.27454.00003262@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40469

>Subject: EFF CEE CEE Enacts I-Net Morse requirement
>From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 04/11/02 13:07 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <apjt8.483$3z3.54786@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net

Troll-o-meter barely registers! But funny none the less.

Steve

1251. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 21:20:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB5FE50.E943532@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40470

I guess it depends on whether you subscribe to the traditional definition of amateur as lover of (radio in this case) or if you prefer the popular culture definition as mediocre or worse. 8^) I prefer the former.

- Mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > I'm amazed in this thread that we have actually had people stand up for
> > poor design as if it were a mark of superior content, via the "if they
> > spend time on design, they take it away from content!!! Or "if they pay
> > an art director" (or apparently an illustrator) "they steal from" (pick
> > your choice) "which is much more important."
>
> Why on earth would someone want an amateur radio magazine to look
> professional? Wouldn't that be false advertising?

1252. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 21:25:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB5FF6D.52021253@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40471

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:
> > >Okay. How did Dick Van Dyke figure into this for you?
> >
> > Very simply, he is a celebrity well known to me, whom I respect for
> > his work in movies and television, ...
>
> Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
> amateur radio?

Geesh, Cecil!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1253. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 21:37:02 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2mnt8.999$IV4.179723313@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40472

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB50AF4.B4B6E443@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
> > > We started down the slippery slope with the No-Code Tech in '91 --
> > > and we are picking up more speed as we get closer to the bottom.
> > > All I can say is -- fasten your seat belts!
> >
> > Yep, the sky is still falling after 12 years. I wonder when its going
to
> > crash?
>
> Wonder when they're gonna realize that an empty sky can't fall?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Bullllllcrap it's empty.

The sky is full of condensation nuclei!

1254. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 21:42:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zrnt8.1003$U_4.180063376@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40473

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020410011506.10062.00000386@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <20020409064126.08001.00002606@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >>Nice call sign, Carl -- sure would sound great in CW! You ought to
> >>give it a try sometime...
> >
> >Hey, I asked him first! And he has given CW a try and concluded that he
> >doesn't like it.
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed:
>
> OK, fair enough, then. I tried yakking into a microphone on HF, and
> decided I didn't like it, either. I found that it didn't provide any sort
of
> intellectual challenge,

Then you're not interested in what the other person has to say. There is
substantially no difference in the content of a SSB QSO and a CW QSO.

and required a higher tolerance for boredom
> than I possess.

Right, ADD stikes again.

> Like ham radio in general, I guess it isn't for
> everyone -- and shouldn't have to be!

Sounds like it isn't for you.

> However, I believe all radio
> amateurs should be familiar with our simplest, most practical,
> effective, efficient, and universal mode of communication -- Morse/CW.

PEE-U!

> Like most people that don't "like" CW, I believe what Carl really
> doesn't like about it is the effort required to achieve a useful level
> of proficiency at it. Operating a PTT switch is, after all, much easier,
> and provides a higher level of instant gratification.

It didn't gratify you.

That seems to be
> a common factor among those who have whined the loudest about
> the code testing requirements in the ARS...although they certainly
> can't, and won't, admit it.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Yeh, yeh, yeh. How's Natasha, your young Russian concubine?

1255. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 22:18:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB60BC8.6D930BC1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40474

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
> > amateur radio?
>
> Geesh, Cecil!

Well Mike, I'm an admitted alcoholic and nobody has asked me
to be a spokesman.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

1256. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 22:55:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <nvot8.1046$LT6.187787463@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40475

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:AIit8.413$3z3.48290@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Addendum (courtesy W4FOA, K4HB, W9SZ, HK3CW)
>
> QWD? Who is DX on frequency
> QWD I know who DX is but I'm not telling you
>
> QLT? Gimme yer lass too
> QLT My lass too is **
>
> QPC Please Copy **
> QPC? Which QLT is calling me?
>
> QLH When last hurd
> QLH? What was my report when last hurd?
>
> QTU Quit tuning up on the DX frequency!
> QTU? Will you PLEASE quit tuning up on the DX frequency?
>
> QLZ? Do you work List Lizards?
> QLZ I do not work List Lizards
>
> QWE? Can you copy Morse code?
> QWE I am a Welfare Extra - PSE QRS

Wonder when Larry will jump on here and give us a "QFU?'

1257. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 23:08:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <XHot8.1053$Oh7.189445215@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40476

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:fSDs8.18508$QC1.1158571@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> (reposted to Bill Sohl's new thread)
>
> >> Kim, W5TIT, posted (about traffic info on the repeaters):
> >> What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up
> >> and made a broadcast, addressing his/her comments to
> >> no one in particular....
>
> > Larry Roll, K3LT, responded (in part):
> > ... It just so happens that discussing local traffic
> > conditions is a perfectly legal and very reasonable
> > and practical use of an amateur repeater....
>
> Not only that, Larry, but I believe it comes under the
> umbrella of being amateur-radio-related.
>
> Every vehicle with a licensed amateur radio station
> installed in it could, in the event of a man-made or
> natural disaster, become a mobile, emergency-communications
> facility. It is important that these potential
> emergency assets remain free of traffic entanglements
> so as to be instantly available in case of need.
> Traffic advisories moved over the local V/UHF repeater
> systems serve this purpose well, in addition to being
> practice sessions for "the real thing".
>
> ----------------
>
> I wrote the above with a big sh*t-eating grin on my
> face. But upon re-reading it, and re-thinking the premise,
> I'm not so sure I can be facetious about it. In a real
> emergency, traffic and road conditions *would* be a prime
> concern of mobile stations involved. And establishing
> protocols for getting that information from hard sources
> and out to the field units, as well as getting "ground
> truth" information back, might be a very good preparation
> for such eventualities.
>
>
> --
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona

Hello Glendale Jim, Larry rides around conducting his own unannounced "Communications Emergency Tests." He gets better responses by discussing traffic, so thats what he does. He's responsible for engaging truckers with comments such as "Did you see that knuckle dragging Tech with the Southern Drawl cut across 3 lanes of traffic?" and his all time favorite, "Did you see the Kazoos on that Gal with the xx5TIT plates?"

Brian

1258. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 23:13:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <GMot8.1062$Mr7.190081193@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40477

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:tPGs8.2618$CA6.220237@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote
> .
> > Years ago, whilst on Guam, we had a typhoon which knocked the coast
> > guard tower down on Rota. We sent a chief petty officer over to
> > re-establish communications. Apparently the coast guard station was
> > damaged and the chief happened to be a ham - and used the ham shack.
>
> You got most of it right. The location was Saipan, not Rota, and the
> Chief didn't use the ham shack, he (we) set up comms using a Swan
> 500C and a Drake TR4 at Kobler Field. One of our antennas was
> the chain link fence surrounding the passenger terminal at Kobler.
>
> You can get more details in the September 1968 issue of QST in
> the public service column. I still have the letters of commendation
> from Capt Delaney, Admiral McCain (yes, the Senators dad), and
> the Commissioner of TTPI.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB ex-KG6AQI

Sounds like a real live, "been there, done that" story. Tell us about how
CW was used to save the day.

1259. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 23:19:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <LRot8.1066$6E7.190889179@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40478

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a91h9u$1bp$0@208.206.142.90...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > \
> > >Getting to work is not an emergency...unless, say, you were a doctor
and
> > >someone's life depended on you getting through the traffic quickly. :)
> >
> > Why would traffic information, relayed to people involved in routine
> > commuting, be a "gray area" just because it isn't an "emergency?" Do
> > you possess some weird notion that ham radio must be used strictly
> > for "emergency" communications purposes?
>
>
> Isn't this just special? She thinks that because ham radio is useful
> for emergencies it supposed to be reserved solely for them. Neat!

Just as special as Dixie and Larrie imagining an emergency where the only
possible solution is CW, and forcing 650,000 people to learn it because of a
vivid imagination.

1260. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 23:27:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_Zot8.1070$%Y7.192240753@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40479

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message

> Kim:
>
> There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
> facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports by
> radio amateurs. Shudder all you want, but this is about as black &
> white as any policy discussion we've had here. Traffic reporting is
> a perfectly valid and legal amateur radio activity. End of Story. If
> you think it is not, provide some convincing proof, or at least a valid
> argument. So far, all you've done is to make yourself seem to be
> totally unqualified to offer any opinion at all on this subject.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

But wouldn't the message carry more weight if it were sent in Morse Code?

1261. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-11 23:31:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <01pt8.1071$R%7.192426132@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40480

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:wPYs8.5006$3P4.441819@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> > Eventually, the group can become irrelevant.
>
> I've tried to use rrap to remind people that they owe me a QSL card. So
far
> I'm batting .000
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

From which QTH? I've just located some previously unopened boxes....

1262. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 00:02:59 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <c22b232c4ad033d50424a0d461e07019.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40481

What does CW have to do with this thread? Did you read that the SSB signal was too strong for the local oscillator? KG6AAY was set up for SSB, AM (I think, but who would us it?), CW, and RTTY. Three operating stations within the shack. I could be wrong, but you sound like someone who doesn't want to have to learn something to get a license. Pray tell, what is your call?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message news:GMot8.1062$Mr7.190081193@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...

> Sounds like a real live, "been there, done that" story. Tell us about how
> CW was used to save the day.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1263. "Amateurs" and Education

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 00:14:44 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <UFpt8.1312$3z3.115544@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40482

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO ONE
> wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur."

Val,

I belong to a group called "Society for Amateur Scientists". We're pretty damned proud of the word "Amateur" in our name.

Our Mission

The Society for Amateur Scientists, a unique collaboration between world-class professionals and citizen scientists, is dedicated to the proposition that making discoveries is the birthright of all free people. We remove the roadblocks that prevent ordinary people from participating in scientific adventures of all kinds. Now you are limited only by your own intelligence, drive, and ambition.

Our members include people with no technical training whatsoever all the way to people with Ph.D.s in one field who want to explore fields outside their training. Our aim is to get everyone involved to the limits of their own desire; from tinkering in their own garage to working on stimulating projects on the front lines of science regardless of age, ethnicity or background.

We are the world's premiere support organization for amateur scientists. We define "amateur" to mean anyone who wants to do science simply for the pleasure of finding things out.

Interestingly, among our membership there are numerous amateur astronomers as well as numerous amateur radio enthusiasts. Among our leading 'sponsors' are Marshall Electronics and Edmund Scientific.

At SAS we have our own version of the "Big Project". We recently announced the creation of our "STAR" program. The idea was pioneered by a chapter in Connecticut (just coincidentally the HQ of ARRL) who built an observatory on a high school campus. The idea has "gone national" as the STAR program. SAS National intends to raise $50,000 this year to support one full-time employee who will work with our members and other community activists to build an observatory at a high school in their own school districts. The National office will act as facilitators-- developing the necessary written materials, observatory plans, etc. and helping each local team of activists to carry the project forwards. We will help these teams sell the vision of the program to their city officials, community leaders and local business professionals. The teams will then secure the necessary local support and raise the money for their own observatories from their own communities, just

as WCCSAS did. And SAS will work with them to help oversee the construction.

The project's long-term goal is to put one telescope into each school district in the country. A tall order! But to get started, have there is a more modest goal of completing two observatories in the next 24 months. As the program grows, SAS will seek additional funds to hire more staff to accelerate the pace.

Now doesn't that sound almost like a clone of the ARRL "Big Project"?

Now then Val, do you think SAS is doing this to have more "influence" in Washington or other hidden motives, a goal you berate ARRL for having, or could our goal (and the ARRL goal) be simply to help improve science education in America?

Should SAS abandon our "Big Project" and use the money to design and print some attractive brochures instead?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

PS: Our logo is really ugly also, with the word "Amateur" very prominent. Ain't it just awful!

1264. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 00:23:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a959en$fl1$0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 40483

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:
> > > >Okay. How did Dick Van Dyke figure into this for you?
> > >
> > > Very simply, he is a celebrity well known to me, whom I respect for
> > > his work in movies and television, ...
> >
> > Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
> > amateur radio?
>
> Geesh, Cecil!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Tell him--better than an unadmitted one.

1265. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 00:27:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a959m9$gs1$0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 40484

Don't pay any attention to him, Jim. He and Carl Stevenson made a lifetime career of complaining about the code test, now they find time hanging heavy on their hands and need to keep it going for something (anything) to do. No longer do they have that mean ol' code test hanging over their heads, like a guillotine. I guess the strain relief was just too much for them.

Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> What does CW have to do with this thread? Did you read that the SSB
> signal was too strong for the local oscillator? KG6AAY was set up for
> SSB, AM (I think, but who would us it?), CW, and RTTY. Three operating
> stations within the shack. I could be wrong, but you sound like
> someone who doesn't want to have to learn something to get a license.
> Pray tell, what is your call?
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:GMot8.1062$Mr7.190081193@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
>
> > Sounds like a real live, "been there, done that" story. Tell us about how
> > CW was used to save the day.
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1266. Re: "Amateurs" and Education

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 00:40:07 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <deaac402acc85acad2bd758b3ffd8b98.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40485

Hans, you have hit upon something interesting here. Amateur astronomer. Similar to amateur radio, they have their publications. Most interesting ... Unless you are happy with a 1 1/2 inch reflector clamped to a folding chair looking forever at the moon, Jupiter, or Saturn, you are - if you wish to enjoy your hobby - going to have to learn a few things along the way. My guess is the average amateur astronomer knows more about time - standard, daylight savings, universal, and sidereal than the average amateur (DXers likely excepted - if you leave out sidereal. Oh, and the EME gang.) Amateur astronomers will understand elevation, right ascension, optics ... They will know constellations. What does the average ham know? The gazinta for the antenna? The gazotta from the radio? Operate all knobs to the right? I am not in favor of forcing CW on folks; however, what knowlege should one have to obtain an amateur radio license? Frankly, amateur astronomer - to me, at least - implies one more involved in astronomy and its' various aspects than amateur radio operator implies involvement in anything much beyond where to press the PTT button or (maybe with help) how to set up a vox. Maybe I'm nuts, but ... a lot of your recommended Q signals could be replaced by a simple ZBM-2 ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:UFpt8.1312$3z3.115544@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote
>
> > Folks, this kind of thing has GOT TO STOP. It is the year 2002 and NO ONE
> > wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur."
>
> Val,
>
> I belong to a group called "Society for Amateur Scientists". We're pretty
> damned proud of the word "Amateur" in our name.
>
(big SNIP - to save bandwidth, plus mailgate does NOT like quotes larger than the replies!)

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1267. Re: "Amateurs" and Education

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:00:48 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <4lqt8.1397$3z3.122851@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40486

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote

> What does the average ham know? The gazinta for the antenna? The
> gazotta from the radio? Operate all knobs to the right? I am not in
> favor of forcing CW on folks; however, what knowlege should one have to
> obtain an amateur radio license? Frankly, amateur astronomer - to me,
> at least - implies one more involved in astronomy and its' various
> aspects than amateur radio operator implies involvement in anything
> much beyond where to press the PTT button or (maybe with help) how to
> set up a vox.

Jim,

With all due regard, I think you're hanging around the wrong kind of
hams. Get away from the 2M repeaters, and join YCCC, FRC, PRC,
or one of the other east coast radiosport clubs. You'll think you were
back at AAY, or a MARC meeting down at the Agana Heights
clubhouse.

73, Hans, K0HB

1268. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:26:51 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <88456a5b0c5d1e29f0d423e339ee2859.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40487

Actually, I probably owe him an apology. As I read other threads, it
appears he is simply chiding folks over their belief in the necessity
of Morse. In that vein, I would agree with him. My only problem is
just what knowlege should an individual possess in order to obtain an
amateur license? I am truely dismayed by the almost total lack of
understanding that many folks possess. I am not talking necessarily
about the newly licensed amateur; rather, I refer to those folks that
have been licensed 10 years or more. Certainly, if my neighbor were to
hold a ticket that entitled him or her to transmit at the 1.5 KW level,
I would hope they wouldn't point the darn thing at my bedroom at night
on 10 meters at full power ....

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a959m9$gs1$0@208.206.142.99...

> Don't pay any attention to him, Jim. He and Carl Stevenson made a
> lifetime career of complaining about the code test, now they find time
> hanging heavy on their hands and need to keep it going for something
> (anything) to do. No longer do they have that mean ol' code test hanging
> over their heads, like a guillotine. I guess the strain relief was just
> too much for them.
>

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1269. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:28:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020411212800.06878.00000215@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 40488

In article <rhUs8.2760$zx.1226976328@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>, "Lars121"
<lars121@pacbell.net> writes:

>
>Are amateur radio operators allowed to encrypt or encode if it is data that
>is being transmitted?
>
>Lars

Lars:

In a word, no.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1270. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:28:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020411212801.06878.00000216@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 40489

In article <3CB42C40.C9F56B24@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Kim not upgrading her ham license is like you not upgrading your college
>degree, Larry. You can't have it both ways.

Cecil:

Don't look now, but I have *upgraded* my college degree. I had only
an A.A. from 1972 to 1999. Now I have a B.S. However, we all know
you have BS, so you have no need to prove anything here.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1271. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:28:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020411212803.06878.00000217@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 40494

In article <20020410193736.22569.00000631@mb-fg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>You've missed the "fine print" in interpersonal behavior.
>
>Back when you were soma come loud you were making a lot
>of rude noises on how "good" you were and how you were always
>good (teaching your officers how to do their thing, etc.) and all
>those high-paying management jobs you were going to get.
>
>You wound up DRIVING A BUS. Geez, Larrah, that's something
>a "woman of color" can do...and they do by the hundreds, perhaps
>thousands. I see them regularly.

Lennie:

Tens of thousands, at least! What's your point? It's a good job, and I, as a Paratransit Specialist, have the satisfaction of dealing with physically and mentally "challenged" individuals on a daily basis, making sure that they can lead a more normal life because I'm there to get them where they need to go! Go ahead and make all the fun of my job you want! But if you were to ride with me for a week, I think you'd be whistling a different tune!

>Do you have an AA degree or a BS degree? Is either one from
>an accredited educational organization?

I have both, actually, and both are from accredited institutions -- Villa Maria College of Buffalo, and Wilmington College, Delaware, respectively.

>>If so, how do you explain all the other people in
>>the world that are not actively employed in fields directly related to
>>their educational credentials?
>
>If they are like you, Larrah, they have lots of BS credentials.
>The difference is that the acronym does NOT mean "bachelor of
>science."
>
>>Flying an airliner is a highly technical
>>task, but I'm sure you'll find a lot of airline pilots who do not hold
>>degrees in Aeronautical Engineering.
>
>Noooo, Larrah, flying, even in a complicated commercial air carrier,
>is a SKILL acquired after long practice and already possessing the
>aptitude and physical attributes necessary for flying.

That's right, Lennie -- but how many military or commercial pilots do you know that aren't college graduates? Years ago, I heard an Air Force general officer speaking on the concept of enlisted pilots. He agreed with a commentor that it doesn't require a college degree to learn how to fly an airplane, even a complicated Air Force jet fighter -- but that he wasn't going to bother trying to train anyone to do so unless they *had* a college degree -- only because that is the one way to be sure that that person is worth making the multi-million dollar investment in his/her training.

>DESIGNING a commercial air carrier requires knowledge and skill
>of highly technical intellectual matters with basic engineering best
>obtained through an accredited educational institution leading to a
>degree.

I don't think anyone in this newsgroup, or anywhere else, would disagree with that, Lennie, least of all myself.

>>Most Executive Chefs are
>>college graduates in a variety of majors, but their primary duties have
>>little, if any, direct correlation to what they learned while pursuing
>>their degrees.
>
>Oh, my, I will forward your comment to Emeril and the Naked Chef,
>maybe the execs of the Food Channel.

Don't forget Morimoto-San.

>I'll congratulate the Master Chef at the next Taco Bell for not
>correlating what they've learned while pursuing their degrees.

Don't look now, Lennie, but a Taco Hell doesn't necessarily qualify as a "fine dining" establishment. Even so, I doubt that many of their high-level managers are high-school grads with a "C" average.

>>In every instance, however, the benefits of a higher
>>education exceed the simple learning of purely technical, job-related,
>>task-specific material.
>
>Beautiful boilerplate pasties you made there, master chef!

Thank you.

>>wanted to take them. If and when I go for a graduate degree, it may
>>not have anything to do with HR, or even business in general. Heck --
>>the easiest Ph.D for me to get would be in Education! I could
>>probably knock off an MSED with as little as another year's worth of
>>night school courses!
>
>Yawn...here come da Soma Come Loud stuff again.

I think I'm starting to get a whiff of your problem here, Lennie. Are you jealous of the fact that I'm an Honors Graduate? Or are you just annoyed that I had the initiative, motivation, and desire to

become one, the same why I became an Amateur Extra under the
Pre-Restructuring licensing standards?

>>So, you're absolutely right -- I am not "using" my degree, in the
>>sense that I'm not making my living working as an HR specialist.
>
>Cut the BS on fancy names. "HR" as in Human Resources is still
>PERSONNEL. "Paratransit operators" are BUS DRIVERS.

Correct on both counts, Lennie. I am a BUS DRIVER. A lot of
college graduates are TRUCK DRIVERS, TUGBOAT CAPTAINS,
AIRLINE PILOTS, CHEFS, MUSICIANS, PHOTOGRAPHERS,
LIMOUSINE DRIVERS, 7-11 OWNERS, HOTEL CLERKS, HAM
RADIO STORE SALESMEN, AUTOMOBILE DEALERS, and a lot
of other occupations you can spell out in upper-case letters -- in
addition to doctors, lawyers, engineers, and educators. Don't look
now, but I'm sure you can even find the occasional college graduate
flipping burgers at McDonalds or delivering Domino's Pizza! Go
ahead, Lennie -- make all the fun you want at the occupational
choices of each and every college graduate who is not directly
employed in the field of their major course of study. If fact, why
don't you write a "My Turn" column for Newsweek, railing on the
fact that there are so many of us college grads out there who are
employed in such a manner?

>Not a damn thing wrong with using the conventional titles. Everybody
>knows what they do, are whether they have fancy titles or not.

It just so happens that the term "Paratransit Operator" accurately
defines my particular job -- since it involves a lot more than merely
steering a bus around a pre-determined route between bus stops.
I have to provide door-to-door service to physically and mentally
challenged persons, maintain an extremely tight schedule, and
ensure the safe operation of my vehicle under far more challenging
circumstances than those experienced by fixed-route operators.
It is different from fixed-route operation, has much greater
responsibility, and pays significantly more as a result. And, no, it
certainly doesn't require a college degree, but we have a number
of college graduates doing it! So, please, continue in your jeremiad
about how I'm not "using" my college degree.

>>Now -- please tell me how this makes me an inferior person?
>
>"HR" in this newsgroup is Ham Radio.
>
>You keep demanding that others "be as good as you" in all the
>BS about "applying yourself" and showing "dedication and
>motive" and such. You've bragged all over this newsgroup on
>how "good" you are, "qualified" and all that...and wind up
>DRIVING A BUS.

Don't look now, Lennie, but I've been involved in one form of
transportation or another for my entire working life, civilian and
military. You got something against people and things moving
from point A to point B?

>>I'm sure you will enjoy doing so!
>
>I really don't...but some inflated egoes have grown so large that
>the needle to puncture them is simply irresistable.

I hope you were looking in a mirror while you typed that!

>Now, WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED ABOUT RADIO in all the time
>you've been hitting on all those "dumbed down" no-code types?

More than you'll ever know.

>Apply yourself. Lots of stores have crazy glue.

Good idea. Go to the local hobby shop, get a bottle of Zap, and
glue your fingertips together!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1272. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:28:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020411212805.06878.00000218@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 40493

In article <3cb4d0b2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Not even close, Jim. Getting that truck *safely* and efficiently to it's
>> destination is definitely within limits of PICON. If the drivers were
>> using ham radio to coordinate the pickup of loads, negotiate fees,
>> or advertise their services, then *that* would be a violation of the
>> "no-business" rule. However, when they are simply taking advantage
>> of information related strictly to safe vehicle operation, then they
>> are perfectly OK. In fact, I've always believed it is a great failing
>> of amateur radio that there isn't a widespread network of ham
>> motorists and fixed-station operators specifically dedicated to this
>> task, as there is on the Citizen's Band.
>>
>
>What a huge, huge waste of ham radio.

Well, Kim, all I can say is that there's nothing new about you being
wrong about something! For you to say this only verifies the fact
that you're not qualified to make such judgements!

>There are broadcast stations all over
>the place, with helicopters, motorists who call in on cellular phones, etc.,
>to do the job you describe above.

Sure, but why should amateur radio operators not use the direct
communications capabilities they possess to perform the same service
to other hams? Where's the beef?

>Ham radio is more aptly used to report
>directly to the police items such as accidents, and even to assist motorists
>with getting roadside help.

Oh, now I get it. Unless we're being Ham Heroes™, then we're supposed
to maintain the usual radio silence characteristic of most repeater
systems.

>But, to have hams as a major contributor to
>traffic reporting is just not good use of spectrum.

Sez someone who is not qualified to make that judgement. Fortunately,
others, who *are* qualified to make that judgement, disagree totally
with your notions of this being a "waste" of spectrum. Don't look now,
but you're outvoted by a factor of everybody else-to-one (you). But
please, don't bother admitting you're wrong -- I wouldn't want anyone
to have a heart attack!

>> Considering the great
>> emphasis placed on public service in the ARS, I think we're missing
>> out on a golden opportunity to serve in such a capacity.

>The emphasis on public service in ham radio is specifically to fill a void
>for our public service agencies and volunteer groups--*NOT* to provide
>competition for already-in-use commercial ventures of broadcast radio
>stations!

You may have a point, were such competition actually occurring. However,
communications between amateur radio operators do not compete with
any other commercial or non-commercial services, and can actually
provide more timely and accurate information than is available in the
mass media.

>> Exactly, but this example doesn't relate too well to the issue of
>professional
>> drivers using amateur radio to give and receive traffic information,
>> directions,
>> or report accidents. All of the above serve not only the interest of that
>> particular driver, but the general public as well, since it is in the
>interest of the safe and efficient movement of traffic. I am sure that if
>>the FCC were required to specifically address this issue, that they would
>>find it to be
>> completely within the Basis and Purpose of the ARS.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>The magic word you said above is "professional." If you are using ham radio
>in any way to enhance your ability to make money, then I believe you could
>be called into question on the rules. As I said, have at it...but I won't
>be involved in the discussions, nor will I answer those questions if I feel
>you're asking for those reasons...

Sooo, if you're on your daily commute to/from work, and you observe an
accident scene with traffic blocked by police and being re-routed, you
wouldn't advise another amateur you were in QSO with, even if you
knew he/she was approaching that area, and had the opportunity to
avoid delays by taking an alternate route? Or would you just tell them
to tune in the local AM/FM broadcast station with Weather and Traffic
on the 8's?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1273. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:28:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020411212806.06878.00000220@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 40490

In article <3CB42DE2.1872B76E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Very simply, he is a celebrity well known to me, whom I respect for
>> his work in movies and television, ...
>
>Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
>amateur radio?
>
>> (I am not sure about the latter, I've been
>> told that Dick Van Dyke is a stage name, but don't know how to
>> verify this information.)
>
>His brother is Jerry Van Dyke. Is that also a stage name?

CAM:

I now know (by checking imdb.com and having just seen N2EY
confirm this info from the same source) that Dick Van Dyke was
born Richard Wayne Van Dyke, so it is his actual name. He
still doesn't come up on QRZ, so if he ever was a ham, his ticket
has expired. Does anyone know for sure whether or not he was
ever licensed? Or did he just do that PSA as a one-off gig?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1274. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:28:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020411212806.06878.00000219@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 40491

In article <20020410034701.16876.00002904@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>I honestly believe that promotion of the ARS by well-known celebrity
>>hams could go a long way toward attracting the kind of people we
>>seek to become involved in this hobby/service.
>
>Fair enough. What do you think is wrong with the present ARRL PSAs?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Well, I've been looking, both now and for years, and I haven't *seen* any ARRL PSA's since perhaps the late '80's, when I was stationed in Germany. There, all the "commercials" on AFN-TV were PSA's, including, occasionally, the ARRL PSA with Dick Van Dyke. Has the ARRL produced any PSA's within the last 15 years or so, and if so, where have they been televised? Certainly not in Plattsburgh, NY, Colorado Springs, CO, or the Philadelphia area (where all our TV programming comes from here in Central Delaware). Those are the stateside TV "markets" I've lived in since becoming a ham, and I've not seen any ARRL PSA's in any of them.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1275. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:28:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020411212807.06878.00000221@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 40492

In article <KJ5t8.1201$Ls.62865645@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Hansl:
>>
>> This is supposed to come as some sort of surprise? The NCTA
>> (soon to be simply the NTA) was heading in precisely this direction
>> all along. The whole point is to have a microphone, a "legal" high-
>> power amplifier, a VFO knob and a bandswitch in hand, without the
>> bother of having to actually learn any useful communications skills.
>> We started down the slippery slope with the No-Code Tech in '91 --
>> and we are picking up more speed as we get closer to the bottom.
>> All I can say is -- fasten your seat belts!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Yep, the sky is still falling after 12 years. I wonder when its going to
>crash?

Brian:

Don't look now, but ham radio has been going downhill a lot longer than 12 years. Most "old timers" refer to the '50's and '60's as the "Golden Era" of amateur radio, and from all accounts, they were right. It was in the late '60's when they started playing with the licensing requirements, and Incentive Licensing, which was botched by the ARRL by not making adequate grandfathering provisions, began the NCTA and the ultimate Balkanization of the ARS we experience now. As to when ham radio is going to "crash," I'd say that's pretty much already happened, as of 4/15/2000 with the announcement of "Restructuring."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1276. Re: "Amateurs" and Education

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 01:37:52 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <4ab04b6b6646f00f803e1a1509ceae71.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40495

Naw, I'm not on 2. I'm on 440, and it would have done your heart a wee bit o good to hear us one night when one guy was ranting about the necessity of keeping the code. All head full and damn the torpedoes .. 40 WPM F2 ahoy! That was fun ;) ... Heck, I spent some time at 'NAC as well (the hospital - as a ham, not a patient!). Ahhh ... Agana ... I forget what club it was, but they had a REAL pinball machine. The ancient type with fixed pins (nails?) and you had to try and see how far down the thing you could get the ball. Ho boy, and Old Swill (Old Milwaukee beer) had just been introduced to the em club. 5 cents got you a 16 ounce can of old swill. If you were broke, just borrow a quarter! I saw a short movie on Guam on the satellite. I wouldn't recognize it today for all the high-rise fancy hotels and such.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
ps - what was it, KUAM? The TV station where if they didn't get part two ahead of part three, they'd play part three of the movie one night followed by part two the next .... And the weather reports - if it was raining, you could hear the rain pounding on the quonset hut!

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:4lqt8.1397$3z3.122851@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

> Jim,
>
> With all due regard, I think you're hanging around the wrong kind of
> hams. Get away from the 2M repeaters, and join YCCC, FRC, PRC,
> or one of the other east coast radiosport clubs. You'll think you were
> back at AAY, or a MARC meeting down at the Agana Heights
> clubhouse.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1277. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 02:16:16 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <4A1062BA72722AE8.59F591C60D7892C7.8D66742CB5B39377@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40496

On 11 Apr 2002 12:07:14 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>>There's an interesting point; why don't we ever see a PBS special on
>>ARISS? For that matter, why don't we ever see a PBS special on
>>Amateur Radio? They've got them for everything (and I do mean
>>*every*damn*little*thing*) else.
>>
>GREAT IDEA, Joe!
>
>Perhaps NOVA could do an episode on ham radio. A version of "Antiques Roadshow"
>could visit various radio museums and 'fests like the AWA.

So, how does one go about suggesting topics to PBS stations?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1278. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 02:23:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB6453C.C97EA00E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40497

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Kim not upgrading her ham license is like you not upgrading your college
> >degree, Larry. You can't have it both ways.
>
> Don't look now, but I have *upgraded* my college degree. I had only
> an A.A. from 1972 to 1999. Now I have a B.S.

That's like going from tech to general, Larry. Why are you too lazy
to get a PhD degree? If you are satisfied with a lowly BS degree, why
can't Kim be satisfied with a Tech+ license?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1279. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 02:42:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB649AD.500B6460@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40498

And I have no problem if they did! At least for that reason. 8^)

Mike KB3EIA

CAM wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
> > > amateur radio?
> >
> > Geesh, Cecil!
>
> Well Mike, I'm an admitted alcoholic and nobody has asked me
> to be a spokesman.

1280. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 02:47:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB64AEB.328B9B07@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40499

I'm happy with Kim keeping her tech license if she wants, but Larry
could have a really good reason to not pursue his piled haer and deeper.
Depending on his job, that degree could be not worth much, or even a
detriment.

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Kim not upgrading her ham license is like you not upgrading your college
> > >degree, Larry. You can't have it both ways.
> >
> > Don't look now, but I have *upgraded* my college degree. I had only
> > an A.A. from 1972 to 1999. Now I have a B.S.
>
> That's like going from tech to general, Larry. Why are you too lazy
> to get a PhD degree? If you are satisfied with a lowly BS degree, why
> can't Kim be satisfied with a Tech+ license?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1281. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 02:49:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB64B46.6C947BD9@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40500

I still say it has been going downhill since the early 1900's, Larry ;^)

- Mike -

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Don't look now, but ham radio has been going downhill a lot longer than
> 12 years. Most "old timers" refer to the '50's and '60's as the "Golden
> Era" of amateur radio, and from all accounts, they were right.

1282. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 03:31:53 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Jyst8.1704$3z3.151405@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40551

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> Don't look now, but ham radio has been going downhill a lot longer than
> 12 years. Most "old timers" refer to the '50's and '60's as the "Golden
> Era" of amateur radio, and from all accounts, they were right. It was
> in the late '60's when they started playing with the licensing
requirements,
> and Incentive Licensing, which was botched by the ARRL by not
> making adequate grandfathering provisions, began the NCTA and the
> ultimate Balkanization of the ARS we experience now. As to when
> ham radio is going to "crash," I'd say that's pretty much already
> happened, as of 4/15/2000 with the announcement of "Restructuring."

Larry, your jeremiad is not original. This same dismayed chant has
been going on for 90 years, ever since 1912 when Hiram Percy Maxim
was forced to give up his call, "SNY", move above 200 meters, and
knuckle under to government regulation including a (gasp) 5WPM
Morse test.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
went on and flourished.

Then in 1919 they raised the Morse test to 10WPM.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
went on and flourished.

Throughout the 20's CW gradually replaced King Spark, and spark was
eventually outlawed.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
went on and flourished.

In 1923 they introduced something called "Amateur Extra First Grade"
with special calls and privileges. The class was discontinued
when only 6 people applied in 1926.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
went on and flourished.

Then in 1927 they reduced the license classes from two to only one
class. Old "Second Grade" had to upgrade within one year, or go
QRT.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
went on and flourished.

In 1932 they changed it all again, dividing us up into Class A, B, and C, all with a 10WPM code test.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio went on and flourished.

In 1936 they said there were too many new hams coming into the hobby, so they raised the Morse test speed to 13WPM.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio went on and flourished.

In the early 50's they renamed everybody from A, B, or C to Advanced, General, or Conditional. They also introduced 3 new license classes called Novice, and Technician at 5WPM, and Extra at 20WPM.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio went on and flourished.

In the late 60's they invented something called Incentive Licensing.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio went on and flourished.

In 1976 they quit requiring us to certify we had been on the air for 12 hours last year (for renewal). They also ended the Conditional license.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio went on and flourished.

In 1991 they removed the Morse requirement for VHF/UHF-only licensees.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio went on and flourished.

In 2000 they changed Morse testing back to the 1912 requirement of 5WPM, and the number of classes to 3.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" is the cry.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1283. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 03:40:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a95lml$ur8$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40553

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3CB5FF6D.52021253@adelphia.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:
> > > >Okay. How did Dick Van Dyke figure into this for you?
> > >
> > > Very simply, he is a celebrity well known to me, whom I respect for
> > > his work in movies and television, ...
> >
> > Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
> > amateur radio?
>
> Geesh, Cecil!

I have to admit too Cecil, I'm disappointed in that post.

The reality of being an alcoholic...at least those that are
admited to be and have successfully taken the AA road
to sobriety is that they recognize and "admit" they ARE
an alcoholic...and always will be. My dad was just such
a person who happily had had some 40+ years of sobriety...
but he never stopped "admiting he was an alcoholic."

Nuff said on that. Judge the person on what they are doing
now.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1284. Re: Illegal sales.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 03:49:00 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <MOst8.1759$3z3.155310@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40552

"Randy" <Anonymous@anon.com> wrote

> The sale of Ham radios to non-licensed persons is not illegal.
> Perhaps this line of thinking should be addressed but until it is you can
> look forward to unending "pirate" operations on the Ham bands.
> Now you know why I refuse to belong to the ARRL or
> any of it's affiliates. Why waste my money?

Holy cow, Batman, there is trouble in River City for sure!

Anyone who has the money or adequate credit can stop in at HRO, AES, Radio City, any Radio Shack outlet, or one of dozens of other places and buy amateur radio transmitting equipment, with no background check or breathalyzer test of any kind!

Ain't it awful!

If they are bedridden, but can reach a telephone, these sickos can call one of a dozens of "1-800" numbers and place their order which will be delivered promptly.

Aint't it awful!

On their scanner they can clandestinely spy on swap nets to find equipment available for sale, or they can stop at the next swapfest/fleamarket/hamfest and purchase amateur equipment from any table, and take it home for their nefarious purposes with no waiting period,

Ain't it awful!

In years past we could buy amateur equipment at Sears (right alongside the Craftsman socket sets), or order it from their catalogs. Heath had stores all over the country. Anyone who had the money or credit could purchase amateur radio equipment from those folks. Here in my modest-sized Midwestern hometown we once had several retail outlets which handled amateur equipment along with other electronic equipment including consumer items such as televisions, record players, and even (gasp!) citizens band equipment.

It was TERRIBLE, I tell ya!

Even worse, some folks have been known to clandestinely acquire the bits and parts from infamous open markets such as "radio row" in New York and actually build their own equipment. Kids have been cannibalizing their Aunt Emma's old junked TV and doing the same thing, probably with unsterilized soldering irons!

Ohmygawd, how awful!

I have heard that there is a network of deviants who use the codename "Elmer" who are trying to lure unlicensed youth with promises of help building their own station. I've heard even the Scouting programs give radio badges to unlicensed children if they show an interest in mystery codes.

This is clearly an affront to the sanctity of youth, the Boy Scouts, and probably the Constitution!

And all this has been going on right under our noses for about 90 years! It's gonna ruin the hobby if we don't clamp down right now! We must remove this temptation from the general public. We need new laws, including a waiting period to check out the background of persons who seek to buy a handheld weapon..... errr.... I mean handheld radio. Authorities must be consulted to make sure that prospective purchasers know all the right secret handshakes and belong to all the right clubs and societies. Especially we must take steps to ensure that the general public is not subjected to the sight of amateur equipment out in plain view of children and the infirm and elderly who might inadvertently become interested in becoming hams. It must be HIDDEN from public view and sold only in regulated stores on the back streets of distant and obscure cities like Watertown, South Dakota. We must hire FCC guards to ensure that you don't get in the store without the proper credentials.

What a lot of hooey!

Amateur Radio is not a controlled substance!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1285. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 03:50:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a95lmm$ur8$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40554

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:442400E659C4E909.001288B0145E70FB.E7BB63667BB63632@lp.airnews.net...
> On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 16:03:12 GMT, "K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:
>
> >The US Navy fleets now operate without the following enlisted ratings:
> >
> > Pigeon Trainer
> > Sail Maker
> > Stoker
> > Radioman
>
> Do they still have someone trained in flag semaphore and the use of
> the signalling lights, or are those covered under other
> specializations?

The semaphore and morse signal lamp communications falls
under the rating of Signalman. The skill set of reading
signal lamp code by eye-sight (Signalman) is significantly different
than copying morse code by ear (was the Radioman rating)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1286. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 04:08:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a95ndn$on0$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40555

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020411212800.06878.00000215@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <rhUs8.2760$zx.1226976328@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>,
"Lars121"
> <lars121@pacbell.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Are amateur radio operators allowed to encrypt or encode if it is data
that
> >is being transmitted?
>
> In a word, no.
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Let's be careful as to how strong that NO is.

If the ONLY people knowledgeable as to the coding
or encryption technique or encryption scheme is a
limited (i.e. non-pulic, unpublished set) of people
or hams, then Larry is correct. IF, on the other hand,
a public, common or published scheme is used which
others can freely "decode/decrypt", then it is OK.

I think that covers it. By example, PSK31, ASCII,
EBCDIC are some common coding techniques for
character encoding/decoding.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1287. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 04:50:40 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB667A0.A647C30D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40556

>
>
> Dick Van Dyke's "birth name" is Richard Wayne Van Dyke
>
> (source: http://www.imdb.com)

So he didn't really change his name, as Dick is the short form
(nickname) of Richard. And he left out the middle name.

>
>
> > That particular PSA always stayed in my
> > mind, and made me think of amateur radio as a hobby which must
> > be highly worthwhile, if a respected celebrity like Mr. Van Dyke was
> > promoting it. I have no doubt that present-day ham celebrities could
> > have the same impact on prospective amateurs.
>
> Exactly. "Image" and first impressions play a big role.

Picture "Dr Dre" with an HT. May not be so absurd, he could get
some of the kids in the 'hood into radio and electronics, and may
lead to them to college and to good jobs, and such.... Of
course they would have to put in the required work and effort,
but if you get them to want to do it....

1288. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 04:57:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB66934.7EA9E7A4@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40557

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> What mode did you use on 30 meters?

CW in a QSO with Larry? :-)

I suppose an extra never needs a control op. Unless
it's a courtesy to the person whose' station you are a
guest at.

1289. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 05:00:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB669DA.CBC363D1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40558

She's done a lot more than I have in this area.

1290. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 05:21:17 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB66ECC.8252C699@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40559

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>
> And, that's your interpretation, Bill. I think different. I also don't
> like it. I think it cheapens ham radio. This is pointed up by the fact
> that many people who are near enough to my equipment in the office and
> listen will respond to my "would you be interested in ham radio" with "why
> would I want to talk about traffic, the weather, and how sick I've been?"

The gall bladder ailments QSOs and such are just the old timers exchanging
physcologal support with each other. Seems as valid use of radio as say
contests and such. Sure it's boring to listen to if you're
young, but they're not "broadcasting" to you. There's other QSOs going on
to listen to, or call CQ and start a topic with someone.

>
>
> >
> > The "broadcast" to no one in particular probably is a grey area,
> > but unless it was done repeatedly (e.g. If I did such broadcasts
> > every day at 8am to no one at all), I'd doubt it would
> > even be noticed.
> >
>
> It is. And I don't like to get myself into gray areas, either. Remember, I
> don't think I made any comment about reporting violations. I simply said I
> believe these types of conversations are stretching the rules. Gray areas
> are the test waters, and you probably know that.
>
> The FCC doesn't seem too worried about this. Now if you had

units all over town gathering info and reporting back via ham radio
to a broadcast station, that would be illegal. And this rule (pecuniary
interest) is there really to protect our bands from being invaded
by business users. We'd be crowded off 2 meters otherwise.

I suppose a broadcast station could have a scanner easdropping on
ham repeaters to learn about traffic problems. The hams wouldn't
even know if that happened.

>
>
> Getting to work is not an emergency...unless, say, you were a doctor and
> someone's life depended on you getting through the traffic quickly. :)
>
> > > The guys at the commsta had the rf

> > > gain up too high for the local oscillator, so the ssb copy was poor.
> > > 'sparkplug one this is sparkplug, you are loud, but garbled'. Hearing
> > > this, we gave a call 'sparkplug1, sparkplug, this is KG6AAY standing
> > > by'. Inside of 15 minutes, KG6AAY was handling all relief traffic and
> > > passing it directly to Commander, Naval Forces, Marianas. Captain
> > > Delany made an appearance to secure the amateurs from all other duties
> > > and to man the ham shack 24/7 until otherwise ordered. Illegal?
> >
> > Not illegal in my book...in fact, the military could have simply
> > used the ham station as its own without any need to use
> > amateurs at all. There's no worries about military using
> > amateur equipment at all. No type acceptance needed.
> >
> > > Military comms to an amateur station? On 75 meters? Getting the hams
> > > relieved from duty (work)? Captain Delany was happy; the FCC liaison
> > > officer was only a lieutenant. Besides, the Captain was in charge and
> > > I doubt anyone on Rota would have argued the decision.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
>
> Kim W5TIT

1291. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 05:27:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB67032.287EC24F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40560

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>
> > Kim:
> >
> > There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
> > facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports by
> > radio amateurs. Shudder all you want, but this is about as black &
> > white as any policy discussion we've had here. Traffic reporting is
> > a perfectly valid and legal amateur radio activity. End of Story. If
> > you think it is not, provide some convincing proof, or at least a valid
> > argument. So far, all you've done is to make yourself seem to be
> > totally unqualified to offer any opinion at all on this subject.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> But wouldn't the message carry more weight if it were sent in Morse Code?

only at 20wpm. :-)

1292. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 05:32:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB6717C.3887B35F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40561

Larry, could you make use of a ham radio for traffic reports when driving your bus? I suspect your employer might not like it, but the FCC wouldn't care. Issue being a distraction while driving.

1293. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 05:43:52 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB67418.633B1F2F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40562

> >
> > The Tech PLus itself is no longer issued but you can get the privleges
> > simply by passing the code test. It adds CW in four bands and phone at
> > 28.3-28.5 200 watts.
> >
>
> A huge "however" here, though: if you ever intend to upgrade to General
> after passing your 5wpm test, you *must* do it within one year of passing
> the CW test or you must do it all over again.
>
>

So you might as well study up and take the general written at the same
VE session as the code test. If you pass the written, that "locks it in"
for as long as you keep your license renewed. And you get more
spectra to operate in.

1294. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 05:57:08 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <UGut8.3755$P13.1895181378@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40563

Jeez..... c'mon.... the way I see it you have to use RF to practically kill someone before the FCC would even notice. Does anyone have any experience that shows the FCC is active in enforcement? I could be wrong, but they seem under-manned ant not very empowered to provide oversight and regulation.

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:3cb38a8e_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020409031536.07832.00001106@mb-mv.aol.com...
> > In article <3cb26071_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >What's wrong with the above? The person has keyed up and made a
> broadcast,
> > >addressing his/her comments to no one in particular. Now, I've even
seen
> it
> > >happen that the person making the broadcast then ends their
transmission
> > >without even IDing...although that doesn't happen often.
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > Incorrect. An "announcement" of such a nature is perfectly legal, as
> > long as it is properly identified.
> >
>
> I quite disagree. However, I doubt the infraction is serious enough to
> warrant a report to the FCC.
>
> > >
> > >Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place. These
> people
> > >check with each other often about traffic flow and route. Truckdrivers
> will
> > >also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere. Sorry folks, but
> both
> > >examples here are those that involve communication with pecuniary
> interest:
> > >namely employment.
> >
> > Also incorrect. The fact that there are professional drivers involved
> does
> > not make such transmissions illegal in the ARS.

> >
>
> Well, DUH. What does make their transmission illegal (in my opinion) is
> that their questions are either "where is [company name] and does anyone
> know how to get there?" That is a direct question related to getting them
> where they need to be to discuss business. I err on the side of caution
and
> will not get involved in such discussions. It's their ticket...and I
think
> they are stretching the rules when they do that. The only reaction I have
> to it is that I would find it surprising at all *if* they were ever to be
> brought into question for it.
>
> >
> > This use of amateur
> > radio is certainly falls within limits of Public Interest, Convenience,
or
> > Necessity, and are thus perfectly legal, even if the parties involved
are
> > engaged in commercial activity at the time.
> >
>
> Then you are stretching what I believe to be a rule that says absolutely
no
> transmissions may be made if any party has a pecuniary interest in the
> conversation. Getting to your office, getting to your truck terminal,
> getting to your delivery site, are all examples of items where a pecuniary
> interest is primary to the discussion. I have a CB radio in my truck
> specifically for the purpose of discussing those things.
>
> >
> > What they are NOT
> > doing is actually advertising, dispatching, or otherwise directly
> facilitating
> > the day-to-day operation of their business.
> >
>
> A part of dispatch is getting around in traffic, Larry.
>
> >
> > They are just promoting
> > traffic safety by operating their vehicles in a manner which not only
> > ensures the safe operation of the vehicles involved, but others on the
> > highways.
> >
>
> Uh huh.
>
> > >
> > >There's pretty much only two repeaters I really ever listen to with any

> > >regularity. One is the most popular repeater in Dallas, the 146.880
> > >machine. The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine. At dinners and
> other
> > >get-togethers, we on the 145.190 machine have pretty much agreed we
will
> not
> > >discuss traffic on our repeater.
> >
> > So, you not only get it wrong, but you encourage othes to get it wrong
> > as well?
> >
>
> Oh, is that what you call it when people are like-minded? There is
someone
> who encouraged them to think that way, eh?
>
> >
> > It just so happens that discussing local traffic conditions is a
> > perfectly legal and very reasonable and practical use of an amateur
> > repeater.
> >
>
> May be. But I don't like it. I will either drop from discussion or never
> even key up where I know that those kinds of conversations dominate. I
will
> rarely, if ever, key up on the '88 machine for that reason.
>
> >
> > Well, nothing new here -- just another example of W5TIT
> > not knowing what she's talking about, but attempting to be seen as
> > an authority in Amateur Radio Public Service while spewing nonsense.
> >
> > >We also chide people who come on and do so...it's not good hamming
> > >at all.
> >
> > How charming. You get on the air, and "chide" people who are actually
> > using ham radio for a practical, useful, public service purpose -- and
> then
> > you have the nerve to call yourself a Public Service expert within the
> > ARS. You also infer that your "inner circle" of ham friends do
likewise.
> > Fools sure do love company! It's just a question of whether you found
> > them, or they found you!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1295. Repeater Information

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 09:44:10 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <J%xt8.3815$lp4.1966648561@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40564

I'm a little confused and I'm hoping someone can help me figure this out. There are websites who list repeaters that are in operation. But, the location of the repeater does not match what is on the FCC license. If this is permitted, is it possible to find a physical address of the repeater? Who is accountable for the physical address if the FCC is not?
An example is given below and can be found at websites like
www.220sma.org/smarpt.htm
http://www.qsl.net/cora/222_Mhz_Repeater_Guide.htm
http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Hangar/6847/

Freq (MHz) - Call Sign Location of Repeater Hardware - Status Mode
224.840 - K6BWA HOLLYWOOD HILLS - PRIVATE
224.840 - KA6UFC SAND CANYON - PRIVATE
224.840 - KS6E SHERMAN OAKS - PRIVATE
224.840 - KS6K SILVERLAKE, L.A. - PRIVATE
224.840 - N6EHD ALTADENA - PRIVATE
224.840 - WA6MTM YORBA LINDA - PRIVATE
224.840 - WB6PRR ALTADENA - PRIVATE

FCC license information differs and is as follows:

Callsign - Licensee Name - City (according to FCC license)
K6BWA - SCHULMAN, JOSEPH H SANTA - CLARITA
N6EHD - SCHULMAN, DANNY I - LOS ANGELES
KA6UFC - SCHULMAN, BARBARA L - SANTA CLARITA
KS6K - LEIDNER, JOEL D - LOS ANGELES
KS6E - FREEDMAN, MARVIN - LOS ANGELES
WB6PRR - MANCINI, ROBERT F - ALTADENA

1296. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 10:18:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412061852.20572.00002625@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 40565

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Well, I've been looking, both now and for years, and I haven't *seen*
>any ARRL PSA's since perhaps the late '80's, when I was stationed
>in Germany.

Go to http://www.arrl.org and look at the media public relations web page. It will tell you some about the PSAs (though not quite enough for my taste).

When and how they get run is a local broadcasting decision, not an ARRL one. Is this important enough to you that you are willing to work with your local broadcasters to persuade them to air them?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

1297. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 10:59:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a96em4$dr6$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 40566

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Dick Van Dyke's "birth name" is Richard Wayne Van Dyke
> >
> > (source: http://www.imdb.com)
>
> So he didn't really change his name, as Dick is the short form
> (nickname) of Richard. And he left out the middle name.
>
> >
> >
> > > That particular PSA always stayed in my
> > > mind, and made me think of amateur radio as a hobby which must
> > > be highly worthwhile, if a respected celebrity like Mr. Van Dyke was
> > > promoting it. I have no doubt that present-day ham celebrities could
> > > have the same impact on prospective amateurs.
> >
> > Exactly. "Image" and first impressions play a big role.
>
> Picture "Dr Dre" with an HT. May not be so absurd, he could get
> some of the kids in the 'hood into radio and electronics, and may
> lead to them to college and to good jobs, and such.... Of
> course they would have to put in the required work and effort,
> but if you get them to want to do it....

WORK??? EFFORT??? Well, that pretty well kills it. Cecil says there
is no need to work or expend effort, that can never be a requirement.

1298. Re: Repeater Information

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 11:01:45 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a96f0gqee1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40567

In article <J%xt8.3815$lp4.1966648561@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>,
lars121@pacbell.net says...
> I'm a little confused and I'm hoping someone can help me figure this out.
> There are websites who list repeaters that are in operation. But, the
> location of the repeater does not match what is on the FCC license. If this
> is permitted, is it possible to find a physical address of the repeater? Who
> is accountable for the physical address if the FCC is not?
> An example is given below and can be found at websites like
> www.220sma.org/smarpt.htm
> http://www.qsl.net/cora/222_Mhz_Repeater_Guide.htm
> http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Hangar/6847/
>
> Freq (MHz) - Call Sign Location of Repeater Hardware - Status Mode
> 224.840 - K6BWA HOLLYWOOD HILLS - PRIVATE
> 224.840 - KA6UFC SAND CANYON - PRIVATE
> 224.840 - KS6E SHERMAN OAKS - PRIVATE
> 224.840 - KS6K SILVERLAKE, L.A. - PRIVATE
> 224.840 - N6EHD ALTADENA - PRIVATE
> 224.840 - WA6MTM YORBA LINDA - PRIVATE
> 224.840 - WB6PRR ALTADENA - PRIVATE

These are the physical locations of the repeaters.

>
> FCC license information differs and is as follows:
>
> Callsign - Licensee Name - City (according to FCC license)
> K6BWA - SCHULMAN, JOSEPH H SANTA - CLARITA
> N6EHD - SCHULMAN, DANNY I - LOS ANGELES
> KA6UFC - SCHULMAN, BARBARA L - SANTA CLARITA
> KS6K - LEIDNER, JOEL D - LOS ANGELES
> KS6E - FREEDMAN, MARVIN - LOS ANGELES
> WB6PRR - MANCINI, ROBERT F - ALTADENA

These are the trustees of the repeaters. These people are responsible
for the FCC regulated operations of the repeaters. IOW, if something
goes wrong, or if the repeaters are not used according to Part 97, these
people are the ones that the FCC will contact 1st.

They do not have to be physically located at the same address.

1299. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 11:03:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a96et6$dr6$1@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 40568

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >
> > > Kim:
> > >
> > > There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
> > > facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports by
> > > radio amateurs. Shudder all you want, but this is about as black &
> > > white as any policy discussion we've had here. Traffic reporting is
> > > a perfectly valid and legal amateur radio activity. End of Story. If
> > > you think it is not, provide some convincing proof, or at least a valid
> > > argument. So far, all you've done is to make yourself seem to be
> > > totally unqualified to offer any opinion at all on this subject.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > But wouldn't the message carry more weight if it were sent in Morse Code?
>
> only at 20wpm. :-)

Well it's all a possibility we won't find necessary to consider.

1300. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 11:48:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412074847.20532.00002456@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 40569

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Cecil says there
>is no need to work or expend effort, that can never be a requirement.

That is not what Cecil said. Go back and try again.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1301. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 12:07:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412080704.27399.00000473@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40571

In article <3cb4cd0f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020409220627.09489.00000355@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <a8vv3t$uh7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >> > > Two: There are two or more people who work at the same place.
>> >> > > These people check with each other often about traffic
>> >> > > flow and route. Truckdrivers will
>> >> > > also come on frequency and ask how to get somewhere.
>> >> >
>> >> > > Sorry folks, but both
>> >> > > examples here are those that involve communication with
>> >> > > pecuniary interest...namely employment.
>> >> >
>> >> > How does the first involve any pecuniary interest?
>> >> >
>> >> > Are you saying that if hams help
>> >> > each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
>> >> > jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?
>> >>
>> >> I agree with Bill 100%. Unless you are "on the clock" while commuting,
>> >> there is no pecuniary interest.
>> >
>> >What does being "on the clock" have to do with it at all?
>>
>> A truck driver's job - what they are paid to do - is getting the vehicle
>from A
>> to B
>> safely and efficiently. The use of ham radio for to help get the vehicle
>from A
>> to B in a nonemergency by people being paid to do so MAY (heavy emphasis
>on the
>> "may") cross the line of "pecuniary interest. I'm not sure.
>> >
>
>Precisely. And, as I've tried to say, I don't really care whether someone,
>or others, wish to have such discussions on the air. I don't.

Either it's a violation of Part 97 or it isn't. If it's a violation, none of us
should tolerate it. If it's not a violation, of course you don't have to
participate in it.

But from other posts you have said that you chide, tease and make fun of other hams for doing so. That behavior contradicts your claim that you "don;t really care".

> For the
>reasons that a) I believe it *has the potential* for abuse (and is abused in
>my opnion)

Lots of things have the potential for abuse. How about SKYWARN? Or the typical honeydew conversation where one ham spouse asks the other to "pick up" (as in buy) certain items on the way home.

>and, b) it just sounds crappy when all people can do to drum up
>conversation about traffic, weather, and how sick they've been.

Why does that sort of thing "sound crappy" if it's what people are interested in at the time? What would you have hams talk about on the repeaters during drive time?

Some folks might even say that to chide, tease or make fun of other hams on the air sounds much more "crappy" than talking about traffic, the weather and health problems.

>> OK, consider this:
>>
>> Suppose a ham decides to put up a tower and a bunch of locals show up on
>tower
>> raising day to help out. Everyone brings amateur HTs to help coordinate
>the
>> activity. The HTs are used extensively, saving lots of time and effort. Is
>this
>> OK? Of course.
>>
>> Now suppose some of the hams who helped out form a company and install
>radio
>> towers commercially. Can they legally use their amateur HTs on the job for
>the
>> same purpose as when erecting the ham tower for free? I don't think so.
>>
>> Even though it's the same purpose and the same people, in the first case
>they
>> are a bunch of friends helping out a fellow amateur and in the second case
>it's
>> a bunch of professionals doing a job.
>
>Yeah, and I think those examples are reasonable.

I would say they are clear-cut.

> Asking for directions to a
>hamfest, a friend's house, a hotel, a restaurant, whatever, doesn't seem to
>get near anything questionable...again, in my opinion. But, if you have
>just gotten hired by the hotel, restaurant, whatever and you are asking
>directions to the place (say it's a chain and you've never been to the

>location you'll be working at), then to me you are violating the rules. If
>you're going to your friend's house to conduct some work you'll be getting
>paid for...well, ya shouldn't be using ham radio to enhance your ability to
>earn that money by asking for directions over ham radio.

So it's OK to talk about traffic on the way home but not on the way to work?

Sorry, that's not a reasonable interpretation. Interpreting the rules your way results in extreme limitations of what hams can talk about on the air. By your rules, Kim, ham spouses should not exchange "honeydew" lists on the air, because in doing so they may save money by reducing the amount of driving they have to do. That's pecuniary interest.

> Hamfests are
>another matter altogether. I *believe* the FCC has written opinion that
>selling radios/ham equipment is OK, as long as it's not your regular
>business.

But a hamfest may be the regular business of a club, and having a talk-in station
promotes that business. By your rules, talk-in stations for hamfests should not exist.

There are lots of other examples. Perhaps hams should not discuss the weather on the air because one of them may make a business decision based on that information. We should not discuss cars or home appliances on the air because other's experiences and advice may save one of us money.

The potential for abuse is staggering if we follow your interpretation.

It is also quite surreal to read your opinions about how innocuous and legal conversations "sound crappy" and "cheapen ham radio", but you think your choice of call sign does not have any negative effects on ham radio's image, despite many hams' opinions to the contrary.

>Heck, even cities allow a couple/few yardsales a year without
>having to charge sales tax.

In all of the places I've been, sales tax is the province of the state, not the city.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1302. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 12:07:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412080705.27399.00000474@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40570

In article <3CB67418.633B1F2F@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> > The Tech PLus itself is no longer issued but you can get the privleges
>> > simply by passing the code test. It adds CW in four bands and phone at
>> > 28.3-28.5 200 watts.
>> >
>>
>> A huge "however" here, though: if you ever intend to upgrade to General
>> after passing your 5wpm test, you *must* do it within one year of passing
>> the CW test or you must do it all over again.
>>
>>
>
>So you might as well study up and take the general written at the same
>VE session as the code test. If you pass the written, that "locks it in"
>for as long as you keep your license renewed. And you get more
>spectra to operate in.
>
All true and correct. The General written is just 35 multiple-choice questions and gets you lots more bands, modes and spectrum than a Tech-with-HF. And paying the VE fee gets you one try at it anyway.

And while you're at it, try the Extra written even if you haven't studied for it. It's good practice, costs nothing but your time and you might pass it. Back in the summer of '68, when I went to the FCC office to upgrade from Tech to General by passing the 13 wpm code test, the examiner said 'why not try the Advanced while you're here?" I hadn't studied for it at all but a 14 year old kid did not say no to The Man, so I took it - and passed easily. Same thing could happen to you.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1303. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 12:13:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a96j27$l82$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 40572

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Cecil says there
> >is no need to work or expend effort, that can never be a requirement.
>
> That is not what Cecil said. Go back and try again.

Oh he didn't say that *every time* he posted. But if you spend the time
to leaf through his volumnous posts, I'm quite sure you'll find it.

1304. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 14:07:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412100716.26511.00000144@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 40574

In article <Jyst8.1704$3z3.151405@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>
>> Don't look now, but ham radio has been going downhill a lot longer than
>> 12 years. Most "old timers" refer to the '50's and '60's as the "Golden
>> Era" of amateur radio, and from all accounts, they were right.

I'm an "old timer" and I disagree. There was never a "golden age" - each era had its
set of problems. The '50s were full of TVI nightmares and the AM vs. SSB battle. The '60s
experienced almost no growth, arguments and misinformation over incentive licensing proposals,
dismissal as irrelevant bymany young people in a time of civil unrest and other problems like license fees.

Those times also had their good points.

>>It was
>> in the late '60's when they started playing with the licensing
>requirements,
>> and Incentive Licensing, which was botched by the ARRL by not
>> making adequate grandfathering provisions, began the NCTA and the
>> ultimate Balkanization of the ARS we experience now.

WHOA! Slow down a sec!

The whole license requirement mess began in 1958, when the FCC started to express
concern that hams were not keeping up technically and were deficient in operational
skills. (Sound familiar?) Of course in retrospect "Sputnik fever" may have had something to
do with it.

In 1963 the FCC asked for ideas and the ARRL made a very simple proposal: Reopen the Advanced
to newer hams and require Advanced or Extra for full HF phone privileges. Simple and easy. Too
simple for the FCC, who spent the next 5 years getting input from a variety of sources and coming up
with a very complex plan.

The grandfathering issue was not the ARRL's fault. FCC was specifically concerned about those hams

who were already licensed but who had not progressed beyond General or
Conditional. (Back then only
about 1 in 6 hams had an Advanced or Extra, and about one in 50 had an Extra).
FCC actually proposed
demoting Advanceds to General and creating a new "Amateur First Class" to
replace Advanced.

There was also the issue that if existing hams were "grandfathered" to full
privs, the newbies would complain
that they had to meet tougher requirements than the old hands. Not a good
thing, said the FCC.

If the job was botched, it was the FCC that did it.

>>As to when
>> ham radio is going to "crash," I'd say that's pretty much already
>> happened, as of 4/15/2000 with the announcement of "Restructuring."

Yes and no. FCC has made mistakes before.
>
>Larry, your jeremiad is not original. This same dismayed chant has
>been going on for 90 years, ever since 1912 when Hiram Percy Maxim
>was forced to give up his call, "SNY", move above 200 meters, and
>knuckle under to government regulation including a (gasp) 5WPM
>Morse test.
>
Don;t forget the kilowatt input limitation.

>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
>went on and flourished.
>
>Then in 1919 they raised the Morse test to 10WPM.

Also made the written tougher. I don't think they allowed renewal of prewar
licenses,
either.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
>went on and flourished.
>
>Throughout the 20's CW gradually replaced King Spark, and spark was
>eventually outlawed.

1927 - after hams had abandoned it.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
>went on and flourished.

>Then in 1927 they reduced the license classes from two to only one
>class. Old "Second Grade" had to upgrade within one year, or go
>QRT.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio

>went on and flourished.

In 1929 the bands were slashed, particularly the highly popular 40 and 20 meter bands.
(40 used to be 7000 to 8000 kc. and 20 was 14000 to 16000 kc.) Plus hams had to use
pure DC and have stable signals.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
went on and flourished. Between 1929 and 1935 the number of US hams almost tripled.
>
>In 1932 they changed it all again, dividing us up into Class A, B,
>and C, all with a 10WPM code test.

And if a Class C moved to within a certain distance of an FCC office, he/she had to be
retested within 90 days or lose the license.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
>went on and flourished.
>
>In 1936 they said there were too many new hams coming into the
>hobby, so they raised the Morse test speed to 13WPM.

Too many hams coming in with too few skills and too little technical knowledge, and
then dropping out in a year or two. They also made the writtens tougher - again.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
>went on and flourished.
>
>In the early 50's they renamed everybody from A, B, or C to
>Advanced, General, or Conditional. They also introduced 3
>new license classes called Novice, and Technician at 5WPM, and
>Extra at 20WPM.

And announced that in a year they would no longer issue new Advanceds. Plus ful privs were reserved for Advanceds and Extras.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
>went on and flourished.

Then in late 1952 the FCC trashed the system they had just introduced, and
gave all hams except Novices and Techs full operating privileges.

"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
went on and flourished.
>
>In the late 60's they invented something called Incentive Licensing.
>

>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
>went on and flourished.
>
>In 1976 they quit requiring us to certify we had been on the air
>for 12 hours last year (for renewal). They also ended the
>Conditional license.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
>went on and flourished.

>
>In 1991 they removed the Morse requirement for VHF/UHF-only
>licensees.

And in 1990 created medical waivers for 13 and 20 wpm.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" was the cry. But ham radio
>went on and flourished.
>
>In 2000 they changed Morse testing back to the 1912 requirement of
>5WPM, and the number of classes to 3.

Same number of classes as a half-century earlier.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?" is the cry.

Everything old is new again.

--

I really do think ARRL is missing a gold mine by not publishing a collection of
"Rotten Radio" stories. Most of them are still relevant today.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1305. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 14:07:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412100718.26511.00000145@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 40573

In article <3cb4d0b2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020410011503.10062.00000383@mb-cu.aol.com...
>>
>> Not even close, Jim. Getting that truck *safely* and efficiently to it's
>> destination is definitely within limits of PICON. If the drivers were
>> using ham radio to coordinate the pickup of loads, negotiate fees,
>> or advertise their services, then *that* would be a violation of the
>> "no-business" rule. However, when they are simply taking advantage
>> of information related strictly to safe vehicle operation, then they
>> are perfectly OK. In fact, I've always believed it is a great failing
>> of amateur radio that there isn't a widespread network of ham
>> motorists and fixed-station operators specifically dedicated to this
>> task, as there is on the Citizen's Band.
>
>What a huge, huge waste of ham radio.

In a word: WHY? Why is it a "huge, huge waste" for hams to help each other
by discussing traffic conditions?

>There are broadcast stations all over
>the place, with helicopters, motorists who call in on cellular phones, etc.,
>to do the job you describe above.

Here in the Philadelphia area, most of the broadcast stations carry traffic
reports.
At least one station has an all-news/weather/traffic format, and enjoys the
highest
ratings of any BC radio station in the Philly market.

But the traffic info carried on such stations is of very limited use, in my
experience. First off, it's usually "stale", because of the time delays between
a traffic delay and the report of same actually being aired. Second, the
traffic reports must cover a huge area, so you have to listen to all sorts of
stuff to find out conditions in your area. Third, only the biggest delays are
usually reported, due to time limitations.

End result is that very often the delays you encounter are not reported in time
for you to avoid them, and the delays you do hear are cleared up by the time
you get to there.

Direct amateur communications via drivetime repeater roundtables are much more
effective. The coverage area is limited, compared to the BC stations, and
reporting is real-time. Nobody gets paid to make the reports, so it isn't a

pecuniary interest thing.

>Ham radio is more aptly used to report
>directly to the police items such as accidents, and even to assist motorists
>with getting roadside help.

Why isn't that a "huge, huge waste of ham radio", Kim? There are cellphone
towers all over the place now in most major metro areas and along most major
roads. There are far more cellphone-equipped cars than hams. Calling 911
or AAA is a free call for most cellphone users.

>But, to have hams as a major contributor to
>traffic reporting is just not good use of spectrum.

Good thing the FCC disagrees.
>
>> Considering the great
>> emphasis placed on public service in the ARS, I think we're missing
>> out on a golden opportunity to serve in such a capacity.
>
>The emphasis on public service in ham radio is specifically to fill a void
>for our public service agencies and volunteer groups--*NOT* to provide
>competition for already-in-use commercial ventures of broadcast radio
>stations!

Even if the BC stations can't do the job adequately, we shouldn't make them
look bad by doing it ourselves, huh?

>> Exactly, but this example doesn't relate too well to the issue of
>professional
>> drivers using amateur radio to give and receive traffic information,
>> directions,
>> or report accidents. All of the above serve not only the interest of that
>> particular driver, but the general public as well, since it is in the
>interest
>> of
>> the safe and efficient movement of traffic. I am sure that if the FCC
>were
>> required to specifically address this issue, that they would find it to be
>> completely within the Basis and Purpose of the ARS.

>The magic word you said above is "professional." If you are using ham radio
>in any way to enhance your ability to make money, then I believe you could
>be called into question on the rules. As I said, have at it...but I won't
>be involved in the discussions, nor will I answer those questions if I feel
>you're asking for those reasons...

Fine - you don't have to. But to chide, tease and make fun of hams for doing so
is another matter.

There is also the matter of saving fuel and reducing pollution by avoiding
unnecessary delays. This is clearly a benefit to society - a public service.
It fits in perfectly with the basis and purpose of the ARS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1306. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 14:12:43 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <vXBt8.25474$QC1.1612679@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40575

> Hello Glendale Jim, Larry rides around conducting
> his own unannounced "Communications Emergency Tests."
> He gets better responses by discussing traffic, so
> thats what he does. He's responsible for engaging
> truckers with comments such as "Did you see that
> knuckle dragging Tech with the Southern Drawl cut
> across 3 lanes of traffic?" and his all time favorite,
> "Did you see the Kazoos on that Gal with the
> xx5TIT plates?"
>
> Brian

Heh, heh. Well, anything that provides content for the
RF spectrum we have been allocated is OK with me. One
can only hope it won't get too personal (or too raunchy).

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1307. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:04:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a96tn8$c83$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40579

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CB66934.7EA9E7A4@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>
> CW in a QSO with Larry? :-)
>
> I suppose an extra never needs a control op. Unless
> it's a courtesy to the person whose' station you are a
> guest at.

Correct. Even a tech, if operating within the confines
of the tech's permitted frequencies and modes doesn't need
a control op.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1308. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:08:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB6F86D.4C03C3CD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40576

Dick Carroll wrote:
> WORK??? EFFORT??? Well, that pretty well kills it. Cecil says there
> is no need to work or expend effort, that can never be a requirement.

There is no *requirement* to work or expend effort, i.e.
someone who already knows the material is not required
to work or expend effort to learn something else that
he/she doesn't know.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

1309. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:12:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB6F977.D7958A3B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40577

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Oh he didn't say that *every time* he posted. But if you spend the time
> to leaf through his volumnous posts, I'm quite sure you'll find it.

I said there is no *requirement* to work or expend effort.
A person who already knows the material is not *required*
to work or expend effort to learn anything else for the
exams. But, of course, you already knew what I meant.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

1310. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:13:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a96tn9$c83$2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40578

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a96j27$l82$0@208.206.142.113...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > >Cecil says there is no need to work or expend effort,
> > > that can never be a requirement.
>
> > That is not what Cecil said. Go back and try again.
>
> Oh he didn't say that *every time* he posted. But if you spend the
> time to leaf through his volumnous posts, I'm quite sure you'll find it.

Dick, I'll say it as follows:

The aspect of "work" is not and should not be any
consideration as to the rational behind any specific ham
license requirement. We all know that for most people,
work (effort) will need to be expended to achieve
or pass a particular license requirement...BUT, that
having been said, the NEED or DESIRE to try and
make "work" be an aspect of licensing is, again, not
a factor nor should it be.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1311. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:20:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a96u4bpku1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40580

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020412100716.26511.00000144@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <Jyst8.1704$3z3.151405@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
> >> Don't look now, but ham radio has been going
> >> downhill a lot longer than 12 years.
> >> Most "old timers" refer to the '50's and '60's as the "Golden
> >> Era" of amateur radio, and from all accounts, they were right.
>
> I'm an "old timer" and I disagree. There was never a
> "golden age" - each era had its
> set of problems. The '50s were full of TVI nightmares and the
> AM vs SSB battle. The '60s experienced almost no growth,
> arguments and misinformation over incentive licensing proposals,
> dismissal as irrelevant bymany young people in a time of civil
> unrest and other problems like license fees.

EVERY hobby, sport, endeaver seems to regard "the golden age"
as a fond memory of how things were a couple or three decades
back.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1312. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:32:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a96urh$5rg$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40581

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020412100718.26511.00000145@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3cb4d0b2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20020410011503.10062.00000383@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >>
> >> Not even close, Jim. Getting that truck *safely* and efficiently to
it's
> >> destination is definitely within limits of PICON. If the drivers were
> >> using ham radio to coordinate the pickup of loads, negotiate fees,
> >> or advertise their services, then *that* would be a violation of the
> >> "no-business" rule. However, when they are simply taking advantage
> >> of information related strictly to safe vehicle operation, then they
> >> are perfectly OK. In fact, I've always believed it is a great failing
> >> of amateur radio that there isn't a widespread network of ham
> >> motorists and fixed-station operators specifically dedicated to this
> >> task, as there is on the Citizen's Band.
> >
> >What a huge, huge waste of ham radio.
>
> In a word: WHY? Why is it a "huge, huge waste" for hams to help each other
> by discussing traffic conditions?

Additionally, we would run a morning traffic net type
operation three times an hour (on the hour, 20 minutes past
and 40 minutes past). One ham would serve as net control
and the exchanges then took on the operational aspects of
a true net. EVERYONE was encouraged to run a net.
Bottom line of that scenario is individual training on net
operations which benefits all of us in the eventual case
of an emergency net operation being needed.

> >There are broadcast stations all over
> >the place, with helicopters, motorists who call in on
> . cellular phones, etc., to do the job you describe above.
>
> Here in the Philadelphia area, most of the broadcast
> stations carry traffic reports.
> At least one station has an all-news/weather/traffic format, and
> enjoys the highest ratings of any BC radio station in the Philly market.
>
> But the traffic info carried on such stations is of very limited use, in

my
> experience. First off, it's usually "stale", because of the time delays
between
> a traffic delay and the report of same actually being aired. Second, the
> traffic reports must cover a huge area, so you have to listen to all sorts
of
> stuff to find out conditions in your area. Third, only the biggest delays
are
> usually reported, due to time limitations.
>
> End result is that very often the delays you encounter are not reported in
time
> for you to avoid them, and the delays you do hear are cleared up by the
time
> you get to there.

Also, the traffic chopper doesn't usually stay in one area.
We'd get much more detailed info from other hams about
real-time traffic conditions because they were right there.

Additional well reasoned comments from Jim
deleted for brevity.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1313. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:45:47 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <LiDt8.2761$L1.237505@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40582

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> Additionally, we would run a morning traffic net type
> operation three times an hour (on the hour, 20 minutes past
> and 40 minutes past). One ham would serve as net control
> and the exchanges then took on the operational aspects of
> a true net. EVERYONE was encouraged to run a net.
> Bottom line of that scenario is individual training on net
> operations which benefits all of us in the eventual case
> of an emergency net operation being needed.
>

Did you have a designated "chider" and a certified "ridiculer"
to give your net that "north Texas flair"?

73, de Hans, K0HB

1314. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:47:44 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <AkDt8.2766$L1.236705@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40583

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
> I said there is no *requirement* to work or expend effort.
> A person who already knows the material is not *required*
> to work or expend effort to learn anything else for the
> exams. But, of course, you already knew what I meant.
>

Sometimes I wish that there had been a strict *requirement*
for your father to practice Onanism.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1315. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:53:20 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <QpDt8.2780$L1.238800@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40584

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> >
> > I suppose an extra never needs a control op. Unless
> > it's a courtesy to the person whose' station you are a
> > guest at.
>
> Correct. Even a tech, if operating within the confines
> of the tech's permitted frequencies and modes doesn't need
> a control op.
>

Bzzzzzzzzzzzzzt! Bad answer.

"97.7 Control operator required

When transmitting, each amateur station must have a control operator."

Good luck on this on now!

de Hans, K0HB

1316. Re: Repeater Information

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 15:59:01 UTC
From: AC6V <ac6v@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <3CB7044A.95DC4769@amsat.org>
Source record: 40585

And be aware that some repeater groups don't want to reveal the exact location of their repeaters
other than "Zilch Mountain"
Reason -- too many thefts and vandalism -- a sad bit of truth about today's society.
--
73 From AC6V, Rod In Oceanside, CA
I doubt, therefore I might be!

AC6V Mega Ham Index at http://ac6v.com
AC6V Book For DXers at http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm
==========

"Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" wrote:

> In article <J%xt8.3815$lp4.1966648561@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>,
> lars121@pacbell.net says...
> > I'm a little confused and I'm hoping someone can help me figure this out.
> > There are websites who list repeaters that are in operation. But, the
> > location of the repeater does not match what is on the FCC license. If this
> > is permitted, is it possible to find a physical address of the repeater? Who
> > is accountable for the physical address if the FCC is not?
> > An example is given below and can be found at websites like
> > www.220sma.org/smarpt.htm
> > http://www.qsl.net/cora/222_Mhz_Repeater_Guide.htm
> > http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Hangar/6847/
> >
> > Freq (MHz) - Call Sign Location of Repeater Hardware - Status Mode
> > 224.840 - K6BWA HOLLYWOOD HILLS - PRIVATE
> > 224.840 - KA6UFC SAND CANYON - PRIVATE
> > 224.840 - KS6E SHERMAN OAKS - PRIVATE
> > 224.840 - KS6K SILVERLAKE, L.A. - PRIVATE
> > 224.840 - N6EHD ALTADENA - PRIVATE
> > 224.840 - WA6MTM YORBA LINDA - PRIVATE
> > 224.840 - WB6PRR ALTADENA - PRIVATE
>
> These are the physical locations of the repeaters.
>
> >
> > FCC license information differs and is as follows:
> >
> > Callsign - Licensee Name - City (according to FCC license)
> > K6BWA - SCHULMAN, JOSEPH H SANTA - CLARITA
> > N6EHD - SCHULMAN, DANNY I - LOS ANGELES
> > KA6UFC - SCHULMAN, BARBARA L - SANTA CLARITA

> > KS6K - LEIDNER, JOEL D - LOS ANGELES
> > KS6E - FREEDMAN, MARVIN - LOS ANGELES
> > WB6PRR - MANCINI, ROBERT F - ALTADENA
>
> These are the trustees of the repeaters. These people are responsible
> for the FCC regulated operations of the repeaters. IOW, if something
> goes wrong, or if the repeaters are not used according to Part 97, these
> people are the ones that the FCC will contact 1st.
>
> They do not have to be physically located at the same address.

1317. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 16:07:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412120713.19000.00000746@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40586

In article <3CB5D9B1.77B8D070@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Of course, you neglected to repost the untrue part. Here it is again:
>> >
>> >> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code
>test
>> >> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.
>>
>> How is that not true?
>
>It is obviously not true.

In other words, you cannot refute it with facts so you simply say it's not true and we are supposed to take that on faith. (Somebody get the net!)

>Techs accounted for 30% of the growth in the ARS
>during the 90's.

No, they did not.

There was 34% growth in the 1990s.

30% of 34% growth is 10.2%. "30% of" means "multiply by .30".

So you are saying that Techs caused 10.2% growth and all the other classes caused 23.8% growth. Total is 34% growth.

>All other classes of licenses combined were responsible
>for that 4% that you attribute to the Techs.

You just contradicted yourself twice. First you tell us that Techs were responsible for 30% of the growth, leaving most of the growth to the other classes, then you say that the other classes only contributed 4%.

Better take some remedial math classes, Cecil.

And show us your work if you want to be taken seriously.

>You seem to have interpreted
>everything backwards and upside down.

The only possible mistake I have made is thinking you might actually be serious about any of this. Of course I know better, and am merely posting here to point out the absurdity of your claims and analysis. I'm being your straight man, so to speak, because you've told us many times you never post seriously here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1318. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 16:07:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412120714.19000.00000747@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40587

In article <3CB5D2A8.60DFC415@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> True or false?
>
>Why do you keep posting stuff with which I have no disagreement
>and ignoring the stuff with which I disagree?

I'm simply pointing out the facts, Cecil. Ham radio in the US grew 30% in the 1980s and 34% in the 1990s. In the '80s all US hams were code tested and in the '90s there was a new license class that permitted a ham license with no code test, AND, medical waivers of the 13 and 20 wpm code tests for those with a letter from a doctor.

The difference between 34 and 30 is 4. That means 4% more growth in the 1990s than in the 1980s. Simple.

Why do you keep editing out the facts and ignoring simple questions?

>Here's your statement with which I disagree:
>
>> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
>> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.

Is that not true? If it's not true, what part is false? It says "4% more growth in a decade" - did that not happen?
>
>This statement does an injustice to 30% of US hams.

How? It does not say WHO caused the growth. It simply says how much more growth occurred after certain changes were made. Nobody is blamed or credited, no license class is held up or put down.

All I did was write some simple, direct, true facts, yet you take offense to them for some reason. Seems like they don't support your agenda. Too bad.

>It is straight out of the PCTA Handbook.

I know of no such book. Do you know where I can get one?

Since my statement is true, if a "PCTA Handbook" exists, you're saying that it instructs people to tell the truth. Sounds like a good book to me.

>Techs were responsible for about 30% growth
>in the ARS during that decade.

Show your work. How many Techs were there in 1990? How many in 2000?
How much growth is that?

Besides, my statement does not say who is or is not responsible for the growth.

It's interesting that you have quietly backed away from "nocode Tech" and "coded hams".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1319. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 17:55:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB71FAE.201E9438@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40588

K0HB wrote:
> Sometimes I wish that there had been a strict *requirement*
> for your father to practice Onanism.

What do electric power generators have to do with it?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

1320. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 18:05:41 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB721F5.DD19A7F6@psu.edu>
Source record: 40592

I said it before, I'll say it again, SHEESH!

I for one respect the job of bus driver. You have lots of people you are responsible for every day. You perform a valuable service.

But the attitude of some here is hard to get happy about. One problem with so many here in the US anymore is that a fair number of people have no respect for so many jobs. There is dignity in all honest jobs.

Interestingly, those who don't share this belief, and like to rank jobs for their level in the food chain, seem to inevitably have the "proper job" cutoff point somewhere below their own vocation. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

<A whole bunch of stuff snipped>

> I am a BUS DRIVER.

1321. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 18:06:22 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <a977mu$c12$1@mycroft.cmhnet.org>
Source record: 40589

In article <3cb4cd0f_1@newsa.ev1.net>,
W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>But, if you have
>just gotten hired by the hotel, restaurant, whatever and you are asking
>directions to the place (say it's a chain and you've never been to the
>location you'll be working at), then to me you are violating the rules. If
>you're going to your friend's house to conduct some work you'll be getting
>paid for...well, ya shouldn't be using ham radio to enhance your ability to
>earn that money by asking for directions over ham radio. Hamfests are
>another matter altogether.

I think I understand where you're coming from, Kim. I think what you
say here says it best: ham radio shouldn't be used to *enhance* your
money making opportunities.

In your first case, where someone didn't know where they worked, and asked
directions, I disagree -- it doesn't enhance their opportunity to make
money. Yes, it might keep them from being late, but I don't really see
a problem with this. I don't feel it enhances the persons ability to make
money, not in a realistic sense.

In the second case, I can see that as less gray -- that seems akin to
setting up a work appointment using ham radio, which isn't gray at all,
it's simply not allowed.

I don't see a problem with talking about travel conditions on your route
to work. It certainly doesn't enhance my ability to make money -- I'm
not paid hourly.

On another, somewhat related note (at least I think it was in this thread)
you said something about how people discussing medical conditions *cheapens*
amateur radio. That's sounds amazingly like what Larry says about your
callsign. I don't agree with either one of you. I think listeners have
to understand that amateur radio is a way for people to talk. We have some
restrictions on what we're supposed to discuss and how we use our frequencies,
but still, most people just use it to talk. I don't care what people talk
about as long as its within the guidelines.

Sean.

1322. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 18:09:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB722C7.CE4E768C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40590

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Here's your statement with which I disagree:
> >
> >> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
> >> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.
>
> Is that not true? If it's not true, what part is false? It says "4% more growth
> in a decade" - did that not happen?

Again you state the obvious and ignore the error. The "code waivers and
dropping of the code test" did not cause "just 4% more growth in a decade".
You are ignoring many other causes, possibly more important than those two.

> >This statement does an injustice to 30% of US hams.
>
> How? It does not say WHO caused the growth.

It says code waivers and dropping of the code test caused
4% of the growth. "Brought about" *means* "caused".
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

1323. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 18:10:07 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CB722FF.9CBCB69B@psu.edu>
Source record: 40591

Which country is it that still has a sailed vessel that it's navy officers all train on? Their officers *really* know the oceans. There are some parallels between CW and that.

probably starting a brand new argument.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> So true....But just think how much more confidence you can have that
> the message will actually arrive at its destination (and consider the
> fact that you will know it instantly since the recipient will
> immediately acknowledge it) when you use radio's most basic mode-
> Radiotelegraphy!
> And you won't have to worry about contracting histoplasmosis from those
> smelly, nasty birds.....

1324. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 18:28:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412142844.01569.00000023@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 40594

In article <20020411100841.00417.00003304@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>I spent four months total in five trips to Naval Air Development
>>Center in Warminster, PA, in 1971-1972, while working for
>>RCA Corporation.
>
> Another trip down CV lane...another dissertation created to marvel at his
>self-appreciating "career", his presence long forgotten (and in some cases
>gladly) by all but himself.

Not a "curriculum vitae" (CV) "dissertation," just a demonstration of ordinary memory from 31 to 30 years past. It will be seen that the talibanian from tennessee has no long-term memory extending beyond 2 years.

> And another example that in his 15 years of night school, very little, if
>any, was spent in Composition or Professional Writing.

I took the normal English requirements for an EE major, got A+ in all of them (schools had not fully converted to numeric point scores at the time). No problem. One reason for my high-percentage acceptance as a freelance professional writer is the "composition" and neatness and format which are pleasing to editors.

Anyone can do that if they apply themselves and practice hard.

> Just how many words CAN you pack into one "paragraph", Lennie? At least
>words that MEAN anything?

...as many words as there are in the English language plus a few from other languages. All have meaning. Not all readers can comprehend everything that is written... :-)

>>Whatever became of the Warminster NAS or the old
>>NADC buildings is not important to me personally since I never
>>went back there again, not the nearby Willow Grove NAS, nor...(SNIP)

> You try to make some "point" by discussing things that ALLEGEDLY happened
>in 1972 when I have clearly stated my presence was a decade later, assuming,
>I suppose, that you think Pennsylvania simply ceased to stop dead in it's
>tracks when you left.

Some residents of Bucks County were of the opinion that that section of PA had already "stopped dead in its tracks" long before the 1970s...but that was locals talking. :-)

Much of what I've said about NADC is verifiable by printed documents
produced by the USN. None of it is "alleged." It is simply a straight-
forward recounting.

>>What STEVIE has to supply is the year where he "visited the
>>HRO" outlet I described in Burbank, CA.
>
> January 2000, Lennie. Sorry.

A mere 27 months ago and you cannot remember any details of
the store, its location, or the neighborhood? :-)

Not a problem for me...I can remember farther back than 31 years
and recall verifiable details. :-)

I call your bluff. Why in the world would you be traveling from
Tennessee to a single HRO in Burbank, CA, when they had
other stores in the southeast? A quick glance at their catalog
back pages shows one in Atlanta, GA, New Castle, DE, and
Woodbridge, VA. HRO has been on-line in the Internet for a long
while and has done mail-order for much longer.

>>There are apparent differences in geographic locations which should
>>be easily recalled.
>
> I was more interested in the company and conversation than taking in
>geographical points of interest so I could do USENET jousting with Your
>Loserness. But "been there-done that" still applies.
>
> And the traffic and air in SoCal still sucks.

I have no doubt that the talibanian from tennessee has been in *A*
HRO store. It is highly suspicious in this discussion since HRO is
a large chain and very far from the east coast (three of four eastern
HROs already mentioned). As a store it takes only a single space
in the small mini-mall. There is a Radio Shack in the other wing of
the mini-mall, same size as the HRO. In January of 2000 one of
the corners of that major intersection was undergoing a large
construction project, something any competent and observing driver
could not fail to notice; exit on Buena Vista to reach the freeway
on-ramp of I-5 would face that construction. Deconstruction on
the diagonally-opposite corner had just begun, also easily visible
from the HRO parking area (there is no "parking behind the store"
in that mini-mall).

There are two other major amateur radio stores in the Southern
California area comprising Greater Los Angeles. Each of those
have as much or more than HRO. Why were not those mentioned?
Hint: They also advertise in ham periodicals and on the Internet.

The traffic in the Greater Los Angeles area moves well except for
certain instances of accidents. The street and highway systems
here are large and long ago planned and built for much traffic. The
Air Quality Management District has made much progress in

improving air quality, so much so that the Los Angeles area hasn't been even close to the bad air of other areas for years. The month of January is particularly clean here.

Conclusion: The resident talibanian is simply bluffing. He got called and LOST.

> Now...WHICH RADIO SERVICE IS STRICTLY RECREATIONAL..???

That was already answered in another thread. Obviously the fist is still clenched inside the jar, no doubt the pain preventing full comprehension of the words written there. :-)

1325. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 18:28:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412142846.01569.00000024@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 40593

In article <20020411095011.00417.00003303@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Already been done. A paper was done many years ago on using Morse Code
>>>by Handi-Hams.
>>
>>Incorrect. This was a research project carried out by a group of
>>universities.
>
> "...group of universities."...??? I provide specifics and you claim
>it's incorrect and substitue a generalitiy. Uh huh...we believe you, Your
>Putziness.

From the Incidental Things Noted In Recent Past section of my memory, a group of colleges (from more than one university) were putting out an Internet notice on a meeting/seminar/symposium on geriatrics and disabilities. One of the disabilities concerned the possible use of morse code as a means of communicating with stroke victims. The URL was posted in here by Hans Brakob.
I linked to that notice, found nothing substantial to prove/disprove that particular means of communication.

In a subsequent message exchange between Brakob and myself plus a few others, I challenged anyone to demonstrate teaching any stroke victim anything with particular emphasis on morse code. No one had any distinct reply to my challenge, only the standard boilerplate jingoism about learning the code.

It seems that few in here have had any close family experiences with stroke victims or visited nursing homes caring for stroke victims.

>>TIA = Transient Ischemic Attack, also known as a "micro-stroke."
>
> NOT known as a "micro-stroke". Wrong again...Break open a medical
>terminology text, Your Clammyness.

My mother's MD broke open a medical text for me to show the terminology, effects, and general details. The text was one used at the USC School of Medicine. "TIA" and its colloquial "micro-stroke" is a common short-form descriptor used by doctors and staff at two hospitals in this area.

This isn't a medical newsgroup...it is about amateur radio.

Now, YOU break open a RADIO TEXT and LEARN.

>>There are various kinds of such "attacks," all caused by hemorrhages
>>of blood vessels in the brain.
>
> NOT "all caused by hemmorhages of blood vessles of the brain" , Lennie.
>Again you offer absolutes that are NOT substantiated by facts.

As I said before, this is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup.

I'm not a medical professional, I'm an electronic professional. I depend on medical professionals for the health and well-being of myself and my family. What I wrote in here was an almost verbatim description of the explanations given to me by MDs on each of three times my mother required hospitalization due to TIAs.

>>Doctors will explain all the details to patients' family members.
>
> Either the one who did the explaning to you did a poor job, or you
>weren't paying attention.

In that case, it is four graduate, licensed Medical Doctors who are "all wrong?" Three of them are still in practice in California, licensed by that state. One moved to Texas and is in practice there.

It is difficult to NOT PAY ATTENTION when looking at imagery from a computer-aided tomography machine (aka "cat-scan") where an MD is pointing to "probable" damage areas...especially when it is a close, blood relative.

What this has come down to is believability of the words of four graduate, licensed medical doctors versus an emotional nurse in another state who is not a medical doctor. The four MDs win, the nurse loses.

The nurse loses again on the "recreational" aspect of creation of certain personal radio services. The nurse is simply giving over to emotion and fighting-for-the-cause-of-fighting on picking nits over qualifiers. Logic and reason and history (Reports and Orders creating a radio service by the FCC) cannot dissuade the emotional so it is of no worth to continue that "argument." I won, but the nurse's fist is still clenched in the jar.

1326. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 18:54:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB72D61.324BAE88@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40595

N2EY wrote:
> No, they did not.

Here's your posted ARS numbers (rounded).

Y2000 = 208k techs + 470k others = 678k total

You said: ARS grew by 34% from 1990 to 2000.
Therefore there were about 506k hams in 1990, all coded.

Based on your numbers, coded hams dropped from about
506k in 1990 to about 470k in 2000. That's about a
7% decline in others (coded hams). The techs had to
make up for that 7% decline. Techs actually
accounted for the 34% of growth plus 7% more.

To say that only 4% of the growth was caused by the code
waivers and the nocode license is just ridiculous.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

1327. Re: Repeater Information

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 19:11:21 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204121910240.18205-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 40596

So? In the amateur service, the license will list the MAILING address of the
person the license is assigned to. The FCC does not regulate transmitter
locations like it does in other services.

On Fri, 12 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
>I'm a little confused and I'm hoping someone can help me figure this out.
>There are websites who list repeaters that are in operation. But, the
>location of the repeater does not match what is on the FCC license. If this
>is permitted, is it possible to find a physical address of the repeater? Who
>is accountable for the physical address if the FCC is not?
>An example is given below and can be found at websites like
> www.220sma.org/smarpt.htm
>http://www.qsl.net/cora/222_Mhz_Repeater_Guide.htm
>http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Hangar/6847/
>
>Freq (MHz) - Call Sign Location of Repeater Hardware - Status Mode
>224.840 - K6BWA HOLLYWOOD HILLS - PRIVATE
>224.840 - KA6UFC SAND CANYON - PRIVATE
>224.840 - KS6E SHERMAN OAKS - PRIVATE
>224.840 - KS6K SILVERLAKE, L.A. - PRIVATE
>224.840 - N6EHD ALTADENA - PRIVATE
>224.840 - WA6MTM YORBA LINDA - PRIVATE
>224.840 - WB6PRR ALTADENA - PRIVATE
>
>FCC license information differs and is as follows:
>
>Callsign - Licensee Name - City (according to FCC license)
>K6BWA - SCHULMAN, JOSEPH H SANTA - CLARITA
>N6EHD - SCHULMAN, DANNY I - LOS ANGELES
>KA6UFC - SCHULMAN, BARBARA L - SANTA CLARITA
>KS6K - LEIDNER, JOEL D - LOS ANGELES
>KS6E - FREEDMAN, MARVIN - LOS ANGELES
>WB6PRR - MANCINI, ROBERT F - ALTADENA
>
>
>
>
>
>

1328. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 21:27:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412172715.13688.00000592@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 40597

In article <3CB722C7.CE4E768C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Here's your statement with which I disagree:
>> >
>> >> So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code
>test
>> >> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade.
>>
>> Is that not true? If it's not true, what part is false? It says "4% more
>growth
>> in a decade" - did that not happen?
>
>Again you state the obvious and ignore the error.

What error? What part of the statement is in error?

"So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade."

Just exactly what in that statement is not true?

>The "code waivers and
>dropping of the code test" did not cause "just 4% more growth in a decade".
>You are ignoring many other causes, possibly more important than those two.

So the "4% more growth" part is agreed upon as true (34% - 30% = 4%), but you
think the code waivers and dropping of the code test for Tech were not totally
responsible for that "4% more growth". Interesting.

What other causes am I ignoring? Sunspot cycle, more buying power
equipment-wise, new modes like PSK31? If such causes are responsible for part
of that 4% increase, it means the code test stuff is even less important to
growth than I stated.

So what are the other causes and how much did they contribute?
>
>> >This statement does an injustice to 30% of US hams.
>>
>> How? It does not say WHO caused the growth.
>
>It says code waivers and dropping of the code test caused
>4% of the growth.

All hams codetested and no waivers: 30% growth in 10 years
Some hams codetested and waivers: 34% growth in 10 years

Difference: 4%

> "Brought about" *means* "caused".

So? Rules changes are not people. And you have not explainmed how that true statement does anyone an injustice.

If anyone is doing an injustice to 30% of the US amateur population, Cecil, it's YOU. You keep harping on "coded" and "noncoded" hams as if there is some fundamental difference. To me they're all just hams. FCC agrees with me.

As I have said many times, all who meet the requirements and play by the rules are welcome. But you keep kicking up a fuss about some alleged difference, citing imaginary handbooks and doing really bad mathematical analysis of pretty simple stuff.

So tell us what those other causes of growth were....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1329. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 21:39:15 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <7ult8.3191$3z3.292821@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40598

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> As I have said many times, all who meet the requirements and play by the
rules
> are welcome. But you keep kicking up a fuss about some alleged difference,
> citing imaginary handbooks and doing really bad mathematical analysis of
pretty
> simple stuff.
>

Jim,

I must interrupt here. You're going to get a heart-attack from mountain
climbing over molehills.

73, Hans

1330. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 21:40:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB7544D.B952FDAD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40599

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Again you state the obvious and ignore the error.
>
> What error? What part of the statement is in error?
>
> "So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade."
>
> Just exactly what in that statement is not true?

"Brought about" means "caused". The statement is simply false.

> >The "code waivers and
> >dropping of the code test" did not cause "just 4% more growth in a decade".
> >You are ignoring many other causes, possibly more important than those two.
>
> So the "4% more growth" part is agreed upon as true (34% - 30% = 4%), but you
> think the code waivers and dropping of the code test for Tech were not totally
> responsible for that "4% more growth". Interesting.

Nice try at obfuscation, Jim. The 4% growth was not the only growth caused
by the addition of the Tech license. By your own posted figures, the Techs
were responsible for about 41% of the growth. The coded hams were responsible
for a decline of 7%.

> What other causes am I ignoring?

Whatever caused the decline in code tested hams. I don't know what that was
but it's obvious to the most casual observer that something drastic happened.

> All hams codetested and no waivers: 30% growth in 10 years
> Some hams codetested and waivers: 34% growth in 10 years
>
> Difference: 4%

Yep, like I said, figures don't lie but liars figure.

> If anyone is doing an injustice to 30% of the US amateur population, Cecil,
> it's YOU. You keep harping on "coded" and "noncoded" hams as if there is some
> fundamental difference. To me they're all just hams. FCC agrees with me.

Nice try at obfuscation, Jim. It is readily apparent that you want to ignore
the contribution of the Techs to the ham population. Won't work. Take away the
Techs and the ARS population would be in decline.

> So tell us what those other causes of growth were....

The Techs were responsible for about 41% of the growth. The code tested hams were responsible for a 7% decline according to your posted figures. No wonder you want to cover up the effect of the Techs by lumping them with the coded hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1331. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 21:46:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB7559D.B5BD481A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40600

K0HB wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > As I have said many times, all who meet the requirements and play by the rules
> > are welcome. But you keep kicking up a fuss about some alleged difference,
> > citing imaginary handbooks and doing really bad mathematical analysis of
> > pretty simple stuff.
>
> I must interrupt here. You're going to get a heart-attack from mountain
> climbing over molehills.

You think 200,000 Techs are a molehill? Shame on you, Hans. Techs are a
good 30% of the ARS mountain which is *NOT* a small percentage. Without
the Techs, the ARS population would be in decline.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1332. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 21:49:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a97kut$kd6$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40601

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CB722FF.9CBCB69B@psu.edu...
> Which country is it that still has a sailed vessel that it's navy
> officers all train on?

Actually, there are many countries...including the USA if
you count the US Coast Guard.

> Their officers *really* know the oceans. There
> are some parallels between CW and that.

Not at all a valid parallel since the reality of
knowing the oceans is certainly a basic building block
or foundation of knowledge related to seamanship. No one
MUST know morse code to be an outstanding or excellent
ham radio operator.

> probably starting a brand new argument.........

Nope...I seem to recall that line having
been drawn before.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1333. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 21:56:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a97lbocjm1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40602

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020412142844.01569.00000023@mb-mg.aol.com...
> In article <20020411100841.00417.00003304@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >>I spent four months total in five trips to Naval Air Development
> >>Center in Warminster, PA, in 1971-1972, while working for
> >>RCA Corporation.
> >
> > Another trip down CV lane...another dissertation created to marvel at
his
> >self-appreciating "career", his presence long forgotten (and in some
cases
> >gladly) by all but himself.
>
> Not a "curriculum vitae" (CV) "dissertation," just a demonstration of
> ordinary memory from 31 to 30 years past. It will be seen that
> the talibanian from tennessee has no long-term memory
> extending beyond 2 years.
>
> >And another example that in his 15 years of night school, very
> >little, if any, was spent in Composition or Professional Writing.
>
> I took the normal English requirements for an EE major, got A+ in
> all of them (schools had not fully converted to numeric point scores
> at the time). No problem. One reason for my high-percentage
> acceptance as a freelance professional writer is the "composition"
> and neatness and format which are pleasing to editors.
>
> Anyone can do that if they apply themselves and practice hard.

As an add-on comment, I have (as I'm sure Len and others have)
had the unfortunate opportunity to have to work with some
career engineers and/or scientists who couldn't write their
way out of a paper bag. They may have been brilliant in what
the could do...but articulating and conveying their ideas and
thoughts in an understandable fashion was severly lacking.

1334. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:01:24 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <UOIt8.3233$3z3.295614@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40603

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB7559D.B5BD481A@IEEE.org...
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > > As I have said many times, all who meet the requirements and play by
the rules
> > > are welcome. But you keep kicking up a fuss about some alleged
difference,
> > > citing imaginary handbooks and doing really bad mathematical analysis
of
> > > pretty simple stuff.
> >
> > I must interrupt here. You're going to get a heart-attack from mountain
> > climbing over molehills.
>
> You think 200,000 Techs are a molehill? Shame on you, Hans.

No, Cecil. *You* are the molehill.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1335. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:02:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412180222.19503.00000581@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40611

In article <a95lmm$ur8$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
>news:442400E659C4E909.001288B0145E70FB.E7BB63667BB63632@lp.airnews.net...
>> On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 16:03:12 GMT, "K0HB"
>> <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:
>>
>> >The US Navy fleets now operate without the following enlisted ratings:
>> >
>> > Pigeon Trainer
>> > Sail Maker
>> > Stoker
>> > Radioman
>>
>> Do they still have someone trained in flag semaphore and the use of
>> the signalling lights, or are those covered under other
>> specializations?
>
>The semaphore and morse signal lamp communications falls
>under the rating of Signalman. The skill set of reading
>signal lamp code by eye-sight (Signalman) is significantly different
>than copying morse code by ear (was the Radioman rating)

For what it's worth, the USAF has only one MOS that requires
morse code cognition and that one is "Signals Intelligence
Production" (morse training done at Fort Huachuca, the only
morse school in the US of A).

The US Army long ago eliminated horse cavalry even though
they had a horse-transportable radio set in 1932 and a horse-
mobile (operate while riding, try to do that with a morse key)
radio set in 1936. The USA was also big on carrier pigeon
use in the first world war; it was a part of the Signal Corps.
The Army Signal Corps collar insignia is a torch over crossed
signal flags from the visual semaphore signalling modes used
during the American Civil War and dropped some time around
World War One.

None of the US military service branches requires morse code
skills for transmitting any kind of information. They don't
NEED those skills but some amateurs still like to live in the
glorious past, full of legends and myths.

1336. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:02:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412180225.19503.00000583@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40605

In article <AkDt8.2766$L1.236705@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>> I said there is no *requirement* to work or expend effort.
>> A person who already knows the material is not *required*
>> to work or expend effort to learn anything else for the
>> exams. But, of course, you already knew what I meant.
>
>Sometimes I wish that there had been a strict *requirement*
>for your father to practice Onanism.

The onager once again trots out his onerous experience...

1337. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:02:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412180225.19503.00000582@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40612

In article <20020411212803.06878.00000217@mb-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>You've missed the "fine print" in interpersonal behavior.
>>
>>Back when you were soma come loud you were making a lot
>>of rude noises on how "good" you were and how you were always
>>good (teaching your officers how to do their thing, etc.) and all
>>those high-paying management jobs you were going to get.
>>
>>You wound up DRIVING A BUS. Geez, Larrah, that's something
>>a "woman of color" can do...and they do by the hundreds, perhaps
>>thousands. I see them regularly.
>
>Lennie:
>
>Tens of thousands, at least! What's your point? It's a good job,
>and I, as a Paratransit Specialist, have the satisfaction of dealing
>with physically and mentally "challenged" individuals on a daily
>basis, making sure that they can lead a more normal life because
>I'm there to get them where they need to go!

LarrIE,

I stand in awe of all the patriotic bunting you wrap yourself in...
but I'm not making fun of bus drivers. I'm making fun of self-
professed intellectual whizbangs who promote themselves
way, Way, WAY out of line.

>Go ahead and make
>all the fun of my job you want! But if you were to ride with me for
>a week, I think you'd be whistling a different tune!

Yes, probably "Nearer my God to thee..."

>That's right, Lennie -- but how many military or commercial pilots do
>you know that aren't college graduates?

At least four. One of them bosses a highly-successful aviation
service at VNY (three-letter ICAO identifier for Van Nuys Airport).

>Years ago, I heard an Air
>Force general officer speaking on the concept of enlisted pilots. He
>agreed with a commentor that it doesn't require a college degree to
>learn how to fly an airplane, even a complicated Air Force jet fighter --
>but that he wasn't going to bother trying to train anyone to do so
>unless they *had* a college degree -- only because that is the one

>way to be sure that that person is worth making the multi-million dollar
>investment in his/her training.

For half a century, the US military has had a policy of REQUIRING
commissioned officers to have a college education or the
equivalency of one. The USAF has made it a policy of requiring
all pilots to be commissioned officers. The US Army took a more
realistic view in the Warrant Officer requirements for helicopter
pilots (there are more helos in the US military than fixed-wing
aircraft).

>Don't look now, Lennie, but a Taco Hell doesn't necessarily qualify
>as a "fine dining" establishment. Even so, I doubt that many of
>their high-level managers are high-school grads with a "C" average.

Taco Bell provides sustenance. In Los Angeles they have
consistently gotten an "A" rating, that rating required to be in
public view at all entrances.

>>Beautiful boilerplate pasties you made there, master chef!
>
>Thank you.

It was not a compliment. A "pasty" is both a kind of meat pie
and an appliance worn on the nipples of near-nude female
dancers. Your boilerplate jingoism in here jibes with the latter...

>I think I'm starting to get a whiff of your problem here, Lennie. Are
>you jealous of the fact that I'm an Honors Graduate?

Good grief, NO! All the pretty paper and high-sounding titles
don't mean squat when it comes to USING the alleged knowledge
and skills implied by engraved "sheepskin." You have to actually
DO something worthwhile to "prove your honors."

So far, LarrIE, all you've done is BS about your BS, transformed
BUS DRIVER to "paratransit specialist" in the weirdest bit of
buffoonery on titlemania I've seen in a long time.

As far as radio-electronics technical knowledge presented to the
world, you are a Technical Moron with PR Honors.

>Or are you
>just annoyed that I had the initiative, motivation, and desire to
>become one, the same why I became an Amateur Extra under the
>Pre-Restructuring licensing standards?

I give you credit for having passed a 20 WPM morse code test,
a skill which is of little, if any, use anyplace in the entire world of
radio except in amateur radio in the 1970s, the 1980s, the 1990s,
or the 2000s. Morse code skill counts for squat in knowledge of
radio technology. You can't even squat in that regard.

>Correct on both counts, Lennie. I am a BUS DRIVER.

Took you long enough to admit, ey?

>Don't look now, Lennie, but I've been involved in one form of
>transportation or another for my entire working life, civilian and
>military. You got something against people and things moving
>from point A to point B?

No, not even communications from "point A" to "point B." I'm
only against pretentiousness and puffery about some self-
styled "educated" individuals (such as yourself) adorning their
presences with all that patriotic bunting. When you have some
smarts in RADIO technology you come on back wtih all the
fancy and fanciful name titles and we can have more fun to
see how far up from the Technical Moron ("tm") level you've
come. Or not.

>>Now, WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED ABOUT RADIO in all the time
>>you've been hitting on all those "dumbed down" no-code types?
>
>More than you'll ever know.

LarrIE, I fired up my first 1 KW HF transmitter in '53, went on to
work a number of different radio MOSs, had a long and successful
professional career in radio-electronics, was granted a patent in
radio technology, received reasonably large checks for work
performed, wrote accurate technical articles in radio-electronics
hobby and professional periodicals, have legally transmitted on
far more parts of the EM spectrum than allocated to US amateurs,
have worked in the broadcast, aviation, PLMRS civil radio services.
Yes, I acquired that degree along the way...LONG after being
assigned electronic design and development tasks by folks who
gave "passing grades in periodic tests" known as regular
paychecks...it sits in a box someplace.

You, on the other hand, have passed a 20 WPM code test and
had a number of amateur radio licenses (most granted by other
countries as a courtesy on the basis of passing a US test).
You've also gone at it with a lot of personal PR which amounts
to credentialist self-puffery in amateurism in various computer-
modem forums. I've never had a need to operate any radio
emitter in on-off keying morse modes for 49 years yet I once
"worked" a station ON the moon.

I've got sufficient confidence in my personal radio-electronics
abilities to take a box of electronic parts and decide whether or
not they are suitable for radio use...if so, how to make a radio
from them whether using tubes or semiconductors or both...
and then how to test it to see if it performs as designed...and to
analyze the results, determine if the design can be improved,
then implement that improvement. If necessary, I can go back
to basics and build the test equipment itself, calibrate it, and
prove the calibration. I learned that largely on my own and
claim no "titles" or "honors" or "awards" or other artificialities.

Operating a radio requires setting the controls to achieve the circuit then communicating information over that radio. I've already done that with TTY ("data"), voice (single channel, many modes), television, radar, radionavigation, both low-speed to high-speed digital data, narrow-band to wide-band FM multiple channel multiplex, telecommand, and some modes which are probably still classified.

You made a claim that "you know more than I (about learning radio technology)" and I say that you are just a Technical Moron in radio...but with "honors."

Let's see you PROVE all that "radio learning" to the group.

1338. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:02:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412180226.19503.00000584@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40609

In article <20020412061852.20572.00002625@mb-mn.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>Well, I've been looking, both now and for years, and I haven't *seen*
>>any ARRL PSA's since perhaps the late '80's, when I was stationed
>>in Germany.
>
>Go to http://www.arrl.org and look at the media public relations web page. It
>will tell you some about the PSAs (though not quite enough for my taste).

I haven't seen any sure-fire hints and kinks on getting all those public-service announcements actually broadcast.

>When and how they get run is a local broadcasting decision, not an ARRL one.
>Is this important enough to you that you are willing to work with your local
>broadcasters to persuade them to air them?

K6DUE (professional name Roy Neal) ought to have some sure-fire ideas. Under "Roy Neal" he was an on-air journalist for KNBC in Los Angeles for years. Saw him at work doing a video-audio recording for a live news spot at a science-fiction convention. See the regular Pasternak audio news bylines.

Just the same, I've never seen any ARRL videos in the Los Angeles broadcast service area (roughly 15 million viewers) when Roy was working for channel 4 and NBC. The last news item on amateur radio was a short news piece on KABC about six years ago...non-ARRL.

On the other hand, amateur astronomy organizations have annually gotten video and audio coverage here, both on broadcast and printed media.

1339. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:02:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412180227.19503.00000585@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40606

In article <3CB5FE50.E943532@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> I guess it depends on whether you subscribe to the traditional
>definition of amateur as lover of (radio in this case) or if you prefer
>the popular culture definition as mediocre or worse. 8^) I prefer the
>former.

Hmmm...the FCC doesn't define "amateur" as either "lover" or
"mediocre or worse." Their definition is simply "a personal
radio activity engaged in for non-pecuniary purposes."

:-)

1340. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:02:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412180227.19503.00000586@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40607

In article <20020412080704.27399.00000473@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

<snippage from a large police log...>

>The potential for abuse is staggering if we follow your interpretation.
>
>It is also quite surreal to read your opinions about how innocuous and legal
>conversations "sound crappy" and "cheapen ham radio", but you think your
>choice
>of call sign does not have any negative effects on ham radio's image,
>despite many hams' opinions to the contrary.
>
>>Heck, even cities allow a couple/few yardsales a year without
>>having to charge sales tax.
>
>In all of the places I've been, sales tax is the province of the state, not
>the city.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Ah! Your Radio Kop Badge must have arrived and you are
busy flashing it! :-)

1341. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:02:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412180228.19503.00000587@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40604

In article <3CB6717C.3887B35F@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Larry, could you make use of a ham radio for traffic
>reports when driving your bus? I suspect your employer
>might not like it, but the FCC wouldn't care. Issue being
>a distraction while driving.

Larrie doesn't drive a bus. He specializes his paratransit.

1342. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:02:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412180229.19503.00000589@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40608

In article <3CB72D61.324BAE88@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> No, they did not.
>
>Here's your posted ARS numbers (rounded).
>
>Y2000 = 208k techs + 470k others = 678k total
>
>You said: ARS grew by 34% from 1990 to 2000.
>Therefore there were about 506k hams in 1990, all coded.
>
>Based on your numbers, coded hams dropped from about
>506k in 1990 to about 470k in 2000. That's about a
>7% decline in others (coded hams). The techs had to
>make up for that 7% decline. Techs actually
>accounted for the 34% of growth plus 7% more.
>
>To say that only 4% of the growth was caused by the code
>waivers and the nocode license is just ridiculous.

I disagree. SPIN is absolutely necessary among some to
"prove a point" about the efficacy of morsemanship. SPIN
involves fancy mathematical footwork to "prove" something,
sort of like creative accounting. See the K3LT definitions on
why morsemanship is so necessary... :-)

1343. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:02:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412180229.19503.00000588@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40610

In article <88456a5b0c5d1e29f0d423e339ee2859.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Actually, I probably owe him an apology. As I read other threads, it
>appears he is simply chiding folks over their belief in the necessity
>of Morse. In that vein, I would agree with him. My only problem is
>just what knowlege should an individual possess in order to obtain an
>amateur license?

The FCC has been deciding that since 1934.

The FCC's requirements keep changing but their licensing is
simply one of their "tools" in regulating civil radio services.

>I am truely dismayed by the almost total lack of
>understanding that many folks possess. I am not talking necessarily
>about the newly licensed amateur; rather, I refer to those folks that
>have been licensed 10 years or more. Certainly, if my neighbor were to
>hold a ticket that entitled him or her to transmit at the 1.5 KW level,
>I would hope they wouldn't point the darn thing at my bedroom at night
>on 10 meters at full power ....

It will be of greater possible harm at 6 or 2 meters. That's why
there are limitations in the regulations on RF exposure.

1344. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:03:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a97lo5$k65$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40613

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB7544D.B952FDAD@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Again you state the obvious and ignore the error.
> >
> > What error? What part of the statement is in error?
> >
> > "So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code
test
> > from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade."
> >
> > Just exactly what in that statement is not true?
>
> "Brought about" means "caused". The statement is simply false.

I think it would be more accuarte to say that it "may"
be false. The truth is that we have no way of knowing
what, if any, contibution to the growth was the specific
result of the creation of code waivers and the dropping
of the code test...

The accurate statement (truth being the quality we
all want to agree on) would be...IMHO...as follows:

"So the creation of medical code waivers and the
dropping of the code test from the Tech license
were contributing factors, although unquantifiable
as to specifics, which brought about just 4% more
growth in a decade."

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1345. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:20:43 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <%4Jt8.3272$3z3.298567@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40614

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

>
> Now...WHICH RADIO SERVICE IS STRICTLY RECREATIONAL..???
>

Steve,

We've held a meeting, and decided that it was time the you to be fully
aware of your role in rrap. It goes like this:

Len Anderson is a senile organ grinder, playing a song called "No Code Mio".
You are the little monkey in a bright red hat indignantly hopping up and
down
and acting silly for our amusement.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1346. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 22:24:37 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <F8Jt8.3277$3z3.299056@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40615

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> None of the US military service branches requires morse code
> skills for transmitting any kind of information.
>

Wrong again, old sir.

US and other Allied naval forces use Morse code for tactical
signaling via flashing light.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1347. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 23:44:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a97rgf$37h$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 40616

CAM wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > > As I have said many times, all who meet the requirements and play by the rules
> > > are welcome. But you keep kicking up a fuss about some alleged difference,
> > > citing imaginary handbooks and doing really bad mathematical analysis of
> > > pretty simple stuff.
> >
> > I must interrupt here. You're going to get a heart-attack from mountain
> > climbing over molehills.
>
> You think 200,000 Techs are a molehill? Shame on you, Hans. Techs are a
> good 30% of the ARS mountain which is *NOT* a small percentage. Without
> the Techs, the ARS population would be in decline.

Who was it that said "the numbers don't matter"???

1348. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-12 23:51:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412195143.27502.00003859@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40617

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 04/12/02 18:20 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <%4Jt8.3272$3z3.298567@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Len Anderson is a senile organ grinder, playing a song called "No Code Mio".
>You are the little monkey in a bright red hat indignantly hopping up and
>down
>and acting silly for our amusement.

Thanks for the insight, Hans...Now put a quarter in my cup.....

Steve

1349. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 00:05:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412200558.27502.00003861@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40618

>Subject: Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/12/02 14:28 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020412142844.01569.00000023@mb-mg.aol.com

>I took the normal English requirements for an EE major, got A+ in
>all of them...(SNIP)

Then why can't you seem to implement the concepts?

>Anyone can do that if they apply themselves and practice hard.

THAT'S it...You're not applying yourself or practicing hard...Thanks...

>Some residents of Bucks County were of the opinion that that
>section of PA had already "stopped dead in its tracks" long before
>the 1970s...but that was locals talking.

Too bad you weren't around in more contermporary times.

>A mere 27 months ago and you cannot remember any details of
>the store, its location, or the neighborhood?

For a place I was at for 30 minutes? And NOT on a sight-seeing trip..???
Puh-pleze.

>I call your bluff. Why in the world would you be traveling from
>Tennessee to a single HRO in Burbank, CA, when they had
>other stores in the southeast?.

What bluff, Lennie? I was visiting friends in CA who are LICENSED
Amateurs, which included a sidetrip to HRO. There's McDonald's about 3 minutes
from where I am sitting, but I ate at one in SoCal while I was there too. you
wanna "call my bluff" as to why I ate there too...?!?!

BWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

What a PUTZ!

>HRO has been on-line in the Internet for a long while and has done mail-order
for much longer.

You can't tweak the knobs over the Internet, Lennie.

>The traffic in the Greater Los Angeles area moves well except for
>certain instances of accidents.

BWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

"...certain instances of accidents..."...?

WAFJ!

>Conclusion: The resident talibanian is simply bluffing. He got
>called and LOST.

"got called and lost"...???

BWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH!

Now...

WHICH RADIO SERVICE IS STRICTLY FOR RECREATIONAL USE?

>That was already answered in another thread. Obviously the fist is
>still clenched inside the jar, no doubt the pain preventing full
>comprehension of the words written there.

Uh huh....sure.....NOTHING has been answered. You have NOT answered a
direct question with a direct answer.

Because you got caught with your pants down...again...made ANOTHER
assertion that you cannot substantiate. Some would call the lying...some would
call if foolish. I think it's just plain stupid.

As if we were surprised.

1350. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 00:07:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412200732.13101.00000616@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 40620

In article <3CB72D61.324BAE88@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> No, they did not.

You completely removed the context. Here it is again:

(CAM previously wrote):

>>>Techs accounted for 30% of the growth in the ARS
>>>during the 90's.

(N2EY previously wrote):
>>No, they did not.

>>There was 34% growth in the 1990s.

>>30% of 34% growth is 10.2%. "30% of" means "multiply by .30".

>>So you are saying that Techs caused 10.2% growth and all the other classes
>>caused 23.8% growth. Total is 34% growth.
--
>
>Here's your posted ARS numbers (rounded).
>
>Y2000 = 208k techs + 470k others = 678k total

Been here before. Nobody denies those numbers.
>
>You said: ARS grew by 34% from 1990 to 2000.

Based on Jon Bloom's numbers, posted earlier.

>Therefore there were about 506k hams in 1990, all coded.

Been here before too. Nobody denies those numbers either.

>Based on your numbers, coded hams dropped from about
>506k in 1990 to about 470k in 2000. That's about a
>7% decline in others (coded hams).

Been here before, too. Nobody denies those numbers either. Why all
the fuss about "coded" vs. "noncoded" hams? They're all just hams. You
seem to be obsessed with making a distinction that most of us don't give
a dang about.

>The techs had to make up for that 7% decline.

Some Techs have passed code tests, though. Did you know that:

- from April 15 to December 2000, the FCC renewed 4553 Tech Pluses
as Techs (source: http://www.ah0a.org). That's about 535 per month.

- the FCC did not formally distinguish between Techs and Tech Pluses
until mid-July, 1994. They left it up to the individual ham to retain code
test documents.

>To say that only 4% of the growth was caused by the code
>waivers and the nocode license is just ridiculous.

Nobody has said that at all - except you.

What HAS been said is that the code waivers and dropping of the code test from
the Tech resulted in just 4% more growth in a decade. Not "4% of the growth"
but
"4% more growth".

But Bill Sohl has recently said it much better than I did:

"So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test from
the Tech license were contributing factors, although unquantifiable as to
specifics, which brought about just 4% more growth in a decade."

What's not true in that statement?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1351. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 00:07:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412200733.13101.00000617@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 40619

In article <a97lo5$k65$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CB7544D.B952FDAD@IEEE.org...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> > >Again you state the obvious and ignore the error.
>> >
>> > What error? What part of the statement is in error?
>> >
>> > "So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code
>test
>> > from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade."
>> >
>> > Just exactly what in that statement is not true?
>>
>> "Brought about" means "caused". The statement is simply false.
>
>I think it would be more accuarte to say that it "may"
>be false. The truth is that we have no way of knowing
>what, if any, contibution to the growth was the specific
>result of the creation of code waivers and the dropping
>of the code test...

Agreed. Makes perfect sense, Bill.
>
>The accurate statement (truth being the quality we
>all want to agree on) would be...IMHO...as follows:
>
>"So the creation of medical code waivers and the
>dropping of the code test from the Tech license
>were contributing factors, although unquantifiable
>as to specifics, which brought about just 4% more
>growth in a decade."
>
Perfect! I agree 100%!

Thanks Bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1352. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 00:10:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412201021.27502.00003864@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40621

>Subject: Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/12/02 18:02 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020412180225.19503.00000582@mb-cm.aol.com>

>I stand in awe of all the patriotic bunting you wrap yourself in...

Again, Lennie expresses his disdain for anything patriotic.

Why am I not surprised?

SR

1353. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 00:26:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412202648.27502.00003869@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40622

>Subject: Re: Birthplace of NTI
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/12/02 14:28 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020412142846.01569.00000024@mb-mg.aol.com>

>My mother's MD broke open a medical text for me to show the
>terminology, effects, and general details. The text was one used
>at the USC School of Medicine. "TIA" and its colloquial "micro-
>stroke" is a common short-form descriptor used by doctors and
>staff at two hospitals in this area.

It's not "microstroke", Lennie. You weren't paying attention.

>This isn't a medical newsgroup...it is about amateur radio.

Then why'd you bring it up?

>Now, YOU break open a RADIO TEXT and LEARN.

I do...a little bit, every day. I just don't have anything to prove by
INSISTING that everyone pay homage to it like you do.

>As I said before, this is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup.

Then why are YOU trying to tell me (erroneously, I might add...) the
pathology of a stroke in this same newsgroup, Lennie?

>I'm not a medical professional,...(SNIP)

That's obvious.

> I'm an electronic professional.

That's debatable. So far you can't tell me which radio service is
"strictly recreational", you YOU assert one exists.

>What I wrote in here was an almost
>verbatim description of the explanations given to me by MDs...(SNIP)

Which was almost as correct as your assertion that a "strictly
recreational" radio service exisits.

"Half correct" is NOT correct.

>In that case, it is four graduate, licensed Medical Doctors who are
>"all wrong?" Three of them are still in practice in California, licensed
>by that state. One moved to Texas and is in practice there.

I simply state that YOU do not understand what you were told.

>It is difficult to NOT PAY ATTENTION when looking at imagery from
>a computer-aided tomography machine (aka "cat-scan") where an
>MD is pointing to "probable" damage areas...especially when it is
>a close, blood relative.

I am sure it was terrible. But your "definitions" are not completely
correct. In other words, you only did HALF your homework.

>The nurse loses again on the "recreational" aspect of creation of
>certain personal radio services. The nurse is simply giving over to
>emotion and fighting-for-the-cause-of-fighting on picking nits over
>qualifiers.

Nope....YOU (an ALLEGED "radio professional") stated not once, but SEVERAL
times that certain radio services existed for "strictly" recrational purposes.

No such radio service exists...Not in the United States, any way.

>I won, but the nurse's fist is still clenched in the jar.

Won what, Lennie? You ahve yet to tell anyone which radio service is
"strictly" for recreational purposes. YOU said it exists. YOU have not said
which one it is.

And WHO is it that is always pontificating about imaginary "message point"
wins, Lennie? Seems you have AGAIN fallen to your own traps.

Sheesh....easier every day.

Steve

1354. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 00:39:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB77E5F.4BB8C174@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40623

K0HB wrote:
> No, Cecil. *You* are the molehill.

A 300,000 foot tall alien is a molehill? Those must be
some moles.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1355. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 00:43:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB77F17.82BA008D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40624

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "So the creation of medical code waivers and the
> dropping of the code test from the Tech license
> were contributing factors, although unquantifiable
> as to specifics, which brought about just 4% more
> growth in a decade."

If Jim had said that, Bill, I wouldn't have blown a gasket.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1356. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 00:46:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB77FEB.937BF7DD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40625

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You think 200,000 Techs are a molehill? Shame on you, Hans. Techs are a
> > good 30% of the ARS mountain which is *NOT* a small percentage. Without
> > the Techs, the ARS population would be in decline.
>
> Who was it that said "the numbers don't matter"???

It wasn't me. Dick, did you take me out of your kill file?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1357. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 00:49:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb780ec$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40627

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:VP5t8.1213$By.63245497@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3CB43D09.7845E5B9@psu.edu...
> > I think maybe the ulterior motive on some peoples part here is that if
> > enough idiots who know nothing about rf safety get on the air, they will
> > accidentally remove themselves from the gene pool? 8^)
> >
> > I'm pretty surprised that some hams seem to have such a underlying
> > hatred for their hobby.
> >
> > - Mike - KB3EIA
>
> Not so much a hatred for their hobby as much as an unreconcilable loss of
> stature. The only way to save face is to destroy it.
>

EWwwwwwww...what a point to ponder. Hadn't thought of that one but I
suppose that anyone who is that steadfastly glued to a "hobby" would
certainly be capable...

Kim W5TIT

1358. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:00:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB7832A.C3540A10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40626

N2EY wrote:

W5DXP wrote:
> >Based on your numbers, coded hams dropped from about
> >506k in 1990 to about 470k in 2000. That's about a
> >7% decline in others (coded hams).

Been here before, too. Nobody denies those numbers either. Why all
the fuss about "coded" vs. "noncoded" hams?

You are the one who brought it up, Jim, in your false statement
about code waivers and nocode licenses accounting for 4% of the
growth. I certainly did not bring it up. The question is: Why are
code waivers and nocode licenses so important to you that you must
segregate ham radio into the code haves and the code have-nots?

> >To say that only 4% of the growth was caused by the code
> >waivers and the nocode license is just ridiculous.
>
> Nobody has said that at all - except you.

That's exactly what you said in your previous statement, Jim. I have reposted
it three or four times already. Do you deny saying what you said?

> What HAS been said is that the code waivers and dropping of the code test from
> the Tech resulted in just 4% more growth in a decade. Not "4% of the growth"
> but "4% more growth".

Give us an everloving break, Jim. "4% more growth" *IS* the top "4% of the growth".
It is certainly not 4% of the non-growth.

> But Bill Sohl has recently said it much better than I did:
>
> "So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test from
> the Tech license were contributing factors, although unquantifiable as to
> specifics, which brought about just 4% more growth in a decade."
>
> What's not true in that statement?

That is *NOT* what you said! If you had said that, I wouldn't have blown a gasket.
You equated the code waivers and nocode license with exactly 4% of the growth.
Why you feel compelled to segregate ham radio into code haves and code have-nots
and give the code have-nots 4% credit for 41% growth is what I am objecting to.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1359. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:00:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb7839b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40629

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9322q$in0$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cb38d4f_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> >
> > It is asking how traffic is and your interest is directly related to
> getting
> > to the office on time, job site on time, whatever. That is a pecuniary
> > interest.
>
> Kim,
> That is...in my not so humble opinion, a crock. I totally
> disagree with you and I'd suggest that IF it ever came up
> with the FCC, they (FCC) wouldn't have a problem with it either.
>

Well, Bill. I'd much rather have it coming up from the FCC on behalf of someone else, rather than me...that is all I am saying. I hope you understand that.

> > > Are you saying that if hams help
> > > each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
> > > jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?
> >
> > No. I am saying that is the way I *interpret* the rules in Part 97.
> Other
> > hams can do whatever they'd like, but I'll not be discussing topics like
> > that because I believe they are rules violations.
>
> Then you ARE saying such discussion is NOT permitted by
> part 97.
>

I am saying that I read there are to be no communications in which we have pecuniary interest. I have heard OTs even say that means discussing things like stock--if they have a pecuniary interest. It is my nature, Bill, to err on the side of caution; not to test the waters. I'd just as soon not get involved with such discussions just as I would not get involved right now with, say, discussions that *could* be misconstrued to be in support of terrorism.

> >
> > Wait a minute, Bill. If I steal something from a store, yet no one
> > "catches" me--how could it ever be said that I did something illegal? A

> > discussion of traffic related to getting to your place of employment (a
> > pecuniary interest) is--to me--a rules violation.
>
> Again, I totally disagree...and so does the majority of
> repeater users. I have NEVER been turned down by anyone
> when I have asked for traffic help or directions.
>

Remember that I am not talking about casual "asking for directions" or "traffic jam" queries. I mean those that everyone on the repeater knows are people who are engaged in conversation about such things only because they are on their way to work and need the best/quickest way to get there.

As to "and so does the majority of repeater users" that doesn't work for me.

The thing I'm wondering about is why you and others are getting so worked up over this. I hold myself only to this ideal...save that we bust peoples' asses if traffic and weather is all they can find to talk about on our repeater. (That's just more of a clannish thing than anything else). Aren't I allowed to say what types of conversations I will or will not get involved with.

We each interpret the R&R. It is only when we land ourselves in front of the FCC that what *we* think about the R&R gets tested. I'd rather not be tested.

> >
> > That's quite different. If you are "just looking" for how to get
> somewhere,
> > that certainly isn't related in any way to a direct pecuniary interest
you
> > have in getting there (unless it is to get to a business meeting).
>
> Just HOW do you or anyone else KNOW why I want to get to
> a particular location. If I said I'm going to pick up a friend
> would you give me directions? If I added that we are on our way
> to work and I'm giving the friend a ride would you NOT give
> me directions?
>

'Spose in some cases we wouldn't know. However, in most cases we do.

> >
> > Oh, I don't think it's all that great a deal to them. Nor is really all
> > that great a deal to stir up so much conversation. However, my opinion
> > stands that it's breaking the rules. If not, where's the harm in my
> erring
> > on the side of caution?
>
> No harm at all to have your own opinion. I still
> disagree with it, however.
>

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Well, disagreeing is one thing...but it really does seem to me that you've been offended by what I think. I also don't test the water with most constitutional laws, tax laws, etc. I let that be done by others...and they are certainly welcome to do so. In some cases, I may be prone to thinking that they are foolish. In some cases they may be thinking that I am the one being foolish. HOWEVER, I say this: in both cases, which fool holds greater liability? Eh?

Kim W5TIT

1360. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:01:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB78387.3A992F04@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40628

N2EY wrote:
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >The accurate statement (truth being the quality we
> >all want to agree on) would be...IMHO...as follows:
> >
> >"So the creation of medical code waivers and the
> >dropping of the code test from the Tech license
> >were contributing factors, although unquantifiable
> >as to specifics, which brought about just 4% more
> >growth in a decade."
> >
> Perfect! I agree 100%!

So are you going to officially change your statement to agree with Bill's?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1361. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:03:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb78462_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40637

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:28F193B9C487CDC9.7E6518775A5808EB.A0B11DC7D4619915@lp.airnews.net...
> On 07 Apr 2002 18:07:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >As mentioned by others, we also have Ronnie Milsap, Jon Bon Jovi, Joe
Walsh,
> >Walter Cronkite and of course many current and past astronauts.
>
> There's an interesting point; why don't we ever see a PBS special on
> ARISS? For that matter, why don't we ever see a PBS special on
> Amateur Radio? They've got them for everything (and I do mean
> *every*damn*little*thing*) else.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

Joe Walsh is regularly and routinely on one of the, I believe, early morning AM HF nets. Would any of you like me to find out which one it is and you can pose your question to him of why he hasn't lived up to his responsibility as a famous person to promote the ARS?

This isn't directed at you, Joe, by the way. It's just the first post I've come across this evening on this thread.

Kim W5TIT

1362. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:06:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb784e5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40638

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:51049F4B0651BA00.C3EC301A37C0FAF0.51F8269A75A71B89@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 8 Apr 2002 22:20:28 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >The other is my haunt, the 145.190 machine.
>
> Oh really? So, where are you at 22:30 every night? We're still
> looking for volunteers for NCS and ANCS spots :)
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

Long, long asleep by that time, Joe...at least most evenings. And, I've had my share of traffic nets! LOL I did that as a new ham a long time ago, including MARS. It's gotten pretty darned boring with nothing more than the perfunctory messages (routine reports, the occasional Handy Hams message, etc.) Sure, great practice, and great for new hams and those for whom traffic nets are a passion.

Kim W5TIT

1363. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:09:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb785b5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40639

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:2743784E26F06A64.EFC6A6EDF713CB3B.CA4212480AC0D1F8@lp.airnews.net...
> On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 18:52:35 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >What a huge, huge waste of ham radio. There are broadcast stations all
over
> >the place, with helicopters, motorists who call in on cellular phones,
etc.,
> >to do the job you describe above.
>
> No, their job is to maybe, possibly, kind of report that there's a
> road somewhere with a car on it. Anything more would cut into the
> airtime reserved for the sponsors and the latest gossip report.
>
> Besides which, too many of them space their traffic reports out too
> widely; one at 5PM, which is useless unless you turn on your Walkman
> before you even get up from your desk, and one at 5:20, after you're
> already sitting in the backup.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

Hmmmm, you must not listen to AM. I don't know what stations you refer to
above, but--for instance--KRLD gives traffic and weather together on the
8's: XX:08, XX:18, XX:28, etc. That works out to about every ten minutes.
It's my understanding that most other AM stations are doing the same thing.

Kim W5TIT

1364. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:10:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb78607_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40641

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:9889002DFC785634.DFC6B05816B0BB7D.BD4B5602AB5325D5@lp.airnews.net...
> On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 18:37:17 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >Precisely. And, as I've tried to say, I don't really care whether
someone,
> >or others, wish to have such discussions on the air. I don't. For the
> >reasons that a) I believe it *has the potential* for abuse (and is abused
in
> >my opnion) and, b) it just sounds crappy when all people can do to drum
up
> >conversation about traffic, weather, and how sick they've been.
>
> Frankly, (although I am curious to hear how WA5I's back problem turns
> out) I'd rather hear people talk about nothing but traffic jams all
> day long on VHF than hear the seemingly endless detailed discussions
> of prostate/colon/toenail/whatever dysfunction on 80m.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

Goodness...hope it's nothing serious. Please say howdy to him...it's been a
long, long time

Kim W5TIT

1365. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:11:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb78636$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40642

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >Anyway, the
> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
I've
> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
>
> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Er, no digital...no CW...LOL

Kim W5TIT

1366. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:14:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412211411.02551.00001632@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40633

In article <a9305s$5nc$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>Even if true, it is of no value or impact as to the justification
>of a morse test requirement. "Effort" at learning anything
>is NOT a goal of amateur Part 97 FCC rules.

Bill:

I don't recall ever claiming that it was. However, it is the avoidance
of this effort which is the underlying motivation of the NCTA. Of
course, they cannot, and will not, admit this.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1367. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:14:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412211412.02551.00001633@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40636

In article <LRot8.1066$6E7.190889179@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Isn't this just special? She thinks that because ham radio is useful
>> for emergencies it supposed to be reserved solely for them. Neat!
>
>Just as special as Dixie and Larrie imagining an emergency where the only
>possible solution is CW, and forcing 650,000 people to learn it because of a
>vivid imagination.

Brian:

More realistically (as opposed to your inane attempts at castigating Dick and I for offering valid reasons for knowing the code), there are many possible "emergency" situations where Morse/CW may, indeed be the "best" mode to choose at the time…for a variety of reasons. If there are not any radio amateurs who know how to use the mode, then that particular emergency communications incident will result in failure, with possibly adverse consequences to life and property. When we get to the point where nobody is learning the Morse code due to a lack of a license testing requirement, then we have lost a valuable emergency communications capability. Of course, I guess you would call that progress, wouldn't you, Brian?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1368. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:14:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412211413.02551.00001635@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40630

In article <nvot8.1046$LT6.187787463@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> QWE? Can you copy Morse code?
>> QWE I am a Welfare Extra - PSE QRS
>
>Wonder when Larry will jump on here and give us a "QFU?'

Brian:

I wasn't going to, but it looks like you did!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1369. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:14:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412211413.02551.00001634@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40635

In article <_Zot8.1070$%Y7.192240753@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>
>> Kim:
>>
>> There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
>> facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports by
>> radio amateurs. Shudder all you want, but this is about as black &
>> white as any policy discussion we've had here. Traffic reporting is
>> a perfectly valid and legal amateur radio activity. End of Story. If
>> you think it is not, provide some convincing proof, or at least a valid
>> argument. So far, all you've done is to make yourself seem to be
>> totally unqualified to offer any opinion at all on this subject.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>But wouldn't the message carry more weight if it were sent in Morse Code?

Brian:

Morse/CW is a mode not normally used to pass highway traffic
reports on VHF/UHF repeaters. I'm surprised you don't realize that
fact. I always believe in using the appropriate mode for the particular
application being pursued at the moment. However, if you want to
beep away in your local repeater during rush-hour traffic, go ahead
and knock yourself right flat out!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1370. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:14:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412211414.02551.00001637@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40631

In article <20020411080714.29940.00000381@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
>>amateur radio?
>
>I have no problem with having a recovering alcoholic as a spokesperson for
>amateur radio.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

As long as he actually *is* in recovery...

73 de Larry, K3LT

1371. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:14:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412211414.02551.00001636@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40634

In article <a92v4i$q8q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Ryan,
>
>I am equally sick of people who make "generic" statements of
>complaint and fail to offer even a minimun list of items that
>constitute ARRL actions or inactions that reflect ARRL
>ignoring the wishes of it's paying members.
>
>Perhaps YOU can offer such examples since Dick, Larry
>and Val haven't taken a shot at all.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Ok, then, I'll lead off. In 1993, the ARRL Board of Directors passed
a resolution to support code testing in future administrative proceedings
relating to amateur licensing requirements. Almost from the minute
that resolution had been passed, ARRL officials began to contradict
it, in some cases even making the same statements NCI has been
making, such as "the future is digital," etc. When I raised this issue
at the ARRL Maryland State Convention several years ago, the
ARRL officials present permitted some hyper-emotional YL No-Code
Tech to shout me down before I could even complete a sentence.
There was no discussion, no debate, not even a thorough two-way
exchange. I mentioned support for code testing, and the representative
of the NCTA side was permitted to run roughshod over me, with no
attempt made by the ARRL Forum Leaders to restore order to the
proceedings or facilitate an exchange where at least both sides got
an opportunity to express their thoughts on the matter. The NCTA
side was supported, the PCTA side was thrown to the dogs. The
ARRL officials present were Kay Craigie, WT3P, and Hugh Turnbull,
W3ABC. I've never forgotten that incident, and it has affected my
opinion of the ARRL ever since. They clearly showed exactly what they
thought of the opinions of those that supported code testing -- and that
was that they were not listening to members who supported it.

Dick or Val, you're next.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1372. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:14:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412211415.02551.00001638@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40632

In article <qN5t8.1209$uv.63042947@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Someone PLEASE start NTI, HELL I will even Donate to this cause, and you
>dont
>> even have to give me some Phoney NTI number.
>
>OK Larry, since all your doomsaying isn't doing it, you might as well start
>the organization that will fufill your prophesy.

Brian:

Don't look now, but it was Bruce saying that he wanted NTI to be started. Personally, I couldn't be bothered.

1373. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:18:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb787e4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40643

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB77FEB.937BF7DD@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You think 200,000 Techs are a molehill? Shame on you, Hans. Techs are
a
> > > good 30% of the ARS mountain which is *NOT* a small percentage.
Without
> > > the Techs, the ARS population would be in decline.
> >
> > Who was it that said "the numbers don't matter"???
>
> It wasn't me. Dick, did you take me out of your kill file?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

ROFLMAO!!!! I told ya to just watch...oh goodness, this is precious! Great being "ignored" ain't it? Wait until he makes enough mistakes and the excuse will be that his computer crashed, had to reload everything...blah, blah, blah...

Still laughing!!!

Kim W5TIT

1374. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:23:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a981b6gnu0@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 40640

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> Dick, did you take me out of your kill file?
>
Nope, but I intend to keep an eye on you. When I see enough nonsense
of yours quoted by someone else I may jump in and counter your troll.
There has been plenty quoted in this thread.

1375. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:27:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb789d9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40647

<uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org> wrote in message
news:a977mu$c12$1@mycroft.cmhnet.org...
> In article <3cb4cd0f_1@newsa.ev1.net>,
> W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
> >But, if you have
> >just gotten hired by the hotel, restaurant, whatever and you are asking
> >directions to the place (say it's a chain and you've never been to the
> >location you'll be working at), then to me you are violating the rules.
If
> >you're going to your friend's house to conduct some work you'll be
getting
> >paid for...well, ya shouldn't be using ham radio to enhance your ability
to
> >earn that money by asking for directions over ham radio. Hamfests are
> >another matter altogether.
>
> I think I understand where you're coming from, Kim. I think what you
> say here says it best: ham radio shouldn't be used to *enhance* your
> money making opportunities.
>

Yeah, in a nutshell that's basically it.

>
> I don't see a problem with talking about travel conditions on your route
> to work. It certainly doesn't enhance my ability to make money -- I'm
> not paid hourly.
>

Ah, then surely you are in a position of leading by example? If your job is
not project oriented, or task/goal oriented, isn't it important that you
arrive "on time."

> On another, somewhat related note (at least I think it was in this thread)
> you said something about how people discussing medical conditions
cheapens
> amateur radio. That's sounds amazingly like what Larry says about your
> callsign. I don't agree with either one of you. I think listeners have
> to understand that amateur radio is a way for people to talk. We have
some
> restrictions on what we're supposed to discuss and how we use our
frequencies,
> but still, most people just use it to talk. I don't care what people talk
> about as long as its within the guidelines.
>

> Sean.
>

Larry has every right to believe that my callsign "cheapens" ham radio--I think though that his diatribe goes well beyond logical and something to the point of my callsign bringing the ARS one step closer to extinction.

Point being, Larry has every right to believe that and I believe he's an idiot for it. I have every right to believe what I believe and not everyone needs to agree with it.

And, really, neither do I care what people talk about, *except* we regulars on our repeater would rather not have it become one of the soup in the metroplex wherein the conversation is pretty much all about traffic. We talk about gardening, home remodeling projects, jokes, trips, politics, religions, humanities...all kinds of stuff, on our repeater. Ever see a good conversation get totally killed with some nitwit coming in and saying "'scuse me everyone, just wanted anyone who's traveling on XXX highway to know that it is totally backed up." Well, DUH...it's rush hour in the DFW Metroplex. Plus the rest of the conversation never gets finished because all the lurkers are suddenly keying up with "Where was that?" Oy ve...

Kim W5TIT

1376. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:31:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb78af7_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40649

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:LiDt8.2761$L1.237505@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Additionally, we would run a morning traffic net type
> > operation three times an hour (on the hour, 20 minutes past
> > and 40 minutes past). One ham would serve as net control
> > and the exchanges then took on the operational aspects of
> > a true net. EVERYONE was encouraged to run a net.
> > Bottom line of that scenario is individual training on net
> > operations which benefits all of us in the eventual case
> > of an emergency net operation being needed.
> >
>
> Did you have a designated "chider" and a certified "ridiculer"
> to give your net that "north Texas flair"?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

I see you didn't like my answer...

Kim W5TIT

1377. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:33:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB78AD2.DF2FBF41@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40645

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I mentioned support for code testing, and the representative
> of the NCTA side was permitted to run roughshod over me, ...

You probably shouldn't have called the NCTA folk "MFSOB's". :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1378. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:33:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a981sripu0@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 40644

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Dick or Val, you're next.
>

My observation of the ARRL is much less specific in that instead of
being the wind, they merely bend before the slightest breeze. Examples
are abundant, and anyone who hasn't observed them wasn't pauingm
attention then and won't believe anything they're told now.

1379. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:34:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB78B22.299FF4BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40646

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Dick, did you take me out of your kill file?
> >
> Nope, but I intend to keep an eye on you.

How are you reading this posting?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1380. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:36:29 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb78c06$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40650

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412211414.02551.00001637@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <20020411080714.29940.00000381@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >>Are you sure you want an admitted alcoholic as spokesman for
> >>amateur radio?
> >
> >I have no problem with having a recovering alcoholic as a spokesperson
for
> >amateur radio.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> As long as he actually *is* in recovery...
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

<CHUCKLE> Larry's quest in life...to get into recovery

Kim W5TIT

1381. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:37:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb78c45$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40701

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a981b6gnu0@208.207.71.156...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > Dick, did you take me out of your kill file?
> >
> Nope, but I intend to keep an eye on you. When I see enough nonsense
> of yours quoted by someone else I may jump in and counter your troll.
> There has been plenty quoted in this thread.

OHMYGAWD!!!! Hilarious...

Kim W5TIT

1382. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:39:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb78cd9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40702

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:X1Mt8.3591$3z3.327780@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> > I hold myself only to this ideal...save that we bust peoples'
> > asses if traffic and weather is all they can find to talk about on our
> > repeater.
>
> Damn, you'd "bust my ass" if I talked about the traffic or weather
> on "your" repeater? This is from "73 @ 88"? You hold yourself
> to that "ideal"? Are all Texans such assholes?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --

Hans, thought you were above such behavior... If you have to generalize, you could just ask if all women are such assholes. And, yes, I'd bust your ass if you started talking about weather and traffic. Don't even tell me you are one of those boring types of hams who can't think of anything else?

Kim W5TIT

1383. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:41:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb78d24_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40703

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB78B22.299FF4BB@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Dick, did you take me out of your kill file?
> > >
> > Nope, but I intend to keep an eye on you.
>
> How are you reading this posting?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

I bet he can also come up with a really good skirt around the fact that he is literally lying when he says he's got people killfiled, yet responds directly to their messages...

Whoohooo

Kim W5TIT

1384. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 01:42:15 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <X1Mt8.3591$3z3.327780@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40648

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> I hold myself only to this ideal...save that we bust peoples'
> asses if traffic and weather is all they can find to talk about on our
> repeater.

Damn, you'd "bust my ass" if I talked about the traffic or weather
on "your" repeater? This is from "73 @ 88"? You hold yourself
to that "ideal"? Are all Texans such assholes?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
Bioethics and You...: The cloned sheep has raised an ethical debate:
"Texas has introduced a bill to ban cloning of humans," reports the Daily
Scoop. "And there are bills pending in the other 49 states to ban cloning
of Texans."

1385. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 02:04:52 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <8nMt8.3629$3z3.331847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40704

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb78cd9_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
> news:X1Mt8.3591$3z3.327780@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
> >
> > > I hold myself only to this ideal...save that we bust peoples'
> > > asses if traffic and weather is all they can find to talk about on our
> > > repeater.
> >
> > Damn, you'd "bust my ass" if I talked about the traffic or weather
> > on "your" repeater? This is from "73 @ 88"? You hold yourself
> > to that "ideal"? Are all Texans such assholes?
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> > --
>
> Hans, thought you were above such behavior...

Naw, I talk about the WX all the time. It got above 65 here today
at the north end of I-35. Melted the ice of the road surfaces. Now
the riff-raff will start coming in from Texas, I suppose. I hate it
when that happens.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0Hard-Body

1386. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 02:07:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020412220716.19000.00000761@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40705

In article <a96urh$5rg$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020412100718.26511.00000145@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <3cb4d0b2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>> >news:20020410011503.10062.00000383@mb-cu.aol.com...
>> >>
>> >> Not even close, Jim. Getting that truck *safely* and efficiently to
>it's
>> >> destination is definitely within limits of PICON. If the drivers were
>> >> using ham radio to coordinate the pickup of loads, negotiate fees,
>> >> or advertise their services, then *that* would be a violation of the
>> >> "no-business" rule. However, when they are simply taking advantage
>> >> of information related strictly to safe vehicle operation, then they
>> >> are perfectly OK. In fact, I've always believed it is a great failing
>> >> of amateur radio that there isn't a widespread network of ham
>> >> motorists and fixed-station operators specifically dedicated to this
>> >> task, as there is on the Citizen's Band.
>> >
>> >What a huge, huge waste of ham radio.
>>
>> In a word: WHY? Why is it a "huge, huge waste" for hams to help each other
>> by discussing traffic conditions?
>
>Additionally, we would run a morning traffic net type
>operation three times an hour (on the hour, 20 minutes past
>and 40 minutes past). One ham would serve as net control
>and the exchanges then took on the operational aspects of
>a true net. EVERYONE was encouraged to run a net.

Now THAT is COOL!

Before I moved to my current QTH back in late 1999, I had a commute that could
take anywhere from 20 minutes to over an hour, depending on traffic. One of the
local repeaters hosted an informal drivetime net. Saved many of us lots of
time, fuel and grief.

>Bottom line of that scenario is individual training on net
>operations which benefits all of us in the eventual case
>of an emergency net operation being needed.

And that's a GOOD thing.

>> >There are broadcast stations all over
>> >the place, with helicopters, motorists who call in on
>> . cellular phones, etc., to do the job you describe above.
>>
>> Here in the Philadelphia area, most of the broadcast
>> stations carry traffic reports.
>> At least one station has an all-news/weather/traffic format, and
>> enjoys the highest ratings of any BC radio station in the Philly market.
>>
>> But the traffic info carried on such stations is of very limited use, in
>my
>> experience. First off, it's usually "stale", because of the time delays
>between
>> a traffic delay and the report of same actually being aired. Second, the
>> traffic reports must cover a huge area, so you have to listen to all sorts
>of
>> stuff to find out conditions in your area. Third, only the biggest delays
>are
>> usually reported, due to time limitations.
>>
>> End result is that very often the delays you encounter are not reported in
>time
>> for you to avoid them, and the delays you do hear are cleared up by the
>time
>> you get to there.
>
>Also, the traffic chopper doesn't usually stay in one area.

Yup - and in bad weather they could not fly.

>We'd get much more detailed info from other hams about
>real-time traffic conditions because they were right there.

Same thing here in Delco. Plus we had conversations on other topics as
well. End result was a lot better commute experience.

I love the formal net/training exercise idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1387. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 02:18:41 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5AMt8.20772$Rw2.1644162@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40706

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:8nMt8.3629$3z3.331847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Naw, I talk about the WX all the time. It got above 65 here today
> at the north end of I-35. Melted the ice of the road surfaces. Now
> the riff-raff will start coming in from Texas, I suppose. I hate it
> when that happens.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0Hard-Body

You'll get a little respite for a while Hans, the returning snowbirds will clog the hiways soon. Even a Texan fears being behind Elmer and Esmerelda in their monster vehicles at 35 mph in the construction zones.

1388. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 02:21:46 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <_CMt8.3648$3z3.335132@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40707

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote

>
> You'll get a little respite for a while Hans, the returning snowbirds will
> clog the hiways soon.
>

Thanks for the card. You need to add some color, though.

73, Hans, K0HB

1389. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 02:36:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a985j5roh0@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 40708

K0HB wrote:
>
> Thanks for the card. You need to add some color, though.

That must be for me. I did add yellow to all the interior white space.
Looked good, but I noticed that it had the propensity to fade, leaving
the card looking better in monochrome.
I told you yours is much more colorful.

W0EX

1390. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:11:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412231101.02551.00001665@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40715

In article <3CB6453C.C97EA00E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Don't look now, but I have *upgraded* my college degree. I had only
>> an A.A. from 1972 to 1999. Now I have a B.S.
>
>That's like going from tech to general, Larry. Why are you too lazy
>to get a PhD degree? If you are satisfied with a lowly BS degree, why
>can't Kim be satisfied with a Tech+ license?

Cecil:

Getting my Ph. D. would cost me tens of thousands of dollars,
and require at least five more years of full-time study. Upgrading
from Tech Plus to Extra is something Kim could do in a matter
of weeks or months, at a very small cost. Someday, my
situation may change, and I may pursue a doctorate. But Kim
can upgrade her ham ticket at any time. The fact that she doesn't
want to is more of an indication of poor motivation on her part. It
is available to her virtually for the taking -- she simply can't be
bothered to reach. There is no similarity in the cost/benefit
analysis between her Extra and my Ph. D. She would get way
more "bang for the buck," comparatively speaking, than I ever could.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1391. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:11:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412231102.02551.00001666@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40712

In article <3CB721F5.DD19A7F6@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>
> I said it before, I'll say it again, SHEESH!
>
> I for one respect the job of bus driver. You have lots of people you
>are responsible for every day. You perform a valuable service.

Mike:

Thank you, thank you very much! I know for a fact that the people whose lives I take into my hands on a daily basis feel the same way -- because they've
told me so! And I feel the same way toward people who do the cooking, cleaning, garbage collecting, street sweeping, day care, policing, shelf stocking, cashiering, oil changing, check cashing, and just about every other routine task I depend on them to do for me -- with the notable exception of telemarketers! THEY can all take a walk -- back to the employment office to get a REAL job, like one of the others mentioned above!

> But the attitude of some here is hard to get happy about. One problem
>with so many here in the US anymore is that a fair number of people have
>no respect for so many jobs. There is dignity in all honest jobs.

Well, perhaps to everyone but Lennie!

> Interestingly, those who don't share this belief, and like to rank jobs
>for their level in the food chain, seem to inevitably have the "proper
>job" cutoff point somewhere below their own vocation. 8^)

Throughout my Air Force career, I've held supervisory and management positions which, in civilian life, would have paid many times what I earned while serving my country. I put up with the stress of mission accomplishment, dealing with great complexity, a fast-changing environment, the constant need to deal with "superiors" who were technically incompetent, and, in most cases, needlessly limited resources. Now, like a great many military retirees, I am grateful to have a job where I can concentrate on doing something as well as it can be done, being responsible only for myself and my immediate customers. I also get great satisfaction in providing a necessary service for people who are totally dependent on me to get them where they need to go in order to have a fuller life than they could on their own. If Len Anderson wants to denigrate me for being a college graduate BUS DRIVER, let him. He's only demonstrating his ignorance, and providing another source of amusement for me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1392. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:11:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412231103.02551.00001668@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40710

In article <3CB6717C.3887B35F@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Larry, could you make use of a ham radio for traffic
>reports when driving your bus?

I can, and I have.

>I suspect your employer
>might not like it, but the FCC wouldn't care. Issue being
>a distraction while driving.

Well, for now at least, it's not something that happens very often.
My daily schedule has me travelling to all corners of a very large
county; and our repeaters don't have enough range to give me
HT coverage. That will be fixed, someday -- and I imagine I'd be
very well able to use ham radio to enhance the efficiency of my
operation, in a perfectly safe and legal manner. Using my HT is
no more distracting than using my company 2-way radio with it's
CAD/AVL system while driving.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1393. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:11:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412231103.02551.00001667@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40713

In article <3CB66ECC.8252C699@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>The gall bladder ailments QSOs and such are just the old timers exchanging
>physcologal support with each other. Seems as valid use of radio as say
>contests and such. Sure it's boring to listen to if you're
>young, but they're not "broadcasting" to you. There's other QSOs going on
>to listen to, or call CQ and start a topic with someone.

Bob:

When it's done on a wide-area coverage repeater, occurs on a daily
basis, and goes on for hours on end, it definitely becomes a "gray" area --
from a standpoint of "good amateur practice." I have monitored such
long-winded health-related diatribes among old-timers, who don't know
the difference between a repeater and their nightly 75-meter roundtable,
while other stations have tried desperately to break-in for a chance to
make a call of a more urgent nature. The Geezer Factor in ham radio
is something that must be reckoned with, particularly in larger urban
areas with a dense population of hams.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1394. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:11:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412231105.02551.00001669@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40716

In article <a977mu$c12$1@mycroft.cmhnet.org>, uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org writes:

>>But, if you have
>>just gotten hired by the hotel, restaurant, whatever and you are asking
>>directions to the place (say it's a chain and you've never been to the
>>location you'll be working at), then to me you are violating the rules. If
>>you're going to your friend's house to conduct some work you'll be getting
>>paid for...well, ya shouldn't be using ham radio to enhance your ability to
>>earn that money by asking for directions over ham radio. Hamfests are
>>another matter altogether.
>
>I think I understand where you're coming from, Kim. I think what you
>say here says it best: ham radio shouldn't be used to *enhance* your
>money making opportunities.
>
>In your first case, where someone didn't know where they worked, and asked
>directions, I disagree -- it doesn't enhance their opportunity to make
>money. Yes, it might keep them from being late, but I don't really see
>a problem with this. I don't feel it enhances the persons ability to make
>money, not in a realistic sense.

Absolutely correct, Sean.

>In the second case, I can see that as less gray -- that seems akin to
>setting up a work appointment using ham radio, which isn't gray at all,
>it's simply not allowed.

Incorrect, Sean. If my accountant, also a licensed radio amateur, is
travelling to my residence to do my taxes, and I give him or her
directions using the local repeater, then this is perfectly allowed, as
long as we do not discuss relevant details of what I want him or her
to do during the QSO. All I'm doing is giving routine directions to
another licensed ham. Perfectly legal, without a hint of "gray."

>I don't see a problem with talking about travel conditions on your route
>to work. It certainly doesn't enhance my ability to make money -- I'm
>not paid hourly.

It wouldn't make any difference if you were hourly or salaried. All
you're doing is getting routine driving directions in a perfectly legal
manner, in accordance with Part 97.

>On another, somewhat related note (at least I think it was in this thread)
>you said something about how people discussing medical conditions *cheapens*
>amateur radio. That's sounds amazingly like what Larry says about your
>callsign. I don't agree with either one of you.

Your agreement isn't required in this case. The negative effect of Kim's call sign has been spelled out quite clearly by a high-ranking FCC enforcement officer. He said it has the potential to take the ARS "…one step closer to extinction" -- and there's nothing "gray" about that, either!

>I think listeners have
>to understand that amateur radio is a way for people to talk. We have some
>restrictions on what we're supposed to discuss and how we use our
>frequencies,
>but still, most people just use it to talk. I don't care what people talk
>about as long as its within the guidelines.

Those guidelines are quite clear. We can use ham radio to order a pizza, but we can't use it to sell a pizza. The fact that the person at Domino's who answers the phone when you place the autopatch call is "selling" pizza doesn't constitute use of amateur radio to deliberately advertise and market his product. If the amateur him/herself is in the role of a "customer," then his/her use of ham radio to avail him/herself of such goods and services is perfectly OK. In the case of my accountant getting directions, there is no issue, since the professional details of the visit would not enter into the content of the conversation.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1395. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:11:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412231106.02551.00001670@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40711

In article <20020412180228.19503.00000587@mb-cm.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>Larry, could you make use of a ham radio for traffic
>>reports when driving your bus? I suspect your employer
>>might not like it, but the FCC wouldn't care. Issue being
>>a distraction while driving.
>
>Larrie doesn't drive a bus. He specializes his paratransit.

Lennie:

It's worst than that: I'm a Specialized Paratransit Lift-Adapted Transportaton Omnibus Operator (SPLATOO). An important part of my job is making sure my bus doesn't make a noise that sounds like the acronym of my job title.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1396. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:11:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412231106.02551.00001671@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40714

> >Are amateur radio operators allowed to encrypt or encode if it is data
that
> >is being transmitted?
>
> In a word, no.
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Let's be careful as to how strong that NO is.

If the ONLY people knowledgeable as to the coding
or encryption technique or encryption scheme is a
limited (i.e. non-pulic, unpublished set) of people
or hams, then Larry is correct. IF, on the other hand,
a public, common or published scheme is used which
others can freely "decode/decrypt", then it is OK.

I think that covers it. By example, PSK31, ASCII,
EBCDIC are some common coding techniques for
character encoding/decoding.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

Bill:

I took the question to mean should the actual message *content*
be encrypted -- in order to actually obscure or conceal it from all
but whomever is equipped with the decryption "key." "Coding" such
as PSK31, ASCII, EBCDIC is merely a way of transmitting perfectly
in-the-clear messages, since, as you point out, everyone has the
ability to "decode" messages transmitted using said codes. Therefore,
I'd submit that we would have to always be sure to clarify the
difference between "coding" and "encryption." The first doesn't
necessarily mean we're keeping something secret; the second does.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1397. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:11:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412231107.02551.00001672@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40709

In article <Jyst8.1704$3z3.151405@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>In 2000 they changed Morse testing back to the 1912 requirement of
>5WPM, and the number of classes to 3.
>
>"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?"

Hansl:

Actually, it is! We went from a clear superior licensing system, with reasonable, applicable, and highly achievable standards, to the dumbed-down standards of 90 years ago. Of all the incidents you relate on your timeline, Restructuring will go down in history as the greatest travesty ever visited on the Amateur Radio Service.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1398. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:30:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB7A649.E9B54FFF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40717

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The fact that she doesn't
> want to is more of an indication of poor motivation on her part. It
> is available to her virtually for the taking -- she simply can't be
> bothered to reach.

She probably doesn't like your favorite flavor of ice cream either.

> There is no similarity in the cost/benefit
> analysis between her Extra and my Ph. D. She would get way
> more "bang for the buck," comparatively speaking, than I ever could.

Not according to Kim.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1399. Re: Amateur Technician Class & Encryption

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:30:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cb7a66c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 40718

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a95ndn$on0$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020411212800.06878.00000215@mb-ch.aol.com...
> > In article <rhUs8.2760$zx.1226976328@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>,
> "Lars121"
> > <lars121@pacbell.net> writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Are amateur radio operators allowed to encrypt or encode if it is data
> that
> > >is being transmitted?
> >
> > In a word, no.
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Let's be careful as to how strong that NO is.
>
> If the ONLY people knowledgeable as to the coding
> or encryption technique or encryption scheme is a
> limited (i.e. non-pulic, unpublished set) of people
> or hams, then Larry is correct. IF, on the other hand,
> a public, common or published scheme is used which
> others can freely "decode/decrypt", then it is OK.
>
> I think that covers it. By example, PSK31, ASCII,
> EBCDIC are some common coding techniques for
> character encoding/decoding.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill, et al,

PSK31, etc. or other "encodings" are legal as long
as they are 1) "widely" published and 2) not used for the
pubpose of obscuring the meaning of a transmission
(many forms of encoding used to facilitate transmission
of data render the bits going by rather unreadable to the
casual "sniffer" ... but that is an unintended consequence,
not the purpose of the encoding.)

There is a difference between that sort of "encoding"
and "encryption," which IS intended to obscure the

meaning.

If I recall correctly, the only exception allowing encryption in amateur radio is on a limited basis for satellite command systems (harder to service than a regular repeaters site and wouldn't want someone messing with the attitude control systems and causing the bird to tumble, or worse yet, de-orbit ...)

Carl - wk3c

1400. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:33:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB7A6EF.999F7581@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40719

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Of all the incidents you
> relate on your timeline, Restructuring will go down in history as the
> greatest travesty ever visited on the Amateur Radio Service.

And you know this is a fact because?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1401. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:44:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412234415.02551.00001674@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40720

In article <3cb78c06$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> >I have no problem with having a recovering alcoholic as a spokesperson
>for
>> >amateur radio.
>> >
>> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> As long as he actually *is* in recovery...
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
><CHUCKLE> Larry's quest in life...to get into recovery
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I *am* in recovery. I'm a "recovering" HF-Single Sideband luser!

Good Evening. My name is Larry Roll, K3LT, and I used to
talk into microphones attached to HF transceivers! Now, I know
better!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1402. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 03:44:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020412234415.02551.00001673@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 40721

In article <3CB78AD2.DF2FBF41@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I mentioned support for code testing, and the representative
>> of the NCTA side was permitted to run roughshod over me, ...
>
>You probably shouldn't have called the NCTA folk "MFSOB's". :-)

Cecil:

Of course! Which is why I didn't! Unfortunately, I was called that,
and much worse, by the NCTA shrew -- and the ARRL "officials"
running the meeting just let it happen!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1403. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 04:57:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413005743.01569.00000045@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 40725

In article <3cb78cd9_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
>news:X1Mt8.3591$3z3.327780@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>>
>> > I hold myself only to this ideal...save that we bust peoples'
>> > asses if traffic and weather is all they can find to talk about on our
>> > repeater.
>>
>> Damn, you'd "bust my ass" if I talked about the traffic or weather
>> on "your" repeater? This is from "73 @ 88"? You hold yourself
>> to that "ideal"? Are all Texans such assholes?
>>
>> With all kind wishes,
>>
>> de Hans, K0HB
>> --
>
>Hans, thought you were above such behavior... If you have to generalize,
>you could just ask if all women are such assholes. And, yes, I'd bust your
>ass if you started talking about weather and traffic. Don't even tell me
>you are one of those boring types of hams who can't think of anything else?

Hans sits around iceholes all winter. He gets confused easily.

1404. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 04:57:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413005744.01569.00000046@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 40727

In article <20020412202648.27502.00003869@mb-mr.aol.com>, DrKildare@aol.com (RichardChamberpot) writes:

>>My mother's MD broke open a medical text for me to show the
>>terminology, effects, and general details. The text was one used
>>at the USC School of Medicine. "TIA" and its colloquial "micro-
>>stroke" is a common short-form descriptor used by doctors and
>>staff at two hospitals in this area.
>
> It's not "microstroke", Lennie. You weren't paying attention.

That's what MDs and licensed nurses (two in an ER) called it.

>>This isn't a medical newsgroup...it is about amateur radio.
>
> Then why'd you bring it up?

Oh? A casual mention of "TIA" and you suddenly think you
are a full professor at some School of Medicine?

>>Now, YOU break open a RADIO TEXT and LEARN.
>
> I do...a little bit, every day. I just don't have anything to prove by
>INSISTING that everyone pay homage to it like you do.

You "don't have anything to prove" because you've got a
"credential" you think makes you some kind of "expert"
in either medicine or radio?!? Merde, Docktor Killgore.

>>As I said before, this is an AMATEUR RADIO newsgroup.
>
> Then why are YOU trying to tell me (erroneously, I might add...) the
>pathology of a stroke in this same newsgroup, Lennie?

I never brought up "pathology of a stroke" in here.

Come back when you're able to actually design a radio or
even parts of a radio successfully, then we might have a
civil conversation. So far, you haven't shown you can go
beyond simple Ohm's Law.

>>I'm not a medical professional,...(SNIP)
>
> That's obvious.
>
>> I'm an electronic professional.
>

> That's debatable. So far you can't tell me which radio service is
>"strictly recreational", you YOU assert one exists.

I said "created as strictly recreational." That's what CB, FRS,
R/C in Part 95 are under the Part heading of "Personal Radio
Services."

>>In that case, it is four graduate, licensed Medical Doctors who are
>>"all wrong?" Three of them are still in practice in California, licensed
>>by that state. One moved to Texas and is in practice there.
>
> I simply state that YOU do not understand what you were told.

Go shove your sphygometer someplace and assemble a Fleet Kit,
then turn it on and work some dee-ecks..

>>It is difficult to NOT PAY ATTENTION when looking at imagery from
>>a computer-aided tomography machine (aka "cat-scan") where an
>>MD is pointing to "probable" damage areas...especially when it is
>>a close, blood relative.
>
> I am sure it was terrible.

Why are you showing "compassion" in here, Gomer P? Your "job"
(self-described, self-appointed) is all about insulting old people,
right little monkey? If they don't agree with you, you clench your
little fists and dance all over shouting obscenities.

>But your "definitions" are not completely
>correct. In other words, you only did HALF your homework.

No, I did ALL the required homework. I took care of my mother
at home for over five years before she had to be hospitalized.
At the same time I had to earn income as a professional.

> Nope....YOU (an ALLEGED "radio professional") stated not once, but
>SEVERAL times that certain radio services existed for "strictly" recrational
>purposes.

Gomer, I'm getting tired of your "allegations." I've been a professional
according to two state governments, the federal government, the
IEEE, the ACM, DCAS, the FBI, and other assorted alphabet-soup
agencies. In radio-electronics since 1951. That's longer than you've
been alive.

Now you dance right over to some psychologic counseling and seek
a cure for your sociopathy, little monkey. Modern medicine has
relief for some psychoses, too.

1405. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 04:57:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413005745.01569.00000047@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 40723

In article <%4Jt8.3272$3z3.298567@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Steve,
>
>We've held a meeting, and decided that it was time the you to be fully
>aware of your role in rrap. It goes like this:
>
>Len Anderson is a senile organ grinder, playing a song called "No Code Mio".
>You are the little monkey in a bright red hat indignantly hopping up and
>down and acting silly for our amusement.

Okay, now give Gomer P the monkey a quarter to keep him happy.

He might unclench his little fists and pull it out of that big jar.

That would help him dance all the way to the halls of montezuma
or someplace.

>With all kind wishes,

You keep up with those blinking lights, mister chief, maybe
you can get some instructions on how to start that Onan.

blink, blink

1406. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 04:57:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413005746.01569.00000049@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 40722

In article <F8Jt8.3277$3z3.299056@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> None of the US military service branches requires morse code
>> skills for transmitting any kind of information.
>
>Wrong again, old sir.
>
>US and other Allied naval forces use Morse code for tactical
>signaling via flashing light.

Of course...extremely valuable for radio silence in the fog...but
easily seen through an unfriendly periscope on a clear night.
You just keep up them old morsemyths, mister chief.

>With all kind wishes,

More power to you...keep up with your onan-isms on
morsemanship being "required." :-)

A hearty putt-putt-putt-putt to you, too!

1407. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 04:57:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413005746.01569.00000048@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 40726

In article <20020412231102.02551.00001666@mb-dh.aol.com>,
MotherThersa@LittleSistersOfTheBus.net (Larrie Roll K3LT) writes:

>If Len Anderson wants to denigrate me for
>being a college graduate BUS DRIVER, let him. He's only demonstrating
>his ignorance, and providing another source of amusement for me!

Larrie;

I must admit to some ignorance. I've been a professional
illustrator but have NEVER seen such a BIG brush used to
paint yourself in such bright DayGlo purity and saintliness!

Truly superb self-aggrandizement!

You've come a long, long way since you told everyone about
your soma cum loud in Human Resources and how you would
"soon" be an HR "manager!"

Now you hock a loogie on the newsgroup floor and call yourself
a "SPLATOO."

It's poetic. In fact, it's onomatopoesy!!!

...must be the effect of listening to too many beepings...tsk, tsk.

1408. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 04:57:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413005748.01569.00000050@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 40724

In article <20020412211412.02551.00001633@mb-dh.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <LRot8.1066$6E7.190889179@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
>Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
>>> Isn't this just special? She thinks that because ham radio is useful
>>> for emergencies it supposed to be reserved solely for them. Neat!
>>
>>Just as special as Dixie and Larrie imagining an emergency where the only
>>possible solution is CW, and forcing 650,000 people to learn it because of a
>>vivid imagination.
>
>Brian:
>
>More realistically (as opposed to your inane attempts at castigating Dick
>and I for offering valid reasons for knowing the code), there are many
>possible "emergency" situations where Morse/CW may, indeed be the
>"best" mode to choose at the time…for a variety of reasons.

Absolutely. When the Titanic II goes into service in iceberg-laden
waters, I'm sure that morsemanship skills will be most handy.
That would insure a profitable future for James Cameron III and
the PCTA authors.

...skipping some stuff with the same relevance as floating Ten-Tecs,

>... When we get to
>the point where nobody is learning the Morse code due to a lack of a
>license testing requirement, then we have lost a valuable emergency
>communications capability.

Oh, dear, the sky falls once more!

>Of course, I guess you would call that progress, wouldn't you, Brian?

Didn't you forget the bit about Invading Aliens From Outre Space
and Saving The World through see-double-view? For shame!

Now go specialize your paratransit, loogie hocker.

1409. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 05:44:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413014426.29991.00002346@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40728

>Subject: Re: Birthplace of NTI
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/13/02 00:57 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020413005744.01569.00000046@mb-mg.aol.com>

>
>I never brought up "pathology of a stroke" in here.

OK, Pinnochio.

>Come back when you're able to actually design a radio or
>even parts of a radio successfully, then we might have a
>civil conversation. So far, you haven't shown you can go
>beyond simple Ohm's Law.

Another reminder, Lennie...It's Amateur Radio POLICY. I have already
"ceeded" to your knowledge of what goes on INSIDE the box, Lennie.

It's what happens TO the box or how it's used that you are grossly
ignorant of... (ie:..WHAT radio service is "strictly" recreational, Lennie?)

>I said "created as strictly recreational." That's what CB, FRS,
>R/C in Part 95 are under the Part heading of "Personal Radio
>Services."

Lennie, CITE THE FCC REGULATION that says that ANY of those services are
"strcitly" recreational...!!!!

Ignorance, Lennie! Anyone with a couple minutes of spare time can pull up
the regs on ANY of those services and dispell your untruth!

In no way, shape or form has the FCC created ANY radio servie for
"strictly" recreational purposes. Even Amateur Radio has it's "serious"
applications, which may or may NOT be considered recreational by the licensee
or the FCC.

>Go shove your sphygometer someplace and assemble a Fleet Kit,
>then turn it on and work some dee-ecks..

There is no such thing as a "sphygometer", Lennie. Perhaps you meant a
sphygmomanometer?

Again, Lennie, you are trying to deal with half-facts and demonstrate your
ignorance. Thanks for making my case for me.....

>Why are you showing "compassion" in here, Gomer P? Your "job"
>(self-described, self-appointed) is all about insulting old people,
>right little monkey? If they don't agree with you, you clench your

>little fists and dance all over shouting obscenities.

Hmmmm...."shove your sphygometer.."

"Gomer P"

"little monkey"

Lennie, you make one assertion and then show EVERYONE exactly WHO is the "lilttle monkey" and who has his fists clenched.

>No, I did ALL the required homework. I took care of my mother
>at home for over five years before she had to be hospitalized.
>At the same time I had to earn income as a professional.

Congratulations. I wish more families would do that. She probably lived a longer, healthier, more satisfying life until she succumbed to the disease process.

>Gomer, I'm getting tired of your "allegations."

Shaking of fist noted.

>I've been a professional
>according to two state governments, the federal government, the
>IEEE, the ACM, DCAS, the FBI, and other assorted alphabet-soup
>agencies. In radio-electronics since 1951. That's longer than you've
>been alive.

Then (A) GET YOUR FACTS ABOUT RADIO SERVICES CORRECT,

And (b)...ACT like a professional. Your propensity to call names, use improper terminology and frequently analogize the Third Reich to those who don't agree with you are embarrasssing.

>Now you dance right over to some psychologic counseling and seek
>a cure for your sociopathy, little monkey. Modern medicine has
>relief for some psychoses, too.

I'm not the one hounding the newsgroup of a group of radio users of a service for which I am not currently licensed, participate in, nor have expressed an arrogant disdain for, Lennie.

Perhaps Mrs Lennie would lead if you asked HER to dance?

1410. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 05:48:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413014807.29991.00002347@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40729

>Subject: Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/13/02 00:57 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020413005746.01569.00000049@mb-mg.aol.com>

>Of course...extremely valuable for radio silence in the fog...but
>easily seen through an unfriendly periscope on a clear night.
>You just keep up them old morsemyths, mister chief.

Lights in fog?

Easily seen through unfriendly periscopes?

Sheesh, Lennie...Ya for got the helicopters.

1411. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 05:50:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413015027.29991.00002348@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40730

```
>Subject: Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/13/02 00:57 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020413005746.01569.00000048@mb-mg.aol.com>

>I've been a professional illustrator....(SNIP)

Oh Geeze!...Now Lennie's an "arr-teeste"

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !
! ! !
```

1412. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 05:52:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413015210.29991.00002349@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 40731

>Subject: Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/13/02 00:57 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020413005748.01569.00000050@mb-mg.aol.com>

>
>Now go specialize your paratransit, loogie hocker.

Lennie...WHAT where you saying about being a professioanl, name calling,
etcetcetc?

THIS is "profesional"...???

1413. Re: An Answer Please, Lennie...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 08:05:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413040520.09510.00003074@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 40732

>Subject: An Answer Please, Lennie...
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 04/03/02 01:02 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020403000255.13715.00001794@mb-da.aol.com>

Leeeeeeeennnnniiiiiieeeeeeeeeee.....

Ten days is long enough to come up with an answer, isn't it?

WHICH radio service is "strictly" (your words, not mine...) for
recreational applications?

Steve

1414. Re: Moving forward

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 08:21:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413042137.09510.00003075@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 40733

>Subject: Re: Moving forward
>From: Gerald Schmitt KK5YY@arrl.net
>Date: 04/02/02 10:01 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <r1ejaugk5q002mc8q5a31hfm4m9bg7hf08@4ax.com>

>Actually it was a thoughtful insightful piece of writing but I can see
>how you might have missed that Steve.

Opinions, Jerry, are like rectums...Everyone has one, but usually the only one they are concerned with is thier own.

>If and when you ever
>mature enough to see the author's perspective you might start
>having some success in your non radio life.

Thanks you, Dr. Lennie....ooops, I mean Dr. Jerry.

(Jerry's Troll-o-meter a solid eight)

>I know you will have a real need to abuse me for this but please
>let everyone see your bile I don't require your e-mail.

Then keep you insulting sleights to yourself. As for what you "require", may I recommend a visit to the practitioner of the religion or faith of your choice? You still won't get it, but it might make you feel better.

Steve

1415. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 10:31:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413063134.12011.00003740@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 40734

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Of all the incidents you
>> relate on your timeline, Restructuring will go down in history as the
>> greatest travesty ever visited on the Amateur Radio Service.
>
>And you know this is a fact because?

Why, Cecil, it is true because "ain't it awful what they done to us..." THIS time it will be true, just you wait and see. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1416. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 10:34:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413063457.12011.00003741@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 40735

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>When I see enough nonsense
>of yours quoted by someone else I may jump in and counter your troll.

C'mon, Dick, be honest here. You never did put Cecil in your kill file and you are reading every word he says. No one had quoted the words you responded to, so you read it directly.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1417. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 10:40:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413064021.12011.00003742@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 40736

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> >Cecil says there
>> >is no need to work or expend effort, that can never be a requirement.
>>
>> That is not what Cecil said. Go back and try again.
>
>
> Oh he didn't say that *every time* he posted. But if you spend the time
>to leaf through his volumnous posts, I'm quite sure you'll find it.

I don't recall that Cecil said there is no need to work. He said that the
amount of work needed is not a requirement.

Did you twist his words on purpose, or do you really recall them that way?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1418. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 11:54:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB81C99.8D207AE7@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40737

I agree and kind of disagree. The golden agedness of any time period exists in peoples minds. It is a very fluid thing, moving forwards and backwards with the observers own prejudices.

- Mike KB3EIA -

N2EY wrote:

> I'm an "old timer" and I disagree. There was never a "golden age" - each era
> had its set of problems.

1419. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 12:25:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9988b$t4p$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40738

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412211414.02551.00001636@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <a92v4i$q8q$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >Ryan,
> >I am equally sick of people who make "generic" statements of
> >complaint and fail to offer even a minimun list of items that
> >constitute ARRL actions or inactions that reflect ARRL
> >ignoring the wishes of it's paying members.
> >
> >Perhaps YOU can offer such examples since Dick, Larry
> >and Val haven't taken a shot at all.
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
> Ok, then, I'll lead off. In 1993, the ARRL Board of Directors passed
> a resolution to support code testing in future administrative proceedings
> relating to amateur licensing requirements. Almost from the minute
> that resolution had been passed, ARRL officials began to contradict
> it, in some cases even making the same statements NCI has been
> making, such as "the future is digital," etc. When I raised this issue
> at the ARRL Maryland State Convention several years ago, the
> ARRL officials present permitted some hyper-emotional YL No-Code
> Tech to shout me down before I could even complete a sentence.
> There was no discussion, no debate, not even a thorough two-way
> exchange. I mentioned support for code testing, and the representative
> of the NCTA side was permitted to run roughshod over me, with no
> attempt made by the ARRL Forum Leaders to restore order to the
> proceedings or facilitate an exchange where at least both sides got
> an opportunity to express their thoughts on the matter. The NCTA
> side was supported, the PCTA side was thrown to the dogs. The
> ARRL officials present were Kay Craigie, WT3P, and Hugh Turnbull,
> W3ABC. I've never forgotten that incident, and it has affected my
> opinion of the ARRL ever since. They clearly showed exactly what they
> thought of the opinions of those that supported code testing -- and that
> was that they were not listening to members who supported it.
>
> Dick or Val, you're next.
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

OK, that's 1 (one) complaint. Dick, Val, Ryan seemed to suggest many
complaints/actions that dissatisfied a majority of ARRL membership.

Assuming your description is accuate, I'd agree it was a pretty shoddy
way to have handled the situation. Shouting down or just plain

unequal treatment is something I totally disagree with, regardless
of my stand on any particular issue. Indeed, I would go further
to say that those that want or tolerate such behavior really don't want
any dialog which may challenge their ideas or agenda in the first
place.

Cheers,

1420. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 12:31:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a998jtnju1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40739

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a981sripu0@208.207.71.156...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > Dick or Val, you're next.
>
> My observation of the ARRL is much less specific in that instead of
> *being* the wind, they merely bend before the slightest breeze. Examples
> are abundant, and anyone who hasn't observed them wasn't pauingm
> attention then and won't believe anything they're told now.

Well Dick, Larry DID provide one example.
You, on the other hand, still resort to
generalities to make your case. Sorry,
that's a no win in the courts of public debate
and discussion.

As to not believing what might be told, that's
bunk. I took Larry's incident description at
its face value and I agree with Larry that if that is
what happened, then that is wrong. Can I state
with any certainty that it happened exactly
the way Larry said it did? No I can't, but neither
can I say that it did.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1421. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 13:06:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a99al5cqi1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40740

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb7839b_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a9322q$in0$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3cb38d4f_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > >
> > > It is asking how traffic is and your interest is directly related to
> > getting
> > > to the office on time, job site on time, whatever. That is a
pecuniary
> > > interest.
> >
> > Kim,
> > That is...in my not so humble opinion, a crock. I totally
> > disagree with you and I'd suggest that IF it ever came up
> > with the FCC, they (FCC) wouldn't have a problem with it either.
>
> Well, Bill. I'd much rather have it coming up from the FCC on behalf of
> someone else, rather than me...that is all I am saying. I hope you
> understand that.
>
> > > > Are you saying that if hams help
> > > > each other with traffic alerts while commuting to their
> > > > jobs that such discussion is NOT permitted by Part 97?
> > >
> > > No. I am saying that is the way I *interpret* the rules in Part 97.
> > Other
> > > hams can do whatever they'd like, but I'll not be discussing topics
like
> > > that because I believe they are rules violations.
> >
> > Then you ARE saying such discussion is NOT permitted by
> > part 97.
>
> I am saying that I read there are to be no communications in which we have
> pecuniary interest. I have heard OTs even say that means discussing
things
> like stock--if they have a pecuniary interest.

Which is also a crock. Do you consider it a "pecuniary" interest if
I use the repeater's autopatch to order a pizza on my way home so it
is ready for me when I get there? The FCC did say a few years ago

such things were not a violation.

> It is my nature, Bill, to
> err on the side of caution; not to test the waters. I'd just as soon not
> get involved with such discussions just as I would not get involved right
> now with, say, discussions that *could* be misconstrued to be in support
of
> terrorism.

Two significantly different subject areas I'd say.

> > > Wait a minute, Bill. If I steal something from a store, yet no one
> > > "catches" me--how could it ever be said that I did something illegal?
A
> > > discussion of traffic related to getting to your place of employment
(a
> > > pecuniary interest) is--to me--a rules violation.
> >
> > Again, I totally disagree...and so does the majority of
> > repeater users. I have NEVER been turned down by anyone
> > when I have asked for traffic help or directions.
>
> Remember that I am not talking about casual "asking
> for directions" or "traffic jam" queries. I mean those
> that everyone on the repeater knows are people who are
> engaged in conversation about such things only because they
> are on their way to work and need the best/quickest way to get there.

Which, between 6am and 9am typically is everyone on a repeater.

> As to "and so does the majority of repeater users" that
> doesn't work for me.

The point is that the practice is widespread and, if it was in
violation would likly have encountered the rath of the FCC
already. We're talking a decade or more of active repeater
use.

> The thing I'm wondering about is why you and others are getting so
> worked up over this.

Not worked up at all. Just open and friendly debate. You through
down the gauntlet when you made the statements you did which
are totally contrary to practice on just about every repeater anywhere...
other than the one you mention.

> I hold myself only to this ideal...

No, you said they are the rules of the repeater you
use all (most?) of the time.

> ...save that we bust peoples'
> asses if traffic and weather is all they can find to talk about on our
> repeater.

Why? If no one else is using the repeater, why bust anyone's
ass as to their discussing weather or traffic?

> (That's just more of a clannish thing than anything else).

?????

> Aren't I allowed to say what types of conversations I will or will not get
> involved with.

Ansolutely...you need not participate in any discussion... BUT,
you didn't say it was ONLY for you...rather you stated it was
the repeater rules themselves.

> We each interpret the R&R. It is only when we land
> ourselves in front of the FCC that what *we* think about
> the R&R gets tested. I'd rather not be tested.

To each his/her own.

> > > That's quite different. If you are "just looking" for how to get
> > somewhere,
> > > that certainly isn't related in any way to a direct pecuniary interest
> you
> > > have in getting there (unless it is to get to a business meeting).
> >
> > Just HOW do you or anyone else KNOW why I want to get to
> > a particular location. If I said I'm going to pick up a friend
> > would you give me directions? If I added that we are on our way
> > to work and I'm giving the friend a ride would you NOT give
> > me directions?
>
> 'Spose in some cases we wouldn't know. However, in most cases we do.

Crystal ball???

> > > Oh, I don't think it's all that great a deal to them. Nor is really
all
> > > that great a deal to stir up so much conversation. However, my
opinion
> > > stands that it's breaking the rules. If not, where's the harm in my
> > erring
> > > on the side of caution?
> >
> > No harm at all to have your own opinion. I still
> > disagree with it, however.
>
> Well, disagreeing is one thing...but it really does seem to me that you've
> been offended by what I think. I also don't test the water with most
> constitutional laws, tax laws, etc. I let that be done by others...and
they
> are certainly welcome to do so. In some cases, I may be prone to thinking
> that they are foolish. In some cases they may be thinking that I am the
one

> being foolish. HOWEVER, I say this: in both cases, which fool holds
greater
> liability? Eh?

The history of the world is filled with people who challenged the rules.
Not everyone wins, but we'd be no where as developed if people didn't
challenge rules on occasion. In this instant case, you can do what
wou wish, others (the vast majority of repeater users) have been
making that challenge for years and helping other hams with
traffic conditions, route instructions, etc with NO ill effects from
the FCC.

As to the legitamate use of ham radio for traffic condidtions,
it seems we DO have FCC thinking on this. The FCC busted a ham
for getting traffic conditions for (on behlf of) his employer,
a broadcast station. The FCC did not then state that
any/all traffic condition reporting among hams is or should
be a forbidden topic. It was ONLY the ham that was doing
the soliciting of traffic data for direct use by the broadcast
station that got in trouble. If the other hams were in some
way guilty of violating the "pecuniary" use rules (even if
the FCC viewed them as unintended participants) because
the sukect (traffic conditions) is verbotin, then why didn't
the FCC so state that?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1422. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 13:22:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a99c48$hi4$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40741

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412231101.02551.00001665@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3CB6453C.C97EA00E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >> Don't look now, but I have *upgraded* my college degree. I had only
> >> an A.A. from 1972 to 1999. Now I have a B.S.
> > >
> > >That's like going from tech to general, Larry. Why are you too lazy
> > >to get a PhD degree? If you are satisfied with a lowly BS degree, why
> > >can't Kim be satisfied with a Tech+ license?
> >
> > Cecil:
> > Getting my Ph. D. would cost me tens of thousands of dollars,
> > and require at least five more years of full-time study.

Agree completely.

> Upgrading
> from Tech Plus to Extra is something Kim could do in a matter
> of weeks or months, at a very small cost.

That depends on what YOU consider "a very small cost."

> Someday, my
> situation may change, and I may pursue a doctorate.

Exactly, a matter strictly of personal choice governed by
whatever metrics applies in your life (e.g. time, money,
value, need, etc.)

> But Kim can upgrade her ham ticket at any time.

Not at all. The same factors, however smaller in size, scope
or impact determines why anyone does anything.

> The fact that she doesn't
> want to is more of an indication of poor motivation on her part. It
> is available to her virtually for the taking -- she simply can't be
> bothered to reach.

That is as YOU see things through YOUR eyes...applying
your personal metrics to it. You have no knowledge of
why anyone else decides to do or not do something (e.g.
upgrade) unless they specifically tell you.

> There is no similarity in the cost/benefit
> analysis between her Extra and my Ph. D.

The similarity is absolute. The differences are
simply the indivdiual metrics as stated above.

> She would get way more "bang for the buck,"
> comparatively speaking, than I ever could.

Again, that is YOUR opinion only based on how you see
the value, use and need for an Extra. In the last 12 months,
NOTHING I have done as a ham, except for serving as a VE
at a hamfest, has required Extra privileges. The value of the
Extra to me is simply that I can if I want to. Others, such as
Kim, may hae NO desire to ever operate HF at all...there's
nothing wrong with that...and it in no way indicates any
inherent lack of motivation.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1423. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 13:31:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a99c49$hi4$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40742

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412211411.02551.00001632@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <a9305s$5nc$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Even if true, it is of no value or impact as to the justification
> >of a morse test requirement. "Effort" at learning anything
> >is NOT a goal of amateur Part 97 FCC rules.
>
> Bill:
> I don't recall ever claiming that it was. However, it is the avoidance
> of this effort which is the underlying motivation of the NCTA. Of
> course, they cannot, and will not, admit this.

Larry,
Let me give you a partial agreement. It is the avoidence of effort
to accomplish a skill which can NOT be justified as a requirement
that NCTA opposes. Clearly, if testing for CW ends, then an
individual won't need to expend the time/effort to learn morse...unless
that person wants to do so voluntarily.

Generically, I oppose any requirements which can not be
rationally defended as being needed. That's true for just
about everything in life as I see it. All my kids learned
to drive standard shift vehicles...not because they just
wanted to, they did so because if they didn't they wouldn't
be able to drive at all since every car we own is manual.

There will be those hams that come to ham radio and discover
there are other hams out there that only use morse code.
Some of those new hams will learn code to talk to
them. Of that I am certain. You, Larry, can be a
champion for the mode...or you can bemoan the lack
of code testing and convince no one of its value as
you see that value. The choice is yours.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1424. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 13:37:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a99daf$2s6$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40743

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412231103.02551.00001667@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3CB66ECC.8252C699@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >The gall bladder ailments QSOs and such are just the old timers
exchanging
> >physcologal support with each other. Seems as valid use of radio as say
> >contests and such. Sure it's boring to listen to if you're
> >young, but they're not "broadcasting" to you. There's other QSOs going
on
> >to listen to, or call CQ and start a topic with someone.
>
> Bob:
> When it's done on a wide-area coverage repeater, occurs on a daily
> basis, and goes on for hours on end, it definitely becomes a "gray"
area --
> from a standpoint of "good amateur practice." I have monitored such
> long-winded health-related diatribes among old-timers, who don't know
> the difference between a repeater and their nightly 75-meter roundtable,
> while other stations have tried desperately to break-in for a chance to
> make a call of a more urgent nature.

Such behavior would, I must agree with Larry, be truly
horrible amateur practice. If the users of a repeater
don't willingly allow others to intervene in its use,
then somethings rotten. Does the repeater owner
just tolerate such poor behavior?

> The Geezer Factor in ham radio
> is something that must be reckoned with,
> particularly in larger urban
> areas with a dense population of hams.

Sad, but probably true to some extent. The self
policing of repeater use, such as being sure everyone
willingly lets other use it if the only QSO going
on is routine chit-chat, takes an across the board
dicipline and should involve all hams that are
active users.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1425. Re: The End of "Amateur" Radio?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 13:59:29 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1fajslv.vri52e18kqdflN%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 40744

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:

> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >However, I admit that I should have NOT have said that "no one"
> >wants to be identified FIRST as an "amateur" today.
>
> Amateur atheletes are quite proud of the distinction. I am proud of the
> contributions of Amateur Radio and pleased to be a part of them.
>
> It seems that you, not ARRL, are trying to demean the term...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Bingo! I'm an amateur radio operator and an amateur astronomer and I'm proud of it. I make no money at either and it's o.k. with me! I'm in these hobbies due to interest and well, they are damn fun!

There is nothing wrong with being an amateur. Period.

--
If love is blind, why is lingerie so popular?
- George Carlin

1426. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 14:05:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CB83B47.A00C43E3@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40651

Depending on the newsreader, it will put the message in the trash. It
can then be opened if desired.

- Mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Dick, did you take me out of your kill file?
> > >
> > Nope, but I intend to keep an eye on you.
>
> How are you reading this posting?

1427. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 14:07:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413100709.07448.00000624@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 40745

In article <3cb78636$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Anyway, the
>> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
>I've
>> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
>>
>> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>Er, no digital...no CW...LOL
>
I don't understand, Kim.

You wrote:

"I've done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times."

The context was HF bands, of course. 30 meters is an HF band.
What mode did you use on 30 meters?

It's a simple question.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1428. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 14:45:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB84475.D4FEEA99@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40746

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Of all the incidents you
> >> relate on your timeline, Restructuring will go down in history as the
> >> greatest travesty ever visited on the Amateur Radio Service.
> > >
> > >And you know this is a fact because?
> >
> > Why, Cecil, it is true because "ain't it awful what they done to us..." THIS
> > time it will be true, just you wait and see. :-)

This time the sky will actually fall?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1429. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 14:50:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB845D0.F75D33BF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40747

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > Oh he didn't say that *every time* he posted. But if you spend the time
> >to leaf through his volumnous posts, I'm quite sure you'll find it.
>
> I don't recall that Cecil said there is no need to work. He said that the
> amount of work needed is not a requirement.

What I said was in the context of someone who already knows the material.
If someone already knows the material, there is no need to work and no
requirement for additional work just for work's sake. The FCC is interested
in knowledge, not work.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1430. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 14:54:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB84692.B144C290@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40748

Mike Coslo wrote:
> I agree and kind of disagree. The golden agedness of any time period
> exists in peoples minds. It is a very fluid thing, moving forwards and
> backwards with the observers own prejudices.

The golden age of ham radio was when we could watch the VR-150's
pulsate to the sound of our voices. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1431. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 15:12:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a99i1c$c6b$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40749

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB845D0.F75D33BF@IEEE.org...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > > Oh he didn't say that *every time* he posted. But if you spend the
time
> > >to leaf through his volumnous posts, I'm quite sure you'll find it.
> >
> > I don't recall that Cecil said there is no need to work. He said that
the
> > amount of work needed is not a requirement.
>
> What I said was in the context of someone who already knows the material.
> If someone already knows the material, there is no need to work and no
> requirement for additional work just for work's sake. The FCC is
interested
> in knowledge, not work.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil is correct and I'll say the
following once again....

The aspect of "work" is not and should not be any
consideration as to the rational behind any specific ham
license requirement. We all know that for most people,
work (effort) will need to be expended to achieve
or pass a particular license requirement...BUT, that
having been said, the NEED or DESIRE to try and
make "work" be an aspect of licensing is, again, not
a factor nor should it be.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1432. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 17:59:24 UTC
From: dnb <dnb@comcastt.com>
Message-ID: <0m_t8.22741$K5.2369052@bin5.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 40750

Would that be anything like gathering weather reports for one's employer? I frequently hear TV weather jocks referring to the amatuer radio reports they've received. OK, technically (perhaps) filtered through the NWS, but ultimately they get credited on commercial broadcasts.

Sounds kinda "grey".

> He was actively soliciting the information for rebroadcast by his
employer, not
> just listening. The enforcement reports (there was followup in later
> enforcement letters) make it clear (to me, anyway) that the violation was
in
> the use of amateur radio to gather info specifically for commercial
> rebroadcast, not for the traffic reports themselves.
>
> Take a look and tell us what you think.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> >
>
>
>

1433. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 18:07:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413140719.20703.00000646@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 40654

In article <3CB7544D.B952FDAD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Again you state the obvious and ignore the error.
>>
>> What error? What part of the statement is in error?
>>
>> "So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
>> from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade."
>>
>> Just exactly what in that statement is not true?
>
>"Brought about" means "caused".

Nope. In that context, it means "was a cause of". There may be other causes.

> The statement is simply false.

You still haven't said WHY you think it's false, other than a lot of hand
waving, avoidance
of facts and ad hominem stuff.
>
>> >The "code waivers and
>> >dropping of the code test" did not cause "just 4% more growth in a
>decade".

34 - 30 = 4, Cecil.

>> >You are ignoring many other causes, possibly more important than those
>two.

What are they?
>>
>> So the "4% more growth" part is agreed upon as true (34% - 30% = 4%), but
>you
>> think the code waivers and dropping of the code test for Tech were not
>totally
>> responsible for that "4% more growth". Interesting.
>
>Nice try at obfuscation, Jim.

Not at all. How about listing some other causes?

>The 4% growth was not the only growth caused
>by the addition of the Tech license.

I didn't say it was. I said the rules changes (code waivers and dropping the code test) resulted in 4% more growth.

>By your own posted figures, the Techs
>were responsible for about 41% of the growth.

There you go again. 41% of 34% is 13.94%.

>The coded hams were responsible for a decline of 7%.

Only if it is ASSUMED that all Techs are "noncoded", to use your term. That is not a valid
assumption. If only a small percentage of Techs are "coded", the picture changes radically.
>
>> What other causes am I ignoring?
>
>Whatever caused the decline in code tested hams.

Your list, please?

>I don't know what that was

Ah - you don't know what other causes existed but you're sure they exist and had a much bigger effect than the known causes. And we're supposed to accept that on faith. Give us an ever-loving break!

>but it's obvious to the most casual observer that something drastic happened.

Not at all.

Here are some considerations:

1) Not all Technicians are "noncoded", but you insist on counting all of them that way. (Can you spell "agenda"? I knew that you could)

2) From 1989 to 1994, no US ham licenses expired at all. But after that date all classes except post-Feb 14 1991 Techs were expiring at their natural rate. Thus the number of "coded" hams could decrease from expirations during 1994-2000, but not the number of post-Feb 14 1991 Techs, whose licenses would not begin to expire until 2001.

3) FCC did not differentiate Techs from Tech Pluses in its records until 1994. (See any Callbook of the era for confirmation). Even after the changeover in 1994, they renewed an unknown number of Tech Pluses as Techs. A Tech Plus who renewed and got a Tech license had to send a letter and supporting documents to the FCC to get a licnese that said "Tech Plus" How many bothered? I don;t know, and neither do you.

4) FCC has been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs since restructuring. By AH0A, 4553 Tech Pluses were renewed as Techs in 2000 alone.

5) Any Tech who passed Element 1 after restructuring gets a CSCE and no change in the FCC database.

>> All hams codetested and no waivers: 30% growth in 10 years
>> Some hams codetested and waivers: 34% growth in 10 years
>>
>> Difference: 4%
>
>Yep, like I said, figures don't lie but liars figure.

Ah, the old ad hominem attack. Indicates lack of facts on your part.
>
>> If anyone is doing an injustice to 30% of the US amateur population, Cecil,
>> it's YOU. You keep harping on "coded" and "noncoded" hams as if there is
>some
>> fundamental difference. To me they're all just hams. FCC agrees with me.
>
>Nice try at obfuscation, Jim.

Where have I denigrated any class of license? Produce the post instead of
endlessly gassing about untruths.

>It is readily apparent that you want to ignore
>the contribution of the Techs to the ham population.

Only to you.

>Take away the
>Techs and the ARS population would be in decline.

Only if none of them got any other license. Which you take as a given, but
which is not true at all.
>
>> So tell us what those other causes of growth were....
>
>The Techs were responsible for about 41% of the growth.

41% of 34% is 13.94%. Where do you get that number?

>The code tested hams
>were responsible for a 7% decline according to your posted figures.

Nope.

The reduction in the number of non-Techs is caused by hams who did not
renew their licenses, or had them cancelled.

Try posting some accurate facts if you want people to take you seriously. On
the
other hand, since you don;t post accurate facts, we must logically
conclude.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1434. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 18:07:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413140720.20703.00000648@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 40652

In article <3CB84692.B144C290@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Mike Coslo wrote:
>> I agree and kind of disagree. The golden agedness of any time period
>> exists in peoples minds. It is a very fluid thing, moving forwards and
>> backwards with the observers own prejudices.
>
>The golden age of ham radio was when we could watch the VR-150's
>pulsate to the sound of our voices. :-)
>--
Not to the rhythm of Morse?

If the flash of 0D3/VR-150s and 866As is the criteria for "golden age", then
for
the past 33 years I've been in the golden age of ham radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1435. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 18:07:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413140720.20703.00000647@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 40653

In article <3CB591A3.D4ACF8F9@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> >You are trying to
>> >declare the effect of the nocode techs on the ARS as negligible.
>>
>> Where am I doing that? I'm simply pointing out basic facts. 30% growth in
>ten
>> years with all hams code tested, 34% with some hams not codetested. Where
>do I
>> say any ham's effect is negligible?
>
>You said that only 4% of the growth could be attributed to nocode techs.

No, I did not. I wrote that the effect of the rules changes was 4% more growth.
Can you prove differently? I think not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1436. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 18:26:06 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <2L_t8.4905$L1.490581@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40655

"dnb" <dnb@comcastt.com> wrote in message
news:0m_t8.22741$K5.2369052@bin5.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> Would that be anything like gathering weather reports for one's employer?
I
> frequently hear TV weather jocks referring to the amatuer radio reports
> they've received. OK, technically (perhaps) filtered through the NWS, but
> ultimately they get credited on commercial broadcasts.
>
> Sounds kinda "grey".
>

Out here during tornado season you often hear the commercial
guys attribute a Skywarn report to it's source (amateur, LEO, or
whatever). It's certainly legal for amateurs to provide "safety of
life and property" traffic to news broadcasters in accordance with
the exception granted in 97.113(b).

Nothing grey about that.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1437. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 20:26:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB89474.A232E68B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40656

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >"Brought about" means "caused".
>
> Nope. In that context, it means "was a cause of". There may be other causes.

So to say I "brought about" the mowing of my lawn doesn't mean that I
"was the cause of" my lawn getting mowed? Are you playing word games?

> 34 - 30 = 4, Cecil.

You forgot the smiley face, Jim. That figure is irrelevant to the discussion
except to add to the 37% increase in the ham population caused by the Techs.

> >The 4% growth was not the only growth caused
> >by the addition of the Tech license.
>
> I didn't say it was. I said the rules changes (code waivers and dropping the
> code test) resulted in 4% more growth.

But that is false! Code waivers and dropping the code test were simply NOT
the cause of 4% more growth. You are ignoring hundreds of other causes and
effects. Why must you denigrate the contributions of the nocoders?

> >By your own posted figures, the Techs
> >were responsible for about 41% of the growth.
>
> There you go again. 41% of 34% is 13.94%.

What is it with the games, Jim. You are ordinarily a rational person. Why
do nocode techs illicit such an irrational emotional reaction from you?
The Techs were responsible for 41% of the growth in the ARS during the
90's. That means all the other classes of licenses were responsible for
a decline of 7%. Why do you refuse to recognize that fact?

> >The coded hams were responsible for a decline of 7%.
>
> Only if it is ASSUMED that all Techs are "noncoded", to use your term. That is
> not a valid assumption. If only a small percentage of Techs are "coded", the picture
> changes radically.

No it doesn't, Jim. The trend is there whether you like it or not. In your estimation,
what percentage of Techs are coded? If you like, change the discussion from nocoded/
coded to Techs/all-other-classes

> >> What other causes am I ignoring?
> >
> >Whatever caused the decline in code tested hams.
>
> Your list, please?

I don't have a list. That doesn't negate the fact that your jumping to
irrational conclusions is obviously erroneous. It doesn't take knowing
what is right to know that your list is wrong (extremely incomplete).

> >I don't know what that was
>
> Ah - you don't know what other causes existed but you're sure they exist and
> had a much bigger effect than the known causes. And we're supposed to
> accept that on faith. Give us an ever-loving break!

Your irrationality is obvious to the most casual observer. Based on *your* posted
numbers, the Tech license is responsible for 41% growth. All other license classes
are responsible for a 7% decline. That you seek to minimize the contribution of
the Techs by lumping them in with all other classes is comical. Sweep them under
the rug and they cease to exist, eh?

> 1) Not all Technicians are "noncoded", but you insist on counting all of them
> that way. (Can you spell "agenda"? I knew that you could)

What percentage of Techs are coded? If you cannot or will not answer that, you
are just blowing smoke.

> Where have I denigrated any class of license? Produce the post instead of
> endlessly gassing about untruths.

Your statement obviously denigrates the importance of the Tech license class.

> >Take away the
> >Techs and the ARS population would be in decline.
>
> Only if none of them got any other license. Which you take as a given, but
> which is not true at all.

If they would have gotten another kind of license, why didn't they? I was
a VEC during six years of that time, Jim. Many of the Techs I tested went
on to higher licenses. Why didn't they all do that?

> >The Techs were responsible for about 41% of the growth.
>
> 41% of 34% is 13.94%. Where do you get that number?

There you go again: Figures don't lie but liars figure. I'm using your figures,
Jim. How can you possibly deny your own posted figures? I have posted the
details two times now. When are you going to read my postings and stop asking
where I got my numbers?

> >The code tested hams
> >were responsible for a 7% decline according to your posted figures.
>

> Nope.
>
> The reduction in the number of non-Techs is caused by hams who did not
> renew their licenses, or had them cancelled.

That's exactly what I said, Jim. The code tested hams who didn't renew their licenses or had them canceled were responsible for a 7% decline according to *your* posted figures.

> Try posting some accurate facts if you want people to take you seriously.

I'm using your posted facts, Jim. Should we not take your posted facts seriously?

I notice that you didn't retract your statement and substitute Bill's with which you agreed 100%. One wonders why.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1438. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 20:27:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020413162721.19000.00000772@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40657

In article <3cb38892_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

> I am one of those who doesn't like discussing
>traffic on the air. In fact, when I am asked I tell them it's the same
> shit, different day.

Do you actually say those exact words on the air, Kim?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1439. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 20:42:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB89834.99B93EAB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40658

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >You said that only 4% of the growth could be attributed to nocode techs.
>
> No, I did not. I wrote that the effect of the rules changes was 4% more growth.
> Can you prove differently? I think not.

It doesn't matter, Jim. The onus of proof is upon the person who asserts the positive. That's you, my friend. Please *prove* that the effect of the rules changes was 4% more growth. You have offered no causal proof whatsoever so far. So let's forego the speculation and see some valid proof. There are many forces at work in the ARS besides rules changes. There was lots of growth besides the 4%. That you would assert that those two mostly unrelated facts were causal is beyond logic. If the change in growth had been zero, what would you be saying? That the rules changes had no effect at all? Get real.

What you have done is to assert something like the following: The rise in church membership is responsible for the rise in prison populations. Just because things are correlated doesn't mean they are causal. Is some proof of your assertions too much to ask?

Instead of trying to defend your illogical statement, why don't you just change it to agree with Bill's statement which allowed more forces to be in play than simply the rules changes. You said you agreed with Bill's statement 100%. Since Bill's statement expands on your illogical statement, it seems you would jumping at the chance to correct your faux pas.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1440. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 20:43:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB8986C.5DDE0527@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40659

K0HB wrote:
> Out here during tornado season you often hear the commercial
> guys attribute a Skywarn report to it's source (amateur, LEO, or
> whatever). It's certainly legal for amateurs to provide "safety of
> life and property" traffic to news broadcasters in accordance with
> the exception granted in 97.113(b).
>
> Nothing grey about that.

What color are tornados?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1441. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 20:45:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB898DF.313AF529@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40660

Mike Coslo wrote:
> Depending on the newsreader, it will put the message in the trash. It
> can then be opened if desired.

I figured Dick was rummaging through his trash to find my postings.
Can you imagine what he smells like after that?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1442. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-13 22:30:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9absuese1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40661

"dnb" <dnb@comcastt.com> wrote in message
news:0m_t8.22741$K5.2369052@bin5.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> Would that be anything like gathering weather reports for one's employer?
I
> frequently hear TV weather jocks referring to the amatuer radio reports
> they've received. OK, technically (perhaps) filtered through the NWS, but
> ultimately they get credited on commercial broadcasts.
>
> Sounds kinda "grey".

Not grey at all because those reports are almost always
tied to extreme weather conditions and are, therefore,
providing a safety and public service aspect.

> > He was actively soliciting the information for rebroadcast
> > by his employer, not just listening.
> > The enforcement reports (there was followup in later
> > enforcement letters) make it clear (to me, anyway)
> > that the violation was in the use of
> > amateur radio to gather info specifically for commercial
> > rebroadcast, not for the traffic reports themselves.
> >
> > Take a look and tell us what you think.

I agree with your conclusion.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1443. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 01:18:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9aldb$l01$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 40662

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3CB6453C.C97EA00E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >> Don't look now, but I have *upgraded* my college degree. I had only
> >> an A.A. from 1972 to 1999. Now I have a B.S.
> > >
> > >That's like going from tech to general, Larry. Why are you too lazy
> > >to get a PhD degree? If you are satisfied with a lowly BS degree, why
> > >can't Kim be satisfied with a Tech+ license?
> >

Cecil knows there would be no ROI on that investment, but he reserves
that rule only for the code test.

1444. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 01:25:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9alqcnae0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 40663

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >When I see enough nonsense
> >of yours quoted by someone else I may jump in and counter your troll.
>
> C'mon, Dick, be honest here. You never did put Cecil in your kill file and you
> are reading every word he says. No one had quoted the words you responded to,
> so you read it directly.
>

Ed, you're either lying or blockedheaded. I have no intention to ever
again read everything Cecil says. If I ever even open one of his posts
it will be the accidental reault of clicking on the "next" message in
Netscape.
The fact that I read something he wrote that was quoted by another
poster that I do read is another matter. I
I'll reserve the right to comment on that if I wish.

1445. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 01:27:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9altrnae1@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 40664

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> >Cecil says there
> >> >is no need to work or expend effort, that can never be a requirement.
> >>
> >> That is not what Cecil said. Go back and try again.
> >
> >
> > Oh he didn't say that *every time* he posted. But if you spend the time
> >to leaf through his volumnous posts, I'm quite sure you'll find it.
>
> I don't recall that Cecil said there is no need to work. He said that the
> amount of work needed is not a requirement.
>
> Did you twist his words on purpose, or do you really recall them that way?
>

Your record of accurate reading others posts here is not exactly
sterling, Ed. My interpretation of what he said is at least as likely to
be accurate as yours.

1446. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 01:32:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9am76$nk6$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 40665

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a981sripu0@208.207.71.156...
> >
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick or Val, you're next.
> >
> > My observation of the ARRL is much less specific in that instead of
> > *being* the wind, they merely bend before the slightest breeze. Examples
> > are abundant, and anyone who hasn't observed them wasn't pauingm
> > attention then and won't believe anything they're told now.
>
> Well Dick, Larry DID provide one example.
> You, on the other hand, still resort to
> generalities to make your case. Sorry,
> that's a no win in the courts of public debate
> and discussion.

So try this one- why do you think that so small a percentage of US hams ever join ARRL? I really believe I know. And the answer wouldn't be complimentary.
It is simply that they don't believe the elitists who populate HQ care about members interests nearly as much as they do for their own.

1447. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 01:40:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9ammj$pl7$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 40666

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CB7544D.B952FDAD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>

> >Yep, like I said, figures don't lie but liars figure.
>
> Ah, the old ad hominem attack. Indicates lack of facts on your part.

Cecil hopes his supporters won't notice that he's really telling on
himself.

1448. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 01:43:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9amra$pl7$1@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 40667

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3cb38892_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> > I am one of those who doesn't like discussing
> >traffic on the air. In fact, when I am asked I tell them it's the same
> > shit, different day.
>
> Do you actually say those exact words on the air, Kim?

Would a female who chose the suffix TIT for her callsign avoid such
language on the air? I doubt it.

1449. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 01:52:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020413215256.02883.00001474@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 40668

In article <3CB7A6EF.999F7581@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Of all the incidents you
>> relate on your timeline, Restructuring will go down in history as the
>> greatest travesty ever visited on the Amateur Radio Service.
>
>And you know this is a fact because?

Cecil:

Because you're a wanker, and you like it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1450. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 03:23:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9ass1$6av$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40669

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9am76$nk6$0@208.207.71.144...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:a981sripu0@208.207.71.156...
> > >
> > >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick or Val, you're next.
> > >
> > > My observation of the ARRL is much less specific in that instead of
> > > *being* the wind, they merely bend before the slightest breeze.
Examples
> > > are abundant, and anyone who hasn't observed them wasn't pauingm
> > > attention then and won't believe anything they're told now.
> >
> > Well Dick, Larry DID provide one example.
> > You, on the other hand, still resort to
> > generalities to make your case. Sorry,
> > that's a no win in the courts of public debate
> > and discussion.
>
>
> So try this one- why do you think that so small a percentage of US hams
> ever join ARRL? I really believe I know. And the answer wouldn't be
> complimentary.
> It is simply that they don't believe the elitists who populate HQ care
> about members interests nearly as much as they do for their own.

Well Dick...that is just another generalization. Not a damn aspect of
anything specific. You state a "belief" as a generalization yet you
back it up with NO specifics once again.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1451. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 04:13:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB901E2.1B23B6B1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40670

Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >That's like going from tech to general, Larry. Why are you too lazy
> > >to get a PhD degree? If you are satisfied with a lowly BS degree, why
> > >can't Kim be satisfied with a Tech+ license?
>
> Cecil knows there would be no ROI on that investment, but he reserves
> that rule only for the code test.

That doesn't compute, Dick. Kim has already passed the only code test
that is still required.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1452. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 04:15:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB90268.E8D56A89@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40671

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > C'mon, Dick, be honest here. You never did put Cecil in your kill file and you
> > are reading every word he says. No one had quoted the words you responded to,
> > so you read it directly.
> >
> The fact that I read something he wrote that was quoted by another
> poster that I do read is another matter. I
> I'll reserve the right to comment on that if I wish.

Too late for that, Dick. You already replied directly to my postings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1453. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 04:17:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB902D8.84CCA3F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40672

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So try this one- why do you think that so small a percentage of US hams
> ever join ARRL? I really believe I know. And the answer wouldn't be
> complimentary.
> It is simply that they don't believe the elitists who populate HQ care
> about members interests nearly as much as they do for their own.

More likely, they are just too cheap to shell out the $39.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1454. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 05:33:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB914B9.80294778@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40673

>
> Bzzzzzzzzzzzzt! Bad answer.
>
> "97.7 Control operator required
>
> When transmitting, each amateur station must have a control operator."
>

Okay, if "station" means the equipment and antenna setup, then
a ham licensed person would be the control op. But most of
us think of the license as associated with the person and not
the setup. And the FCC IIRC tends to think that way too.

1455. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 05:39:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB915F6.3EB91230@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40674

>
> My observation of the ARRL is much less specific in that instead of
> *being* the wind, they merely bend before the slightest breeze. Examples
> are abundant, and anyone who hasn't observed them wasn't pauingm
> attention then and won't believe anything they're told now.

The ARRL is an organization of lots of people. The leadership
should "bend" with the "wind" of the majority of its members.
It's a democracy type thing.

1456. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 05:42:20 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <0F8u8.6192$3z3.567891@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40675

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CB914B9.80294778@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > Bzzzzzzzzzzzzzt! Bad answer.
> >
> > "97.7 Control operator required
> >
> > When transmitting, each amateur station must have a control
operator."
> >
>
> Okay, if "station" means the equipment and antenna setup, then
> a ham licensed person would be the control op. But most of
> us think of the license as associated with the person and not
> the setup.

You have an operators license *_and_* a station license.
(They're on the same document.)

Your call sign is associated with your station license, not
your operator license.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1457. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 05:53:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CB91958.8532BB91@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40676

```
QYM "Your mama!"
QGM "Your Grandma!"
QSC "Your sister's in love with a carrot!"
```

1458. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 06:29:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9b7ko$bl1$0@208.206.142.84>
Source record: 40677

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >
> > > My observation of the ARRL is much less specific in that instead of
> > > *being* the wind, they merely bend before the slightest breeze. Examples
> > > are abundant, and anyone who hasn't observed them wasn't pauingm
> > > attention then and won't believe anything they're told now.
>
> The ARRL is an organization of lots of people. The leadership
> should "bend" with the "wind" of the majority of its members.
> It's a democracy type thing.

Bending with the wind and merely before the slightest breeze are quite
different. Sometimes the slight breeze (few) trumps a heavy wind (the
majority)

1459. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 07:58:38 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <C311C8FD2D7113CC.A6AE0949F69DC3B7.9222BE4044D8D53C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40678

On Fri, 12 Apr 2002 20:06:03 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Long, long asleep by that time, Joe...at least most evenings.

Darn, I knew I was going to run into trouble when I accepted the NM
spot for the after-most-people's-bedtime net ;)

>It's gotten pretty darned boring with nothing more than the
>perfunctory messages (routine reports, the occasional Handy Hams message,
>etc.)

Yup. Fortunately, we don't get too many W1GMF-grams on the late net
these days, but we're not getting a whole lot of anything. I need a
way to get people to show up, and a way to get them to bring something
when they do. Preferably not the generic welcome message type stuff,
since everbody feels a bit silly delivering those, but theoretically,
most of them should know someone, somewhere, that they'd like to send
the occasional short message to via NTS.

Anybody out there got ideas for promoting a local VHF NTS net?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1460. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 14:03:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9c2d7$8rq$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40679

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:0F8u8.6192$3z3.567891@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3CB914B9.80294778@ix.netcom.com...
> > > "97.7 Control operator required
> > > When transmitting, each amateur station must have a control
> > > operator."
> >
> > Okay, if "station" means the equipment and antenna setup, then
> > a ham licensed person would be the control op. But most of
> > us think of the license as associated with the person and not
> > the setup.
>
> You have an operators license *_and_* a station license.
> (They're on the same document.)
>
> Your call sign is associated with your station license, not
> your operator license.

Didn't the FCC stop issuing actual station licenses some
years back?

Also, even IF station liceses exist, isn't it correct that
the call sign need not be used by another person
operating my station. That other person can operate
my home station using their own call sign, making
no reference to my call sign, as long as the operation
by that person is within the privileges of that person's
license.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

1461. America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 15:13:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB99C89.2FD6B2FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40680

Just wondering if the Stephen Anderson on America's Most Wanted is/was
a ham. He had a shortwave broadcasting setup in his home.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1462. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:05:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9a94e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40681

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:8nMt8.3629$3z3.331847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
>
> Naw, I talk about the WX all the time. It got above 65 here today
> at the north end of I-35. Melted the ice of the road surfaces. Now
> the riff-raff will start coming in from Texas, I suppose. I hate it
> when that happens.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0Hard-Body
>

Don't worry. It'll only be those attracted to their own kind going up
north.

Kim W5TIT

1463. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:06:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9a97c$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40682

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a985j5roh0@208.207.71.156...
>
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > Thanks for the card. You need to add some color, though.
>
>
> That must be for me. I did add yellow to all the interior white space.
> Looked good, but I noticed that it had the propensity to fade, leaving
> the card looking better in monochrome.
> I told you yours is much more colorful.
>
> W0EX

Little Dick's not a very colorful kind of guy. He's pretty boring...

Kim W5TIT

1464. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:07:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9a9c9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40683

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412231103.02551.00001667@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3CB66ECC.8252C699@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >The gall bladder ailments QSOs and such are just the old timers
exchanging
> >physcologal support with each other. Seems as valid use of radio as say
> >contests and such. Sure it's boring to listen to if you're
> >young, but they're not "broadcasting" to you. There's other QSOs going
on
> >to listen to, or call CQ and start a topic with someone.
>
> Bob:
>
> When it's done on a wide-area coverage repeater, occurs on a daily
> basis, and goes on for hours on end, it definitely becomes a "gray"
area --
> from a standpoint of "good amateur practice." I have monitored such
> long-winded health-related diatribes among old-timers, who don't know
> the difference between a repeater and their nightly 75-meter roundtable,
> while other stations have tried desperately to break-in for a chance to
> make a call of a more urgent nature. The Geezer Factor in ham radio
> is something that must be reckoned with, particularly in larger urban
> areas with a dense population of hams.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

See Hans? I told you there's plenty of repeater kops...

Kim W5TIT

1465. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:11:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9aa89_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40684

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412231105.02551.00001669@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <a977mu$c12$1@mycroft.cmhnet.org>, uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
writes:
>
> Those guidelines are quite clear. We can use ham radio to order a
> pizza, but we can't use it to sell a pizza. The fact that the person at
> Domino's who answers the phone when you place the autopatch call
> is "selling" pizza doesn't constitute use of amateur radio to deliberately
> advertise and market his product. If the amateur him/herself is in the
> role of a "customer," then his/her use of ham radio to avail him/herself
> of such goods and services is perfectly OK. In the case of my
> accountant getting directions, there is no issue, since the professional
> details of the visit would not enter into the content of the conversation.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

If the ham was working at the pizza place and you called, you'd both be in
that gray area. If your accountant is a ham and going to your house for the
purpose of providing you with a service for which he is going to charge,
you'd be in the gray area.

Kim W5TIT

1466. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:13:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9ab24$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40685

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020413063457.12011.00003741@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >When I see enough nonsense
> >of yours quoted by someone else I may jump in and counter your troll.
>
> C'mon, Dick, be honest here. You never did put Cecil in your kill file and
you
> are reading every word he says. No one had quoted the words you responded
to,
> so you read it directly.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

heh heh heh...believe me, he will be much, much more careful now.

Kim W5TIT

1467. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:29:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9aedb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40686

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a99al5cqi1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cb7839b_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> >
> > I am saying that I read there are to be no communications in which we
have
> > pecuniary interest. I have heard OTs even say that means discussing
> things
> > like stock--if they have a pecuniary interest.
>
> Which is also a crock. Do you consider it a "pecuniary" interest if
> I use the repeater's autopatch to order a pizza on my way home so it
> is ready for me when I get there? The FCC did say a few years ago
> such things were not a violation.
>

You aren't the one making money in that exchange, Bill. Unless the person
at the pizza place is a ham, I doubt there'd be a chance for much of an
issue.

> >
> > It is my nature, Bill, to
> > err on the side of caution; not to test the waters. I'd just as soon
not
> > get involved with such discussions just as I would not get involved
right
> > now with, say, discussions that *could* be misconstrued to be in support
> of
> > terrorism.
>
> Two significantly different subject areas I'd say.
>

I don't think they are that significantly different. BOTH are subject to
interpretation.

> >
> > As to "and so does the majority of repeater users" that
> > doesn't work for me.
>
> The point is that the practice is widespread and, if it was in
> violation would likly have encountered the rath of the FCC
> already. We're talking a decade or more of active repeater

> use.
>

I don't think the FCC *would* take much issue with this, at all, even if there is something wrong with it. I mean, after all, there are much worse illegalities going on.

> >
> > The thing I'm wondering about is why you and others are getting so
> > worked up over this.
>
> Not worked up at all. Just open and friendly debate. You through
> down the gauntlet when you made the statements you did which
> are totally contrary to practice on just about every repeater anywhere...
> other than the one you mention.
>

They may be usual and customary. I choose not to be involved in the communication. It is also usual and customary to speed on the highway. I *do* choose to be involved with that. It is also usual and customary for hams to "admit" to breaking the law and bragging that they are speeding on the highway. I choose *not* to be involved with those communications.

> >
> > I hold myself only to this ideal...
>
> No, you said they are the rules of the repeater you
> use all (most?) of the time.
>

You misinterpret what we have as common practice into a "rule." There are no "rules" on our repeater. Those of us who use it regularly don't care for weather and traffic reports. We tease those who do.

>
> > Aren't I allowed to say what types of conversations I will or will not
get
> > involved with.
>
> Ansolutely...you need not participate in any discussion... BUT,
> you didn't say it was ONLY for you...rather you stated it was
> the repeater rules themselves.
>

Nope, sure didn't. *If* I used the word "rule" it was purely by mistake.

> >
> > We each interpret the R&R. It is only when we land
> > ourselves in front of the FCC that what *we* think about
> > the R&R gets tested. I'd rather not be tested.
>
> To each his/her own.
>

Absolutely.

> > >
> > > Just HOW do you or anyone else KNOW why I want to get to
> > > a particular location. If I said I'm going to pick up a friend
> > > would you give me directions? If I added that we are on our way
> > > to work and I'm giving the friend a ride would you NOT give
> > > me directions?
> > >
> > 'Spose in some cases we wouldn't know. However, in most cases we do.
>
> Crystal ball???
>

C'mon Bill, it's pretty damned obvious when ham A works with ham B. Ham A is on the highway every morning (usually) before ham B. Ham B always asks ham A which route he should use. It's also pretty obvious that most of us in the local area who are all mobile on the same highways every morning are all going to work--especially when the conversation usualy entails the announcement of such.

> >
> > Well, disagreeing is one thing...but it really does seem to me that
you've
> > been offended by what I think. I also don't test the water with most
> > constitutional laws, tax laws, etc. I let that be done by others...and
> they
> > are certainly welcome to do so. In some cases, I may be prone to
thinking
> > that they are foolish. In some cases they may be thinking that I am the
> one
> > being foolish. HOWEVER, I say this: in both cases, which fool holds
> greater
> > liability? Eh?
>
> The history of the world is filled with people who challenged the rules.
> Not everyone wins, but we'd be no where as developed if people didn't
> challenge rules on occasion. In this instant case, you can do what
> wou wish, others (the vast majority of repeater users) have been
> making that challenge for years and helping other hams with
> traffic conditions, route instructions, etc with NO ill effects from
> the FCC.
>

Bill, some people are cut out for more challenge than others. I am willing to go to jail, say, overnight or for two or three days for something I believe in. I am not willing to lose my ham radio license, or be heard being involved in conversations of a questionable nature on ham radio by scanner listeners or the general public.

If you feel it is that OK to help each other get to work (where a pecuniary interest is involved, why do you say above that others "have been making that challenge for years"? WHAT challenge?

>
> As to the legitamate use of ham radio for traffic condidtions,
> it seems we DO have FCC thinking on this. The FCC busted a ham
> for getting traffic conditions for (on behlf of) his employer,
> a broadcast station. The FCC did not then state that
> any/all traffic condition reporting among hams is or should
> be a forbidden topic. It was ONLY the ham that was doing
> the soliciting of traffic data for direct use by the broadcast
> station that got in trouble. If the other hams were in some
> way guilty of violating the "pecuniary" use rules (even if
> the FCC viewed them as unintended participants) because
> the sukect (traffic conditions) is verbotin, then why didn't
> the FCC so state that?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Like I said, I doubt this is something the FCC is really all that willing to get involved with. It's benign enough that, even if it is wrong and could be used in a court of law as being wrong, what is the real harm in it? I mean, after all, most of us know that there are a lot of abuses on ham radio that go virtually ignored.

Kim W5TIT

1468. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:33:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9afaf_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40687

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a99daf$2s6$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> Such behavior would, I must agree with Larry, be truly
> horrible amateur practice. If the users of a repeater
> don't willingly allow others to intervene in its use,
> then somethings rotten. Does the repeater owner
> just tolerate such poor behavior?
>

Let me ask you a friendly question with a bit of a jab at the side to you, Bill. If the "users" of a particular repeater should be viewed as necessary to intervene in its use, then why wouldn't it be OK for us on our repeater to tease, cajole, or otherwise challenge the use of our repeater for traffic and weather? OH, wait...that may have been Hans that raised such a stink about regulars on a repeater being the ones to kind of "indicate" what types of communication we all prefer...

Never mind

Kim W5TIT

> > The Geezer Factor in ham radio
> > is something that must be reckoned with,
> > particularly in larger urban
> > areas with a dense population of hams.
>
> Sad, but probably true to some extent. The self
> policing of repeater use, such as being sure everyone
> willingly lets other use it if the only QSO going
> on is routine chit-chat, takes an across the board
> dicipline and should involve all hams that are
> active users.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

1469. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:37:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b0b2$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40688

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020413100709.07448.00000624@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <3cb78636$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Anyway, the
> >> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
> >I've
> >> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
> >>
> >> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Er, no digital...no CW...LOL
> >
> I don't understand, Kim.
>
> You wrote:
>
> "I've done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times."
>
> The context was HF bands, of course. 30 meters is an HF band.
> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>
> It's a simple question.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Jim, I've given up on even trying to communicate with you, but I'll make an
exception to say that your "all" and my "all" are two different things.
There are some on this newsgroup who respect you immensely... then there is
me who thinks you're nothing more than an irritation who likes to bring
extreme definition into a topic--when it is one you tend to disagree with.
If it's something you agree with, you are quite liberal...

Kim W5TIT

1470. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:43:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b236$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40689

"dnb" <dnb@comcastt.com> wrote in message
news:0m_t8.22741$K5.2369052@bin5.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> Would that be anything like gathering weather reports for one's employer?
I
> frequently hear TV weather jocks referring to the amatuer radio reports
> they've received. OK, technically (perhaps) filtered through the NWS, but
> ultimately they get credited on commercial broadcasts.
>
> Sounds kinda "grey".
>

I wonder. Let me say that down here there's been a tendency to get every media outlet involved that can get involved so that no "preference" is implied. One of our local TV channels here used to have a "corner on the market" for ham radio when one of their primary weather people was the only media weather "voice" on the air. In fact, there are some stories of how any other media weren't given "right" to enter a RACES net. Now, the tides have turned and nearly all stations, TV *and* radio have hams--and all of them (that I know of) are allowed onto the RACES nets.

That aside, I am not sure there would be anything wrong with a media outlet using reports from ham radio. However, I believe that it is wrong for us to repeat the things we hear on local commercial media outlets and on public service frequencies. We can, however, retransmit items from the NWS, I think.

Kim W5TIT

1471. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:46:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b2d0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40691

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020413162721.19000.00000772@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3cb38892_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> > I am one of those who doesn't like discussing
> >traffic on the air. In fact, when I am asked I tell them it's the same
> > shit, different day.
>
> Do you actually say those exact words on the air, Kim?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I would. Though I do not. I've cursed on the air. I don't do it often,
but I'll use the words "damn" "hell" "crap" and, you know, all those that
are commonly used to imply the same and worse.

Kim W5TIT

1472. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:51:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b418$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40692

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9alqcnae0@208.207.71.144...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >When I see enough nonsense
> > >of yours quoted by someone else I may jump in and counter your troll.
> >
> > C'mon, Dick, be honest here. You never did put Cecil in your kill file
and you
> > are reading every word he says. No one had quoted the words you
responded to,
> > so you read it directly.
> >
>
> Ed, you're either lying or blockedheaded. I have no intention to ever
> again read everything Cecil says. If I ever even open one of his posts
> it will be the accidental reault of clicking on the "next" message in
> Netscape.
> The fact that I read something he wrote that was quoted by another
> poster that I do read is another matter. I
> I'll reserve the right to comment on that if I wish.

Can't get out of it, Little Dick. The attributes of newsgroup readers
aren't that drastically different from one to the next. You *directly*
replied to a post from Cecil, everyone knows it, everyone saw it. Just as
now everyone is seeing you trying your darndest to get out of it.

You're just going to have to be entirely more careful when you tell people
that you've "filtered" them. You will have to spit shit until you *can*
respond to them via someone else's quote--which doesn't happen often enough
for you.

I think right now, the only person with whom you'd have disagreements is Ed,
as I don't believe you've made some kind of public announcement about
filtering him. So, the way I see it, we should begin to see either less
posts from you, or more positive ones.

Kim W5TIT

1473. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 16:58:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020414125845.26511.00000213@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 40690

In article <3CB89834.99B93EAB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >You said that only 4% of the growth could be attributed to nocode techs.
>>
>> No, I did not. I wrote that the effect of the rules changes was 4% more
>growth.
>> Can you prove differently? I think not.
>
>It doesn't matter, Jim.

Then why are you so upset?

>The onus of proof is upon the person who asserts
>the positive. That's you, my friend. Please *prove* that the effect of the
>rules changes was 4% more growth.

34 - 30 = 4 QED

> You have offered no causal proof whatsoever
>so far. So let's forego the speculation and see some valid proof.

"It's obviously true". You used those very words, so I can too.

>There are
>many forces at work in the ARS besides rules changes.

So list some of them that had an effect on growth.

> There was lots of
>growth besides the 4%.

Yep. There was 34% growth from 1990 to 2000. That's a good thing.

>That you would assert that those two mostly unrelated
>facts were causal is beyond logic.

How so? My statement is obviously true because 34 - 30 = 4

>If the change in growth had been zero,
>what would you be saying?

If is for children, spinning daydreams.

>That the rules changes had no effect at all?

No change in growth = changes had no effect on growth. Obviously true.

>Get real.

I'm as real as you are, Cecil. In fact, more so. I'm just
holding up the mirror to you.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1474. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:01:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b65e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40693

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9am76$nk6$0@208.207.71.144...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:a981sripu0@208.207.71.156...
> > >
> > >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick or Val, you're next.
> > >
> > > My observation of the ARRL is much less specific in that instead of
> > > *being* the wind, they merely bend before the slightest breeze.
Examples
> > > are abundant, and anyone who hasn't observed them wasn't pauingm
> > > attention then and won't believe anything they're told now.
> >
> > Well Dick, Larry DID provide one example.
> > You, on the other hand, still resort to
> > generalities to make your case. Sorry,
> > that's a no win in the courts of public debate
> > and discussion.
>
> So try this one- why do you think that so small a percentage of US hams
> ever join ARRL? I really believe I know. And the answer wouldn't be
> complimentary.
> It is simply that they don't believe the elitists who populate HQ care
> about members interests nearly as much as they do for their own.

I will use one of Bill S.'s terms here: What a crock. I'd *BET* (that's for
Jim/N2EY's benefit) that the greatest reason more people aren't members of
the ARRL are:

** Pure ignorance that the ARRL is there--I never heard of the ARRL until
about six months after I became a ham radio operator (in fact, it was my
first Field Day that I heard the initials A-R-R-L spoken)

** Competition with many other interests and ham radio as a secondary
hobby/interest under things like astronomy, hunting/fishing, travel, etc.
Ham radio--to most people I imagine--is quite secondary in their life

** Time. *If* QST is the motivator for membership, what a pity. Many of us
have precious little time to spend reading a magazine for other than a

casual look at the pictures. Most of us don't spend the time it takes to read anything any more

** Competition with club memberships. Most ham radio clubs are, at a minimum, $20-$25 annually. Several are much higher than that--and repeater link clubs are up in the $100+ range (at least around here) If I've got $50 a year to spend on ham "organization" stuff, I think I'm going to spend it locally for a club with people I can know and visit with, as opposed to an "organization" far far away and removed from anything I do with ham radio every day

** Complacency. I'd imagine that many, many hams are quite content to think that ham radio will always be around. I am admittedly complacent. The danger here is enhanced by the fact that many hams are more VHF/UHF users; where spectrum is viewed to be less threatened.

There's more reasons, none of which are conspiracy theories and, thereby, quite non-valid to people like Little Dick.

Kim W5TIT

1475. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:02:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b6ae_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40694

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9amra$pl7$1@208.207.71.144...
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3cb38892_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > > I am one of those who doesn't like discussing
> > >traffic on the air. In fact, when I am asked I tell them it's the same
> > > shit, different day.
> >
> > Do you actually say those exact words on the air, Kim?
>
> Would a female who chose the suffix TIT for her callsign avoid such
> language on the air? I doubt it.

Such language...LOL This from a detestable human being...

Kim W5TIT

1476. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:04:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b729_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40695

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB902D8.84CCA3F6@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So try this one- why do you think that so small a percentage of US hams
> > ever join ARRL? I really believe I know. And the answer wouldn't be
> > complimentary.
> > It is simply that they don't believe the elitists who populate HQ care
> > about members interests nearly as much as they do for their own.
>
> More likely, they are just too cheap to shell out the $39.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Oh yeah! That too. I used to have a great deal of disdain for the
distinction that most hams are "cheapskates" and are really looking for free
stuff. I've come to realize that, though...

Kim W5TIT

1477. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:06:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b777_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40696

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CB915F6.3EB91230@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > My observation of the ARRL is much less specific in that instead of
> > *being* the wind, they merely bend before the slightest breeze. Examples
> > are abundant, and anyone who hasn't observed them wasn't pauingm
> > attention then and won't believe anything they're told now.
>
> The ARRL is an organization of lots of people. The leadership
> should "bend" with the "wind" of the majority of its members.
> It's a democracy type thing.
>

Ah, but the "wind" of the majority of the membership is not known, since the
majority of the membership doesn't express their desires...

Kim W5TIT

1478. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:08:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b801$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40697

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9b7ko$bl1$0@208.206.142.84...
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > My observation of the ARRL is much less specific in that instead of
> > > *being* the wind, they merely bend before the slightest breeze.
Examples
> > > are abundant, and anyone who hasn't observed them wasn't pauingm
> > > attention then and won't believe anything they're told now.
> >
> > The ARRL is an organization of lots of people. The leadership
> > should "bend" with the "wind" of the majority of its members.
> > It's a democracy type thing.
>
> Bending with the wind and merely before the slightest breeze are quite
> different. Sometimes the slight breeze (few) trumps a heavy wind (the
> majority)

And, so you think the ARRL should mind read the majority of the membership?
You're talking out your ass again, Dick. The ARRL doesn't KNOW what the
majority of its membership wants. The majority of the membership doesn't
tell them.

It is as it should be: those who take the time to communicate and activate
are those for whom the ARRL will spend the most time. The rest get their
QST.

Kim W5TIT

1479. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:15:09 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cb9b993_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40699

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:C311C8FD2D7113CC.A6AE0949F69DC3B7.9222BE4044D8D53C@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 12 Apr 2002 20:06:03 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >Long, long asleep by that time, Joe...at least most evenings.
>
> Darn, I knew I was going to run into trouble when I accepted the NM
> spot for the after-most-people's-bedtime net ;)
>
> >It's gotten pretty darned boring with nothing more than the
> >perfunctory messages (routine reports, the occasional Handy Hams message,
> >etc.)
>
> Yup. Fortunately, we don't get too many W1GMF-grams on the late net
> these days, but we're not getting a whole lot of anything. I need a
> way to get people to show up, and a way to get them to bring something
> when they do. Preferably not the generic welcome message type stuff,
> since everbody feels a bit silly delivering those, but theoretically,
> most of them should know someone, somewhere, that they'd like to send
> the occasional short message to via NTS.
>
> Anybody out there got ideas for promoting a local VHF NTS net?
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

Hey, Joe: I hate being an "armchair activist" but, here goes. I come from the days when, literally, 50-60 people showing up for a DFW traffic net was a light turnout. In those days, however, there were dinners, parties and lots of eyeball get togethers among net participants. Maybe a resurgence of those would get more people involved.

Sounds "cheap" but people thrive on getting together. Also, people thrive on feeling a part of something. I've always, always thought that every time Dallas RACES is up on 146.880, then the DFW traffic net should be up on 145.190. But, it's never happened. If you were up during a RACES net, the people who prefer traffic handling would be there (at least some) and would pique the interest maybe of those who don't want to storm spot but would love to be there for traffic handling--which can extend beyond a formal message to getting the police advised of a car wreck, a stranded motorist, etc.... How 'bout messages from storm spotters who know you're there, back to their family members who stay at home?

Kim W5TIT

1480. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:26:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB9BBB0.81AF0E90@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40698

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> Jim, I've given up on even trying to communicate with you, but I'll make an
> exception to say that your "all" and my "all" are two different things.

Is an all-band-antenna still an all-band-antenna if it's not used on all bands? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1481. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:43:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB9BFC9.3103547F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40700

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >The onus of proof is upon the person who asserts
> >the positive. That's you, my friend. Please *prove* that the effect of the
> >rules changes was 4% more growth.
>
> 34 - 30 = 4 QED

You cannot possibly be that dense. Numbers are mere abstractions.

Last year, I made a profit trading stocks. I made 65 trades. The best
trade was equal to my profit. The next two best trades added together
equals my profit. Can I say?: I made all my profit on my best trade.
I made all my profit on my second and third best trades. Both those
statements cannot possibly be true. The truth is that 65 trades were
responsible for my profit.

Using your own figures, the Techs accounted for 41% growth in the ARS.
All other licenses combined accounted for a 7% decline. 41 - 7 = 34 QED

> > You have offered no causal proof whatsoever
> >so far. So let's forego the speculation and see some valid proof.
>
> "It's obviously true". You used those very words, so I can too.

Not when you are the one who asserts the positive proposition. I am
free to disagree without proof until you offer some proof which you
haven't done. Where's the beef, Jim?

> > There was lots of growth besides the 4%.
>
> Yep. There was 34% growth from 1990 to 2000. That's a good thing.

And 41% of that 34% was caused by the Techs. Does that tell you
anything?

> How so? My statement is obviously true because 34 - 30 = 4

Just because 34 - 30 = 4 doesn't mean a thing regarding causality
in reality.

> No change in growth = changes had no effect on growth. Obviously true.

Bullcrap! The changes had a 41% effect on growth. Other things had
a negative effect on growth. Why do you insist on ignoring the many,
many other possible factors?
--

cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1482. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:49:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB9C144.9006F663@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40751

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > More likely, they are just too cheap to shell out the $39.
>
> Oh yeah! That too. I used to have a great deal of disdain for the
> distinction that most hams are "cheapskates" and are really looking for free
> stuff. I've come to realize that, though...

Hams steal more software than any other group that I know of. I had
never heard of ELNEC when I was about to participate in Intel's
AZ field day for the first time. A fellow ham employee just handed me
a copy of ELNEC. Before I fired it up, I thought it was shareware.
When I discovered it was copyrighted, I ordered my own copy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1483. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 17:53:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CB9C22A.4971BF4E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40752

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> And, so you think the ARRL should mind read the majority of the membership?
> You're talking out your ass again, Dick. The ARRL doesn't KNOW what the
> majority of its membership wants. The majority of the membership doesn't
> tell them.

You forgot that Dick has a crystal ball that tells him exactly what people
are thinking no matter what they are saying or even whether they are saying
anything at all. That crystal ball is what makes Dick so omniscient.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1484. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 18:34:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020414143444.27399.00000511@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 40753

In article <3cb9b0b2$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020413100709.07448.00000624@mb-cc.aol.com...
>> In article <3cb78636$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> >> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
>> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Anyway, the
>> >> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
>> >I've
>> >> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
>> >>
>> >> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> >Er, no digital...no CW...LOL
>> >
>> I don't understand, Kim.
>>
>> You wrote:
>>
>> "I've done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times."
>>
>> The context was HF bands, of course. 30 meters is an HF band.
>> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>>
>> It's a simple question.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim, I've given up on even trying to communicate with you, but I'll make an
>exception to say that your "all" and my "all" are two different things.

To almost every ham I know, "all HF ham bands" means "the 80, 40, 30, 20, 17,
15, 12 and 10 meter bands". That's not just my definiton, it's the commonly
accepted one.

You seem to be telling me that your definition of "all HF ham bands" is something else.

>There are some on this newsgroup who respect you immensely...

That's a good thing. Think about WHY they do.

>then there is
>me who thinks you're nothing more than an irritation who likes to bring
>extreme definition into a topic--when it is one you tend to disagree with.
>If it's something you agree with, you are quite liberal...

The above question ("what mode did you use on 30 meters") is a very simple and direct question. It's not about me at all. But you've repeatedly avoided a direct answer for some reason.

Why not just chill out and answer the question?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1485. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 18:46:20 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <08ku8.24013$Rw2.1916347@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40754

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB99C89.2FD6B2FD@IEEE.org...
> Just wondering if the Stephen Anderson on America's Most Wanted is/was
> a ham. He had a shortwave broadcasting setup in his home.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

He was but turned in his ticket to go native.

1486. Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 19:49:33 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CB9DD30.236BA96B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 40755

I just got an invitation to join this organization. Is this
the new name of the American Radio Relay League, or some
veiled attempt at a takeover by W5YI et.al.?

73,
Clay N4AOX

1487. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 22:07:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020414180720.19000.00000808@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40756

In article <3CB9BBB0.81AF0E90@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

> Kim wrote:
>> Jim, I've given up on even trying to communicate with you, but I'll make an
>> exception to say that your "all" and my "all" are two different things.
>
>Is an all-band-antenna still an all-band-antenna if it's not used on all
>bands? :-)
>--
Sure!

But Kim wrote:

"I've done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times."

Is an all-band-antenna still an all-band-antenna if it doesn't actually work on
all
bands?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1488. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 22:24:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9cvnp$jb1$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40757

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb9afaf_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a99daf$2s6$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Such behavior would, I must agree with Larry, be truly
> > horrible amateur practice. If the users of a repeater
> > don't willingly allow others to intervene in its use,
> > then somethings rotten. Does the repeater owner
> > just tolerate such poor behavior?
>
> Let me ask you a friendly question with a bit of a jab at the side to you,
> Bill. If the "users" of a particular repeater should be viewed as
necessary
> to intervene in its use, then why wouldn't it be OK for us on our repeater
> to tease, cajole, or otherwise challenge the use of our repeater for
traffic
> and weather?

In the instance I agreed with Larry on, the behavior of the
hams that wouldn't relinquish the repeater for other use
is, buy all measures, a disgrace.

In your instance, I would agree that the "users" are
free to tease, cajole, or otherwise challenge the use of
your repeater for traffic and weather...IF that is the
rules established by the "owner(s)" of the repeater.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1489. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 22:56:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9d1js$p70$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40758

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb9aedb_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a99al5cqi1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > The history of the world is filled with people who challenged the rules.
> > Not everyone wins, but we'd be no where as developed if people didn't
> > challenge rules on occasion. In this instant case, you can do what
> > wou wish, others (the vast majority of repeater users) have been
> > making that challenge for years and helping other hams with
> > traffic conditions, route instructions, etc with NO ill effects from
> > the FCC.
>
> Bill, some people are cut out for more challenge than others. I am
willing
> to go to jail, say, overnight or for two or three days for something I
> believe in. I am not willing to lose my ham radio license, or be heard
> being involved in conversations of a questionable nature on ham radio by
> scanner listeners or the general public.
>
> If you feel it is that OK to help each other get to work (where a
pecuniary
> interest is involved, why do you say above that others "have been making
> that challenge for years"? WHAT challenge?

Isay it because...IF, as you believe, talking traffic on the way
to work constitutes a violation of the pecuniary interest
prohibition, then all the thousands of such discussions
have been challenging that interpretation for years.

> > As to the legitamate use of ham radio for traffic condidtions,
> > it seems we DO have FCC thinking on this. The FCC busted a ham
> > for getting traffic conditions for (on behlf of) his employer,
> > a broadcast station. The FCC did not then state that
> > any/all traffic condition reporting among hams is or should
> > be a forbidden topic. It was ONLY the ham that was doing
> > the soliciting of traffic data for direct use by the broadcast
> > station that got in trouble. If the other hams were in some
> > way guilty of violating the "pecuniary" use rules (even if
> > the FCC viewed them as unintended participants) because
> > the sukect (traffic conditions) is verbotin, then why didn't
> > the FCC so state that?
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Like I said, I doubt this is something the FCC is really all that willing
to

> get involved with. It's benign enough that, even if it is wrong and could
> be used in a court of law as being wrong, what is the real harm in it? I
> mean, after all, most of us know that there are a lot of abuses on ham
radio
> that go virtually ignored.

The FCC saw fit to weigh in on the "pizza order" via autopatch
because enough hams were being given grief by other hams
that a clarification was requested...and the FCC obliged.
Clearly your opinion on traffic discussions is of such a minority
view that whatever teasing you do is so limited, no one cares.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1490. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 23:01:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9d1sb$i3l$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40759

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3CB9DD30.236BA96B@worldnet.att.net...
> I just got an invitation to join this organization. Is this
> the new name of the American Radio Relay League, or some
> veiled attempt at a takeover by W5YI et.al.?

Clay,
How about some details?

What's their address?
What do they say they will do?
What's the member benefits?
Any publication(s)?

As to your specific questions...I am unaware
of any name change for ARRL and I have
heard of no effort by W5YI to start any
alternative organization.

1491. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-14 23:58:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cba1803$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40760

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020414143444.27399.00000511@mb-mr.aol.com...
>
>
> Why not just chill out and answer the question?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

If it's so all-fired important to you, Jim...which is really strange because it wasn't even your question originally...then I'll answer with: I don't know.

Kim W5TIT

1492. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 00:01:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cba18c0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40761

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9cvnp$jb1$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cb9afaf_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a99daf$2s6$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > Such behavior would, I must agree with Larry, be truly
> > > horrible amateur practice. If the users of a repeater
> > > don't willingly allow others to intervene in its use,
> > > then somethings rotten. Does the repeater owner
> > > just tolerate such poor behavior?
> >
> > Let me ask you a friendly question with a bit of a jab at the side to
you,
> > Bill. If the "users" of a particular repeater should be viewed as
> necessary
> > to intervene in its use, then why wouldn't it be OK for us on our
repeater
> > to tease, cajole, or otherwise challenge the use of our repeater for
> traffic
> > and weather?
>
> In the instance I agreed with Larry on, the behavior of the
> hams that wouldn't relinquish the repeater for other use
> is, buy all measures, a disgrace.
>
> In your instance, I would agree that the "users" are
> free to tease, cajole, or otherwise challenge the use of
> your repeater for traffic and weather...IF that is the
> rules established by the "owner(s)" of the repeater.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Fortunately, that is the case; that the repeater owner has no established
rules. It's also a private (non-club) repeater...which makes it really,
really nice because there's no challenge to the non-rules :)

Jim/N2EY would ask for my definition of "no" in "no challenge" but you can
figure it out, I am sure.

Kim W5TIT

1493. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 00:05:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cba19c4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40762

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9d1js$p70$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cb9aedb_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a99al5cqi1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > The history of the world is filled with people who challenged the
rules.
> > > Not everyone wins, but we'd be no where as developed if people didn't
> > > challenge rules on occasion. In this instant case, you can do what
> > > wou wish, others (the vast majority of repeater users) have been
> > > making that challenge for years and helping other hams with
> > > traffic conditions, route instructions, etc with NO ill effects from
> > > the FCC.
> >
> > Bill, some people are cut out for more challenge than others. I am
> willing
> > to go to jail, say, overnight or for two or three days for something I
> > believe in. I am not willing to lose my ham radio license, or be heard
> > being involved in conversations of a questionable nature on ham radio by
> > scanner listeners or the general public.
> >
> > If you feel it is that OK to help each other get to work (where a
> pecuniary
> > interest is involved, why do you say above that others "have been making
> > that challenge for years"? WHAT challenge?
>
> Isay it because...IF, as you believe, talking traffic on the way
> to work constitutes a violation of the pecuniary interest
> prohibition, then all the thousands of such discussions
> have been challenging that interpretation for years.
>

Please don't misinterpret what I believe. I don't necessarily believe it
is a rules violation, as stipulated above. What I *do* believe is that
there's potential for it to be *CONSTRUED* as a rules violation. On laws
that can threaten me, I am pretty cut and dried: if you don't have
transmissions/communiation that are of a pecuniary interest, then you don't
talk about how to get to work.

> > >
> > > As to the legitamate use of ham radio for traffic condidtions,
> > > it seems we DO have FCC thinking on this. The FCC busted a ham
> > > for getting traffic conditions for (on behlf of) his employer,

> > > a broadcast station. The FCC did not then state that
> > > any/all traffic condition reporting among hams is or should
> > > be a forbidden topic. It was ONLY the ham that was doing
> > > the soliciting of traffic data for direct use by the broadcast
> > > station that got in trouble. If the other hams were in some
> > > way guilty of violating the "pecuniary" use rules (even if
> > > the FCC viewed them as unintended participants) because
> > > the sukect (traffic conditions) is verbotin, then why didn't
> > > the FCC so state that?
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Like I said, I doubt this is something the FCC is really all that
willing
> to
> > get involved with. It's benign enough that, even if it is wrong and
could
> > be used in a court of law as being wrong, what is the real harm in it?
I
> > mean, after all, most of us know that there are a lot of abuses on ham
> radio
> > that go virtually ignored.
>
> The FCC saw fit to weigh in on the "pizza order" via autopatch
> because enough hams were being given grief by other hams
> that a clarification was requested...and the FCC obliged.
> Clearly your opinion on traffic discussions is of such a minority
> view that whatever teasing you do is so limited, no one cares.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

True. And, neither do I (care that other hams think it's OK). The point
that I highlight is that *if* it is ever brought into question--it *won't*
be because someone heard *me* involved in a communication like that...

Other than that, it is simple mind masturbation.

Kim W5TIT

1494. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 00:11:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cba1b3c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40765

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9d1sb$i3l$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3CB9DD30.236BA96B@worldnet.att.net...
> > I just got an invitation to join this organization. Is this
> > the new name of the American Radio Relay League, or some
> > veiled attempt at a takeover by W5YI et.al.?
>
> Clay,
> How about some details?
>
> What's their address?
> What do they say they will do?
> What's the member benefits?
> Any publication(s)?
>
> As to your specific questions...I am unaware
> of any name change for ARRL and I have
> heard of no effort by W5YI to start any
> alternative organization.
>
>

Wow! You are kidding, right? Bill, are you a member of the ARRL? The reason I ask is because if you get QST, look at the very top right corner of your magazine when you get it in the next couple of days, if you haven't already received it.

You'll see the tagline "the national association for AMATEUR RADIO" right under the ARRL initials. I can't think of when this came about...maybe about 6-7-8 months ago. Not without some debate (as usual) also. In fact, the agreement that was signed between REACT and the ARRL was seen, by many amateurs, as a 2nd slap in face by the ARRL after introducing the idea of this tagline--many believed that the ARRL was "positioning" itself to become the all inclusive (CB, FRS, ARS, etc.) radio organization. The agreement with REACT was seen by some to be the first "official" act to bring on board CB to the matters of the ARRL.

I'm sure Ed can highlight some of the debate that went on, there was even some of it here on this newsgroup--surprise, surprise.

Kim W5TIT

1495. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 00:25:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guktr2a.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 40763

On Sun, 14 Apr 2002 18:56:36 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Isay it because...IF, as you believe, talking traffic on the way
>to work constitutes a violation of the pecuniary interest
>prohibition, then all the thousands of such discussions
>have been challenging that interpretation for years.

My two cents' worth is that this type of discussion is not a
violation unless one is generating a traffic report for a non-ham
orgsnization who will be using it for their own precumiary purposes.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1496. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 00:25:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guku5ub.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 40764

On Sun, 14 Apr 2002 19:01:06 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> I just got an invitation to join this organization. Is this
>> the new name of the American Radio Relay League, or some
>> veiled attempt at a takeover by W5YI et.al.?
>
>Clay,
>How about some details?
>
>What's their address?
>What do they say they will do?
>What's the member benefits?
>Any publication(s)?
>
>As to your specific questions...I am unaware
>of any name change for ARRL and I have
>heard of no effort by W5YI to start any
>alternative organization.

The ARRL now identifies as:

ARRL - the national association for AMATEUR RADIO

See it on the letterhead and on the cover of QST.

IIRC this was done by resolution of the Board late last year to
emphasize the "advocacy of amateeur radio" function of the League.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

1497. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 00:42:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020414204257.13101.00000645@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 40766

In article <a99al5cqi1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>The point is that the practice

(discussing traffic situations)

> is widespread and, if it was in
>violation would likly have encountered the rath of the FCC
>already. We're talking a decade or more of active repeater
>use.

More like a quarter century or more, Bill.

I first got on 2 meter FM in 1977, by building a Heathkit HW-2036 kit.
Traffic conditions were a common topic back then everywhere I went,
and I traveled quite a bit back then. FCC never had a problem with it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1498. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 01:05:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020414210514.07832.00001527@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40771

In article <a99c49$hi4$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Bill:
>> I don't recall ever claiming that it was. However, it is the avoidance
>> of this effort which is the underlying motivation of the NCTA. Of
>> course, they cannot, and will not, admit this.
>
>Larry,
>Let me give you a partial agreement. It is the avoidence of effort
>to accomplish a skill which can NOT be justified as a requirement
>that NCTA opposes.

Bill:

Thanks for your most gracious agreement, even if "partial." However,
IMHO, code testing in the ARS is very well justified, considering the
valuable characteristics of the Morse/CW mode, and the fact that
they cannot be exploited by hams unless they *do* expend the effort
to learn the Morse code at a useful proficiency level.

>Clearly, if testing for CW ends, then an
>individual won't need to expend the time/effort to learn morse...unless
>that person wants to do so voluntarily.

Allow me to point out that *everything* a person has to do to become
a radio amateur is "voluntary." The retention of code testing is justified
within the overall set of requirements which must be voluntarily met,
due to the benefits to the ARS of retaining this capability among future
licensees.

>Generically, I oppose any requirements which can not be
>rationally defended as being needed.

And, my dear friend, I have "rationally defended" code testing
requirements here, on Fidonet, and in comments to the FCC, for
over twelve years.

>That's true for just
>about everything in life as I see it. All my kids learned
>to drive standard shift vehicles...not because they just
>wanted to, they did so because if they didn't they wouldn't
>be able to drive at all since every car we own is manual.

And I have absolutely no problem with the fact that you levied
this "requirement," even if by default. My own girlfriend finds it
very inconvenient that she can't "borrow" my car because it

has a 5-speed manual gearbox, which she stubbornly refuses
to learn how to drive.

>There will be those hams that come to ham radio and discover
>there are other hams out there that only use morse code.
>Some of those new hams will learn code to talk to
>them. Of that I am certain. You, Larry, can be a
>champion for the mode...or you can bemoan the lack
>of code testing and convince no one of its value as
>you see that value. The choice is yours.

Perhaps you're right, Bill, and, in my own way, I have
"championed" the mode for nearly as long as I have been a
ham. I have taught the code to many hams, and have
encouraged others to learn it without actually acting as the
"Elmer" of record. However, I know from personal
experience that without the code testing requirement, a
prime motivation to actually make the first attempts to
learn it simply won't exist for the overwhelming majority
of future hams. I learned the code to access HF voice
privileges, and for no other reason at the time. I became
a code advocate *after* I learned it, not before. This
experience taught me a lesson about the value of having
certain "requirements" set for us -- they have the benefit
not only of triggering a need to do something we would not
ordinarily have done, but they ensure the continuation of
valuable skills.

As a corollary, soon we will have jet airliners that can literally
fly themselves, from gate-to-gate, through the entire flight
regime...without human intervention. Does this mean that we
no longer need to train pilots to fly them "by hand" as well?
I say absolutely not, for obvious reasons. If any computer has
ever crashed, for any reason whatsoever, we then see the
need for human pilots to be in the cockpits of our airliners,
forever. And unless the laws of physics and economics which
make Morse/CW a highly practical, robust, and easily implemented
mode are somehow revoked, we will always benefit from
the requirement for radio amateurs to learn it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1499. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 01:05:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020414210515.07832.00001529@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40768

In article <a998jtnju1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>As to not believing what might be told, that's
>bunk. I took Larry's incident description at
>its face value and I agree with Larry that if that is
>what happened, then that is wrong. Can I state
>with any certainty that it happened exactly
>the way Larry said it did? No I can't, but neither
>can I say that it did.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

It occurred at the 1995 Maryland ARRL State Convention at the
Timonium Hamfest, Timonium, Maryland. Then ARRL Atlantic
Division Director Kay Craigie, WT3P, and then ARRL Vice President
Hugh Turnbull, W3ABC, were the ARRL officials present. You
could ask if they recall the incident. I never got the name or call
sign of the enraged NCTA YL who led the pack of attack dogs that
were set on me the minute I mentioned "code testing" -- mainly
because she never stopped yelling long enough for me to do so.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1500. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 01:05:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020414210515.07832.00001528@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40770

In article <20020412234415.02551.00001673@mb-dh.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>> I mentioned support for code testing, and the representative
>>> of the NCTA side was permitted to run roughshod over me, ...
>>
>>You probably shouldn't have called the NCTA folk "MFSOB's". :-)
>
>Cecil:
>
>Of course! Which is why I didn't! Unfortunately, I was called that,
>and much worse, by the NCTA shrew -- and the ARRL "officials"
>running the meeting just let it happen!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Upon further reflection, I wish to retract the above statement. During the incident I mentioned, I was not actually called a "MFSOB." I was, however, accused of a variety of things detrimental to the ARS, mainly because I held the opinion that more could and should be done to support code testing requirements. I humbly apologize for the confusion. I also apologize for referring to the NCTA/YL as a "shrew." I have a conscience about such things, and just want to avoid the same emotional over-reaction that I was subjected to at the time. This incident did leave somewhat of an emotional scar, and has colored my attitude toward the ARRL ever since. Perhaps I need to "get over it."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1501. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 01:05:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020414210516.07832.00001531@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40767

In article <20020413015027.29991.00002348@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>I've been a professional illustrator....(SNIP)
>
> Oh Geeze!...Now Lennie's an "arr-teeste"

Steve:

Anything like that guy with the spray can in "Death Wish?"

73 de Larry, K3LT

1502. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 01:05:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020414210516.07832.00001530@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40769

In article <20020413005746.01569.00000048@mb-mg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>Larrie;
>
>I must admit to some ignorance. I've been a professional
>illustrator but have NEVER seen such a BIG brush used to
>paint yourself in such bright DayGlo purity and saintliness!
>
>Truly superb self-aggrandizement!
>
>You've come a long, long way since you told everyone about
>your soma cum loud in Human Resources and how you would
>"soon" be an HR "manager!"

Lennie:

Well, I guess I was wrong about that, at least for now. After having spent most of a Summer interviewing for HR positions, I discovered that I was apparently the wrong sex, the wrong age, and the wrong color to get into that particular field. In the meantime, this job came along, with much better pay, a complete benefits package, retirement, etc. So I took it, and discovered that I like it. Forgive me for disappointing you.

>Now you hock a loogie on the newsgroup floor and call yourself
>a "SPLATOO."

And, by the way, I've even refined my job title while retaining the same acronym. I'm now a "Special Passenger Lift-Adapted Transit Omnibus Operator (SPLATOO).

>It's poetic. In fact, it's onomatopoesy!!!

Is that anything like onomatopoeiasy? (Note to Kim: An onomatopoeia is the naming of a thing by the sound it makes. Just didn't want you scratching your head too hard over this one!)

>...must be the effect of listening to too many beepings...tsk, tsk.

Whatever you say, Whiney.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1503. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 02:36:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cba3d0c$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40773

Oh buhruther...

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020414210515.07832.00001528@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <20020412234415.02551.00001673@mb-dh.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >>> I mentioned support for code testing, and the representative
> >>> of the NCTA side was permitted to run roughshod over me, ...
> >>
> >>You probably shouldn't have called the NCTA folk "MFSOB's". :-)
> >
> >Cecil:
> >
> >Of course! Which is why I didn't! Unfortunately, I was called that,
> >and much worse, by the NCTA shrew -- and the ARRL "officials"
> >running the meeting just let it happen!
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Upon further reflection, I wish to retract the above statement. During
> the incident I mentioned, I was not actually called a "MFSOB." I
> was, however, accused of a variety of things detrimental to the ARS,
> mainly because I held the opinion that more could and should be
> done to support code testing requirements. I humbly apologize for
> the confusion. I also apologize for referring to the NCTA/YL as a
> "shrew." I have a conscience about such things, and just want to
> avoid the same emotional over-reaction that I was subjected to at
> the time. This incident did leave somewhat of an emotional scar,
> and has colored my attitude toward the ARRL ever since. Perhaps
> I need to "get over it."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

1504. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 02:46:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CBA3EF2.96AC77F8@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40772

>
> Didn't the FCC stop issuing actual station licenses some
> years back?
>
> Also, even IF station liceses exist, isn't it correct that
> the call sign need not be used by another person
> operating my station. That other person can operate
> my home station using their own call sign, making
> no reference to my call sign, as long as the operation
> by that person is within the privileges of that person's
> license.

I suppose, when you operate from a friend's ham set-up,
it's yours for the duration of the operating session. Then
you give it back when you're done. Oh, you should give
it a brief inspection ("okay, it looks like a Kenwood
and a beam for 10-15-20") to be reasonably sure that
it will work properly without trashing the spectrum.

With modern equipment, the FCC doesn't get that
worried about technical foul-ups. When was the
last time someone got a NAL for a technical
problem? Most NALs are for bad behavior.

1505. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 02:50:40 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CBA3FFF.CB701A2E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40774

CAM wrote:

> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > Jim, I've given up on even trying to communicate with you, but I'll make an
> > exception to say that your "all" and my "all" are two different things.
>
> Is an all-band-antenna still an all-band-antenna if it's not used on all bands? :-)

What about the WARC bands? Some people may say "all bands" and have
actually meant "160, 80, 40, 20, 15 and 10 meters". Or maybe not even
include 160.

1506. Onomatopoeia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 02:54:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cba4162_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40776

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020414210516.07832.00001530@mb-mv.aol.com...
>
> Lennie:
>
> Well, I guess I was wrong about that, at least for now. After having
> spent most of a Summer interviewing for HR positions, I discovered
> that I was apparently the wrong sex, the wrong age, and the wrong
> color to get into that particular field.
>

Oh, that'll get you a cup of coffee for sure. If credentials don't work,
it's everything else's fault. Have you ever looked back on your repertoire
of excuses in your posts that you make defending how you have "always been
passed over?" Maybe you interview really crappy, Larry. Maybe you have a
really bad personality. Your antics here on this newsgroup certainly aren't
those preferrably seen in an HR person. Maybe the interviewer was smart
enough to perceive your failure before you wasted their time and yours.

>
> In the meantime, this job came
> along, with much better pay, a complete benefits package,
> retirement, etc. So I took it, and discovered that I like it. Forgive me
> for disappointing you.
>
> >Now you hock a loogie on the newsgroup floor and call yourself
> >a "SPLATOO."
>
> And, by the way, I've even refined my job title while retaining the
> same acronym. I'm now a "Special Passenger Lift-Adapted
> Transit Omnibus Operator (SPLATOO).
>
> >It's poetic. In fact, it's onomatopoesy!!!
>
> Is that anything like onomatopoeiasy? (Note to Kim: An
> onomatopoeia is the naming of a thing by the sound it makes.
> Just didn't want you scratching your head too hard over this
> one!)
>
> >...must be the effect of listening to too many beepings...tsk, tsk.
>
> Whatever you say, Whiney.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I am certain, Larry, that your vocabulary is a far cry from mine and even I had to look this up. Incidentally, I'm not so sure your or Len's use of the word, nor its spelling, was quite up to measure. Here ya go, maybe this will help:

Onomatopoeia

Definition
Onomatopoeia is a figure of speech in which the sound of a word echoes the thing it describes.
It is a form of symbolism in sound.

Examples:
Buzz pop bang
Swish cuckoo hissing
Burble twitter sizzle

Use
Onomatopoeia is used for emphasis or stylistic effect.
It is featured very heavily in children's rhymes and poetry in general.
It is also used extensively in advertising, as in the slogan 'Snap, crackle, pop!'.

NB! 'Onomatopoeia' is derived from the Greek term 'make a word'.

1507. Re: Onomatopoeia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 02:56:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cba41e2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40778

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cba4162_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020414210516.07832.00001530@mb-mv.aol.com...
> >
> > Lennie:
> >
> > Well, I guess I was wrong about that, at least for now. After having
> > spent most of a Summer interviewing for HR positions, I discovered
> > that I was apparently the wrong sex, the wrong age, and the wrong
> > color to get into that particular field.
> >
>
> Oh, that'll get you a cup of coffee for sure. If credentials don't work,
> it's everything else's fault. Have you ever looked back on your
repertoire
> of excuses in your posts that you make defending how you have "always been
> passed over?" Maybe you interview really crappy, Larry. Maybe you have a
> really bad personality. Your antics here on this newsgroup certainly
aren't
> those preferrably seen in an HR person. Maybe the interviewer was smart
> enough to perceive your failure before you wasted their time and yours.
>
> >
> > In the meantime, this job came
> > along, with much better pay, a complete benefits package,
> > retirement, etc. So I took it, and discovered that I like it. Forgive
me
> > for disappointing you.
> >
> > >Now you hock a loogie on the newsgroup floor and call yourself
> > >a "SPLATOO."
> >
> > And, by the way, I've even refined my job title while retaining the
> > same acronym. I'm now a "Special Passenger Lift-Adapted
> > Transit Omnibus Operator (SPLATOO).
> >
> > >It's poetic. In fact, it's onomatopoesy!!!
> >
> > Is that anything like onomatopoeiasy? (Note to Kim: An
> > onomatopoeia is the naming of a thing by the sound it makes.
> > Just didn't want you scratching your head too hard over this
> > one!)
> >

> > >...must be the effect of listening to too many beepings...tsk, tsk.
> >
> > Whatever you say, Whiney.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> I am certain, Larry, that your vocabulary is a far cry from mine and even
I
> had to look this up. Incidentally, I'm not so sure your or Len's use of
the
> word, nor its spelling, was quite up to measure. Here ya go, maybe this
> will help:
>
> Onomatopoeia
>
> Definition
> Onomatopoeia is a figure of speech in which the sound of a word echoes the
> thing it describes.
> It is a form of symbolism in sound.
>
> Examples:
> Buzz pop bang
> Swish cuckoo hissing
> Burble twitter sizzle
>
> Use
> Onomatopoeia is used for emphasis or stylistic effect.
> It is featured very heavily in children's rhymes and poetry in general.
> It is also used extensively in advertising, as in the slogan 'Snap,
crackle,
> pop!'.
>
> NB! 'Onomatopoeia' is derived from the Greek term 'make a word'.
>

Whoops, I forgot to cite my reference (there's lots more on the topic, just use Altavista and do a search on Onomatopoeia) But, here's where I got the information above:

http://dh1a-2.coventry.ac.uk/studyskills/english/Onomat.htm

1508. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 02:59:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40775

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> I would. Though I do not. I've cursed on the air. I don't do it often,
> but I'll use the words "damn" "hell" "crap" and, you know, all those that
> are commonly used to imply the same and worse.

You occasionally hear such on commercial terrestrial broadcast TV.
I've even heard the "F" word on the CBS network (when they had the
Sept 11th fireman special a few weeks ago). The word didn't end....

1509. Re: Traffic Reporting on Repeaters - Broadcasting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:06:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9dg7v$840$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40777

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.guktr2a.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 14 Apr 2002 18:56:36 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >I say it because...IF, as you believe, talking traffic on the way
> >to work constitutes a violation of the pecuniary interest
> >prohibition, then all the thousands of such discussions
> >have been challenging that interpretation for years.
>
> My two cents' worth is that this type of discussion is not a
> violation unless one is generating a traffic report for a non-ham
> orgsnization who will be using it for their own precumiary purposes.
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Thanks Phil,

As a past FCCer, your weighing in is the closest we have to
an actual FCC interpretation.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1510. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:15:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9dgqk$6kl$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40782

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020414210514.07832.00001527@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <a99c49$hi4$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Bill:
> >> I don't recall ever claiming that it was. However, it is the avoidance
> >> of this effort which is the underlying motivation of the NCTA. Of
> >> course, they cannot, and will not, admit this.
> > >
> > >Larry,
> > >Let me give you a partial agreement. It is the avoidence of effort
> > >to accomplish a skill which can NOT be justified as a requirement
> > >that NCTA opposes.
> >
> > Bill:
> > Thanks for your most gracious agreement, even if "partial." However,
> > IMHO, code testing in the ARS is very well justified, considering the
> > valuable characteristics of the Morse/CW mode, and the fact that
> > they cannot be exploited by hams unless they *do* expend the effort
> > to learn the Morse code at a useful proficiency level.

Fair enough, that's your opinion and argument. We
obviously disagree on that.

> > >Clearly, if testing for CW ends, then an
> > >individual won't need to expend the time/effort to learn morse...unless
> > >that person wants to do so voluntarily.
> >
> > Allow me to point out that *everything* a person has to do to become
> > a radio amateur is "voluntary."

Agreed...but IF a person wants to become a ham,
those no longer are voluntary IF a license is the
end goal. I know the issue of "voluntary" has been debated
in the past ad nauseum...so let's just agree to disagree
as to if/when voluntary becomes required.

> > The retention of code testing is justified
> > within the overall set of requirements which must be voluntarily met,
> > due to the benefits to the ARS of retaining this capability among future
> > licensees.

Again, we disagree. So be it.

> >Generically, I oppose any requirements which can not be
> >rationally defended as being needed.
>
> And, my dear friend, I have "rationally defended" code testing
> requirements here, on Fidonet, and in comments to the FCC, for
> over twelve years.

I'll agree that you have defended your position.
We again must disagree as to if that has been
rationally based.

> >There will be those hams that come to ham radio and discover
> >there are other hams out there that only use morse code.
> >Some of those new hams will learn code to talk to
> >them. Of that I am certain. You, Larry, can be a
> >champion for the mode...or you can bemoan the lack
> >of code testing and convince no one of its value as
> >you see that value. The choice is yours.
>
> Perhaps you're right, Bill, and, in my own way, I have
> "championed" the mode for nearly as long as I have been a
> ham. I have taught the code to many hams, and have
> encouraged others to learn it without actually acting as the
> "Elmer" of record. However, I know from personal
> experience that without the code testing requirement, a
> prime motivation to actually make the first attempts to
> learn it simply won't exist for the overwhelming majority
> of future hams. I learned the code to access HF voice
> privileges, and for no other reason at the time. I became
> a code advocate *after* I learned it, not before. This
> experience taught me a lesson about the value of having
> certain "requirements" set for us -- they have the benefit
> not only of triggering a need to do something we would not
> ordinarily have done, but they ensure the continuation of
> valuable skills.
>
> As a corollary, soon we will have jet airliners that can literally
> fly themselves, from gate-to-gate, through the entire flight
> regime...without human intervention. Does this mean that we
> no longer need to train pilots to fly them "by hand" as well?
> I say absolutely not, for obvious reasons. If any computer has
> ever crashed, for any reason whatsoever, we then see the
> need for human pilots to be in the cockpits of our airliners,
> forever. And unless the laws of physics and economics which
> make Morse/CW a highly practical, robust, and easily implemented
> mode are somehow revoked, we will always benefit from
> the requirement for radio amateurs to learn it.

As above, let's just agree to disagree.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1511. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:16:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020414231603.07832.00001540@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40780

In article <3CB99C89.2FD6B2FD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Just wondering if the Stephen Anderson on America's Most Wanted is/was
>a ham. He had a shortwave broadcasting setup in his home.

Cecil:

He used to be; his call was AA8DP. He turned in his ticket. I guess
being a licensee of the federal government would not have done his
credibility much good.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1512. "...one step closer to extinction." (Was: Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:16:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020414231604.07832.00001541@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40779

In article <3cb9a9c9_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>See Hans? I told you there's plenty of repeater kops...
>

This from the person who chides those who make a perfectly legal
and reasonable request for a weather report on the local repeater.
Another example of taking the ARS "...one step closer to extinction."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1513. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:16:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020414231604.07832.00001542@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40781

In article <3cb9aa89_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Those guidelines are quite clear. We can use ham radio to order a
>> pizza, but we can't use it to sell a pizza. The fact that the person at
>> Domino's who answers the phone when you place the autopatch call
>> is "selling" pizza doesn't constitute use of amateur radio to deliberately
>> advertise and market his product. If the amateur him/herself is in the
>> role of a "customer," then his/her use of ham radio to avail him/herself
>> of such goods and services is perfectly OK. In the case of my
>> accountant getting directions, there is no issue, since the professional
>> details of the visit would not enter into the content of the conversation.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>If the ham was working at the pizza place and you called, you'd both be in
>that gray area. If your accountant is a ham and going to your house for the
>purpose of providing you with a service for which he is going to charge,
>you'd be in the gray area.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

As usual, you are totally incorrect. Neither example is even remotely
"gray." If a licensed amateur is employed at a Domino's Pizza, answers
the phone, and it's a ham radio friend of his on the autopatch ordering
a pizza, then the only relationship that exists is the normal merchant/
customer relationship. They can, during the phone/autopatch QSO,
talk about ham radio, use call signs, and order the pizza right down to
the last anchovy, and still never be anything but absolutely, perfectly
legal under Part 97 Rules. Now, if the ham at Domino's installs a
transceiver at his store location, then proceeds to use it to take orders
for pizza, THEN he has violated Part 97 rules. However, the autopatch-
to-landline pizza order is absolutely, perfectly, and metaphysically
legal. I have personally used the autopatch to order Chinese take-out
many times. My accountant using ham radio to get directions is also
perfectly legal, as long as we do not, as already stated, discuss the
details of the professional nature of his visit.

Again, I warn you -- you are not qualified to determine "gray areas"
with regard to ham radio communications. I am. You are not. Stay
out of this. You are beyond your depth. Go back to chiding people
for wishing to get a WX report on your local repeater. At least there,

you can act like a big shot know-it-all repeater cop, without being among others who realize what a fool you are making of yourself -- except for the guy asking for the WX report.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1514. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:24:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9dhbvgjr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40783

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.guku5ub.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > Clay wrote:
> >> I just got an invitation to join this organization. Is this
> >> the new name of the American Radio Relay League, or some
> >> veiled attempt at a takeover by W5YI et.al.?

> The ARRL now identifies as:
>
> ARRL - the national association for AMATEUR RADIO
>
> See it on the letterhead and on the cover of QST.
>
> IIRC this was done by resolution of the Board late last year to
> emphasize the "advocacy of amateeur radio" function of the League.

Assuming that is so. Clay referenced:
The National Association for Amateur radio...he did not
state it as you have above, to wit, ARRL - the national
association for AMATEUR RADIO.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1515. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:26:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cba48f0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40784

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> > I would. Though I do not. I've cursed on the air. I don't do it
often,
> > but I'll use the words "damn" "hell" "crap" and, you know, all those
that
> > are commonly used to imply the same and worse.
>
> You occasionally hear such on commercial terrestrial broadcast TV.
> I've even heard the "F" word on the CBS network (when they had the
> Sept 11th fireman special a few weeks ago). The word didn't end....
>

Aw, this question of "did you say" is really an exercise in semantics. Except for the few instances in which people *really do* refrain from cursing or implying cursing, it is everywhere on the bands. What is the difference between hearing the phrase, "screw that" and "f___ that?" To me, there is none, as the implication is equal to its counterpart. One of the most humorous conversations I've ever heard on ham radio is that of a discussion about the corona balls on top of antennas...hilarious and they do it with a straight voice!! Once again, too, these same people that discuss the corona balls are the same people who'd likely tell others that discussions of politics and religion, etc., are not good on ham radio. Balderdash, I say. I wonder if balderdash is a good example of Onomatopoeia? Oh well, that's another thread also...

If only George Carlin were a ham...we could tell him that it's his *responsibility* (referring to another thread wherein it is implied that famous people have a responsibility to promote ham radio) to amateur radio to put out a list of, oh heck...what was it, Seven Curse words? Whatever it was, ham radio could double it...LOL

And, yes, you are right. Anything that is transmitted over public airwaves is equal to what can be said over ham radio...at least that is my understanding of the legality of language in ham radio. If Howard Stern can say what he says on broadcast radio, then we could also say it over ham radio. Not that we should, but we could. I can't remember their callsigns now, but there used to be two attorneys who are hams and would have really early drivetimes (like 5AM). One morning they got into this very discussion and it was their conclusion that it would be hard to press the issue of hams using "curse" words over the air, when broadcast radio does it.

It really boils down to a matter of interpretation...my "screw" is your "f___" and your "ahole" is my "asshole." Ewww, that didn't come out right, eh? OHMYGAWD, neither did that...LOL I better stop while I'm behind...whoops, there I go again.

(By the way, the above stuff could have been said on ham radio)... :)

Kim W5TIT

1516. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:38:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cba4ba3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40785

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020414231604.07832.00001542@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3cb9aa89_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Those guidelines are quite clear. We can use ham radio to order a
> >> pizza, but we can't use it to sell a pizza. The fact that the person
at
> >> Domino's who answers the phone when you place the autopatch call
> >> is "selling" pizza doesn't constitute use of amateur radio to
deliberately
> >> advertise and market his product. If the amateur him/herself is in the
> >> role of a "customer," then his/her use of ham radio to avail
him/herself
> >> of such goods and services is perfectly OK. In the case of my
> >> accountant getting directions, there is no issue, since the
professional
> >> details of the visit would not enter into the content of the
conversation.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >If the ham was working at the pizza place and you called, you'd both be
in
> >that gray area. If your accountant is a ham and going to your house for
the
> >purpose of providing you with a service for which he is going to charge,
> >you'd be in the gray area.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> As usual, you are totally incorrect. Neither example is even remotely
> "gray." If a licensed amateur is employed at a Domino's Pizza, answers
> the phone, and it's a ham radio friend of his on the autopatch ordering
> a pizza, then the only relationship that exists is the normal merchant/
> customer relationship.
>

How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and his
buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
Larry?

>
> They can, during the phone/autopatch QSO,
> talk about ham radio, use call signs, and order the pizza right down to
> the last anchovy, and still never be anything but absolutely, perfectly
> legal under Part 97 Rules.
>

That is *your* interpretation. I think there are more than a few (no I am not going to count them Jim) who would disagree with you...however, simply stated, I just simply disagree with you.

>
> Again, I warn you -- you are not qualified to determine "gray areas"
> with regard to ham radio communications. I am. You are not. Stay
> out of this. You are beyond your depth. Go back to chiding people
> for wishing to get a WX report on your local repeater. At least there,
> you can act like a big shot know-it-all repeater cop, without being
> among others who realize what a fool you are making of yourself --
> except for the guy asking for the WX report.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Hope the vocabulary lesson on Onomatopoeia will help expand your brain a little. It needs a whole lot more than a little expansion, but that'll be a start...

And, hmmmmm, the guy asking for the weather report pretty much lives in the same area I do...why in the hell does he need a weather report? It could be pouring down rain where I am, and bright and sunny where he is. My answer to him would be, "give it a few minutes and see if anything changes. Get back to us if it does, because then maybe it'll have changed here, too."

And, why would any fool driving around in a city, near a city, around a city, think that there is going to be anything but traffic jam conditions on all the main roads into and out of that city? Good grief, Larry. Discussions of medical conditions are not OK for you, but discussions of weather and traffic are. So, as usual, everyone must think and act like you. Thank goodness, your will not be done.

Kim W5TIT

1517. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:55:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBA4F43.7126153F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40786

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Allow me to point out that *everything* a person has to do to become
> a radio amateur is "voluntary."

Allow me to point out that passing an exam is NOT voluntary for
licensed amateur radio operators - it is required.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1518. It's been 2 years since restructuring now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 03:57:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CBA4FAE.FC2D03BA@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40787

And as far as I can tell, HF has not gone down
the toilet, become CB or such.

And I found that I do most of my operating on HF
nowadays since I got my upgrade 2 years ago.

The world didn't end....

1519. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 04:07:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBA51FF.7EEB6A78@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40788

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3CB99C89.2FD6B2FD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >Just wondering if the Stephen Anderson on America's Most Wanted is/was
> > >a ham. He had a shortwave broadcasting setup in his home.
>
> He used to be; his call was AA8DP. He turned in his ticket. I guess
> being a licensee of the federal government would not have done his
> credibility much good.

They played some of his broadcasts on America's Most Wanted. He sounded
a lot like the old Liberty Net.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1520. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 05:00:09 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cba5da2.34108061@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 40789

Yes, the ex-AA8DP.

I knew him going back to early 1993, when I started checking into the 3905 Century Club WAS Net when I was still licensed as KB7PKE.

He wasn't as radical then, but things started going downhill around 1995. He didn't check in as often, and was often heard up the band between 3930 and 3950.

Stacey AA7YA

On Sun, 14 Apr 2002 10:13:13 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

>Just wondering if the Stephen Anderson on America's Most Wanted is/was
>a ham. He had a shortwave broadcasting setup in his home.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
>-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1521. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 05:01:31 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a9fi4h0gno@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40827

If the ARRL is willing to provide the tapes, there are approximately 6 different broadcast TV stations that I currently work with in promotion of our club, and amateur radio in general. If there is any audio tapes/carts for radio I would also work with the radio stations in the area I would also take those to the radio stations I deal with.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020412061852.20572.00002625@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Well, I've been looking, both now and for years, and I haven't *seen*
> >any ARRL PSA's since perhaps the late '80's, when I was stationed
> >in Germany.
>
> Go to http://www.arrl.org and look at the media public relations web page.
It
> will tell you some about the PSAs (though not quite enough for my taste).
>
> When and how they get run is a local broadcasting decision, not an ARRL
one.
> Is this important enough to you that you are willing to work with your
local
> broadcasters to persuade them to air them?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare,W1RFI

1522. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 05:04:02 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cba5ebe.34391942@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 40790

On Sun, 14 Apr 2002 23:07:27 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>
>They played some of his broadcasts on America's Most Wanted. He sounded
>a lot like the old Liberty Net.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Thats what I was guessing too. Sounded like his Liberty Net rants.

--
Stacey, AA7YA

1523. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 06:55:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9dtgd$56f$0@208.206.142.77>
Source record: 40791

"S. Hanrahan" wrote:
>
> Yes, the ex-AA8DP.
>
> I knew him going back to early 1993, when I started checking into the
> 3905 Century Club WAS Net when I was still licensed as KB7PKE.
>
> He wasn't as radical then, but things started going downhill around
> 1995. He didn't check in as often, and was often heard up the band
> between 3930 and 3950.

So what's he wanted for?

1524. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 07:00:33 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9dton$84q$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40792

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9dhbvgjr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.guku5ub.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > > Clay wrote:
> > >> I just got an invitation to join this organization. Is this
> > >> the new name of the American Radio Relay League, or some
> > >> veiled attempt at a takeover by W5YI et.al.?
> >
> > > The ARRL now identifies as:
> > >
> > > ARRL - the national association for AMATEUR RADIO
> > >
> > > See it on the letterhead and on the cover of QST.
> > >
> > > IIRC this was done by resolution of the Board late last year to
> > > emphasize the "advocacy of amateeur radio" function of the League.
> >
> Assuming that is so. Clay referenced:
> The National Association for Amateur radio...he did not
> state it as you have above, to wit, ARRL - the national
> association for AMATEUR RADIO.

What about the National Association FOR Amateur Radio? Or the NATIONAL
Association for Amateur Radio? Or the National Association for Amateur
RadiO? And who can forget the |\|ATI0NASL A550viatoin4 A/\/\8URr R4dio ?

--
It Came From c!!!!!!!!111 I will HACK you L... smithsuncLaimed ymsteReis.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

1525. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 09:24:18 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <D5DFE33B3A0274F4.3666F0BC5C672C7A.990152FB30D16A99@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40793

On Sun, 14 Apr 2002 12:15:09 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Hey, Joe: I hate being an "armchair activist" but, here goes. I come from
>the days when, literally, 50-60 people showing up for a DFW traffic net was
>a light turnout.

I'm getting an average of 8-10. Not sure what Early's average is, but
when I listen it seems to be just a few more. I'd settle for ten
regulars interested in NCS/ANCS spots, and a dozen or so others who
each make it two or three times a week.

>In those days, however, there were dinners, parties and
>lots of eyeball get togethers among net participants. Maybe a resurgence of
>those would get more people involved.

That's a definite possibility. If we do anything along those lines,
we'll probably get both nets together on it. Even though they're
technically separate, most people (myself included) tend to think of
them more as two sessions of one net.

>Sounds "cheap" but people thrive on getting together. Also, people thrive
>on feeling a part of something. I've always, always thought that every time
>Dallas RACES is up on 146.880, then the DFW traffic net should be up on
>145.190.

Now that's an idea. I'm moderately active in Collin Co ARES, but I
know we have at least a few people who could handle being NCS while
I'm out spotting. Monitoring isn't really a problem for me either;
K5PRK has started linking in their 440 machine during the nets, and I
just got through setting up my extra dualband mobile as a portable
base station. (Through is a relative term...it's in a functional
intermediate stage until I have all the stuff I want to pack into the
casing...more details at http://www.kd5nrh.net on the 'My Projects'
page)

I think I'll run this one by the Early NM, and see what we can come up
with. After thinking it over for a few minutes, ideally, I'd like to
find a linked (or at least linkable) 2m/440 system near the center of
our regular coverage area, and see about getting permission to use it
for special NTS sessions anytime an ARES/RACES emergency net is active
in the core four counties. The .19 repeater is good, but it has a few
dead spots, (at least a dozen of them in my apartment complex's
parking lot) and IMO, one of the minor failings of the DFW nets is
that they're both on Dallas repeaters. It would be nice to get some
of the other cities actively participating.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1526. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 09:28:15 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <E3A7FDEF5DE0692A.82240CA81B0408B5.DCE3B50DB145937C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40794

On Fri, 12 Apr 2002 20:10:53 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>> Frankly, (although I am curious to hear how WA5I's back problem turns
>> out) I'd rather hear people talk about nothing but traffic jams all
>> day long on VHF than hear the seemingly endless detailed discussions
>> of prostate/colon/toenail/whatever dysfunction on 80m.

>Goodness...hope it's nothing serious. Please say howdy to him...it's been a
>long, long time

It's an old problem flaring up, but it's enough to put him in the
hospital. Apparently, there's a new surgical procedure that can fix
him up better than before, but they're having trouble finding a
surgeon that can do it. Carolyn, KC5OZT, has been keeping up with it,
and will generally announce the latest news on the Early net.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

1527. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 10:06:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415060653.09489.00000516@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40796

In article <20020414210515.07832.00001529@mb-mv.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <a998jtnju1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl" ><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>>As to not believing what might be told, that's
>>bunk. I took Larry's incident description at
>>its face value and I agree with Larry that if that is
>>what happened, then that is wrong. Can I state
>>with any certainty that it happened exactly
>>the way Larry said it did? No I can't, but neither
>>can I say that it did.
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>Bill:
>
>It occurred at the 1995 Maryland ARRL State Convention at the
>Timonium Hamfest, Timonium, Maryland. Then ARRL Atlantic
>Division Director Kay Craigie, WT3P, and then ARRL Vice President
>Hugh Turnbull, W3ABC, were the ARRL officials present. You
>could ask if they recall the incident. I never got the name or call
>sign of the enraged NCTA YL who led the pack of attack dogs that
>were set on me the minute I mentioned "code testing" -- mainly
>because she never stopped yelling long enough for me to do so.
>
Larry,

Maybe, just maybe, the ARRL folks let the YL spew for a reason. They may have thought that by carrying on that way in a public forum, she destroyed her credibility and simply made herself look foolish.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1528. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 10:06:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415060654.09489.00000517@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40795

In article <3CB9C144.9006F663@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

> I had
>never heard of ELNEC when I was about to participate in Intel's
>AZ field day for the first time. A fellow ham employee just handed me
>a copy of ELNEC. Before I fired it up, I thought it was shareware.
>When I discovered it was copyrighted, I ordered my own copy.

Correlation is not causation - them's your own words. How do you know that he stole it because he was a ham and not because he was an employee of the same company as you?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1529. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 12:07:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40797

In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>I've even heard the "F" word on the CBS network (when they had the
>Sept 11th fireman special a few weeks ago). The wor[l]d didn't end....

Tell ya what - if a ham is ever in a similar situation as that fireman, I
won't have a problem with some strong language. Otherwise, it's
Not Acceptable. And the FCC agrees with me.

The content standards for broadcast services and the ARS are different,
and should be different. The BC folks have scheduled programs and warnings
that certain shows may be offensive or inappropriate. Amateur radio has no
such controls/protections, so hams must behave in a "G-rated" fashion on the
air. That's just the way it is.

Yes, some hams cuss on the air. Some even make a point of it, or think it's OK,
or a freedom of speech issue. None of those excuses is valid. Not to the FCC,
anyway.

The end result of cussing on the air is to damage the image of the ARS with the
public and the FCC, and to give ammunition to the enemies of the ARS. That's
why it's Not Acceptable.

Here's a scenario to consider:

Suppose a commercial radio service wants the FCC to reallocate 146-148 MHz to
them. Of course hams try to defend that half of 2 meters, pointing to the large
number of repeaters in that segment, public service, etc.

The commercial folks then provide the FCC with tapes of hams cussing on the
repeaters, chiding, teasing and "busting on" other hams for innocuous and
perfectly legal conversations about weather and traffic, and other Not
Acceptable behavior. How are hams going to argue against that?

What good is ARRL's "Big Project" if, when we try to demonstrate ham radio to
young people and their parents and teachers, the sort of thing described above
comes through the 'speaker? You don't get a second chance to make a first
impression.

Not Acceptable behavior doesn't just move Amateur Radio "one step closer to
extinction" - it's more like a full gallop in that direction.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1530. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 12:07:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415080705.19000.00000862@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40798

In article <3cba4ba3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

(K3LT wrote):

>> As usual, you are totally incorrect. Neither example is even remotely
>> "gray." If a licensed amateur is employed at a Domino's Pizza, answers
>> the phone, and it's a ham radio friend of his on the autopatch ordering
>> a pizza, then the only relationship that exists is the normal merchant/
>> customer relationship.
>>
>
>How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and his
>buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
>Larry?

Simple. If the individuals involved do not make a point of mentioning the name
or location of the pizza shop any more than necessary, they are not
advertising.

>> They can, during the phone/autopatch QSO,
>> talk about ham radio, use call signs, and order the pizza right down to
>> the last anchovy, and still never be anything but absolutely, perfectly
>> legal under Part 97 Rules.
>
>That is *your* interpretation.

Not just Larry. It is the FCC's interpretation.

>I think there are more than a few who would disagree with you..however, simply
>stated, I just simply disagree with you.

Then you disagree with the FCC's stated policy as well.

>> Again, I warn you -- you are not qualified to determine "gray areas"
>> with regard to ham radio communications. I am. You are not. Stay
>> out of this. You are beyond your depth. Go back to chiding people
>> for wishing to get a WX report on your local repeater. At least there,
>> you can act like a big shot know-it-all repeater cop, without being
>> among others who realize what a fool you are making of yourself --
>> except for the guy asking for the WX report.

>Hope the vocabulary lesson on Onomatopoeia will help expand your brain a
>little.

That's middle-school stuff around these parts.
>

>And, hmmmmm, the guy asking for the weather report pretty much lives in the
>same area I do...why in the

(expletive deleted)

> does he need a weather report?

Weather prediction, then.

>It could be
>pouring down rain where I am, and bright and sunny where he is. My answer
>to him would be, "give it a few minutes and see if anything changes. Get
>back to us if it does, because then maybe it'll have changed here, too."

Are you always so friendly and helpful on the air?
>
>And, why would any fool driving around in a city, near a city, around a
>city, think that there is going to be anything but traffic jam conditions on
>all the main roads into and out of that city? Good grief, Larry.

Because in many situations traffic flows smoothly even a rush hour.

Here in Philly, for example, if I want to get from Center City to where I live
and work, there are at least 3 routes using the interstates:

I-676 east to I-95 south to I-476 north
I-676 west to I-76 east to I-95 south to I-476 north
I-676 west to I-76 west to I-476 south

Depending on traffic patterns, special events, breakdowns, accidents and
construction, any of these three routes can be the fastest or the slowest.
Variations in travel time of a half hour or more are common.

I have seen this same sort of thing in other cities, like Jacksonville, Florida
and Rochester, New York. Hams in and around those cities help each other
deal with the traffic.

--

Kim, you have chosen to live a long way from where you work, in a city with
inadequate roads and all-but-nonexistent transit. Your choice has pretty
much guaranteed you a long, frustrating, energy-inefficient, air-polluting
commute. Perhaps it bothers you that other hams in other places (like Larry)
have made different choices and don't have to got through that sort of commute
every working day.

In short, jealousy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1531. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 12:24:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415082440.01955.00003566@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40799

From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com

>QYM "Your mama!"
>QGM "Your Grandma!"
>QSC "Your sister's in love with a carrot!"

Dick Carroll can use QSH. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1532. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 12:26:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415082616.01955.00003567@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40800

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Your record of accurate reading others posts here is not exactly
>sterling, Ed.

Sure it is, Dick. That is just another twist. Care to back it up with enough examples to justify your statement?

I thought not...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1533. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 12:27:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415082741.01955.00003568@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40801

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Assuming your description is accuate, I'd agree it was a pretty shoddy
>way to have handled the situation.

Keep in mind that Larry has given us many examples of the horrible way he is treated, in nearly every aspect of his life. Just part of the context...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1534. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 12:34:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415083403.01955.00003569@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40802

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> So try this one- why do you think that so small a percentage of US hams
>ever join ARRL?

1. Your reason: They feel the ARRL HQ staff are elitists.

2. How many of the non-members do you think are not active as hams at all? I meet a number of licensed electronics engineers in my dealings with industry on RFI matters that tell me they haven't been on the air in years. (That dealing with industry on RFI matters must be part of my caring more about myself than ham radio...)

3. What percentage of those that are not members do you think became licensed, but never became active hams? I personally know about 3 or 4, and they are not really interested. Do you really expect them to be members?

4. What percentage of those that are not members are not even alive? With the 10-year expiration period, those that become silent keys can retain their license for 9.999 years.

5. What percentage of those that are not members may be in some financial straits and are choosing not to pay for membership before they pay for groceries.

6. And some small percentage of non-members are letting their membership lapse to hold out for a book offer for ARRL to sign up again.

> I really believe I know. And the answer wouldn't be
>complimentary.
>It is simply that they don't believe the elitists who populate HQ care
>about members interests nearly as much as they do for their own.

Most of your conclusions are "simply" true -- too simply to be plausible.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1535. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 12:35:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415083558.01955.00003570@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40803

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> I never got the name or call
>sign of the enraged NCTA YL who led the pack of attack dogs ...

How convenient.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1536. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 12:39:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415083929.01955.00003571@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40804

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Bending with the wind and merely before the slightest breeze are quite
>different. Sometimes the slight breeze (few) trumps a heavy wind (the
>majority)

What would be in it for ARRL to go along with a minority view?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1537. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 13:06:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBAD059.37FF7718@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40805

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> "S. Hanrahan" wrote:
> >
> > Yes, the ex-AA8DP.
> >
> > I knew him going back to early 1993, when I started checking into the
> > 3905 Century Club WAS Net when I was still licensed as KB7PKE.
> >
> > He wasn't as radical then, but things started going downhill around
> > 1995. He didn't check in as often, and was often heard up the band
> > between 3930 and 3950.
>
> So what's he wanted for?

A host of weapons charges including emptying a 30 round magazine from
an automatic rifle into a highway patrol vehicle with the officer
hiding behind it. (attempted murder of a police officer)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1538. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 13:18:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBAD312.AC1DD079@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40806

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CB9C144.9006F663@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > I had
> >never heard of ELNEC when I was about to participate in Intel's
> >AZ field day for the first time. A fellow ham employee just handed me
> >a copy of ELNEC. Before I fired it up, I thought it was shareware.
> >When I discovered it was copyrighted, I ordered my own copy.
>
> How do you know that he stole it because he was a ham and not because
> he was an employee of the same company as you?

What he did was totally against Intel's written company policy. I've
seen Intel employees escorted to the door for stealing software.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1539. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 13:23:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBAD461.60B2D5B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40807

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Assuming your description is accuate, I'd agree it was a pretty shoddy
> >way to have handled the situation.
>
> Keep in mind that Larry has given us many examples of the horrible way he is
> treated, in nearly every aspect of his life. Just part of the context...

Yep, Larry must be the unluckiest person in the world to have had so many
authority figures abusing him.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1540. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 13:27:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBAD542.BDC8FE6F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40808

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > Bending with the wind and merely before the slightest breeze are quite
> >different. Sometimes the slight breeze (few) trumps a heavy wind (the
> >majority)
>
> What would be in it for ARRL to go along with a minority view?

To further the cause of the minority conspiracy, of course. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1541. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 13:58:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9emjvsfs1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40809

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb9b236$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "dnb" <dnb@comcastt.com> wrote in message
> news:0m_t8.22741$K5.2369052@bin5.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> > Would that be anything like gathering weather reports for one's
employer?
> I
> > frequently hear TV weather jocks referring to the amatuer radio reports
> > they've received. OK, technically (perhaps) filtered through the NWS,
but
> > ultimately they get credited on commercial broadcasts.
> > Sounds kinda "grey".
> >
>
> I wonder. Let me say that down here there's been a tendency to get every
> media outlet involved that can get involved so that no "preference" is
> implied. One of our local TV channels here used to have a "corner on the
> market" for ham radio when one of their primary weather people was the
only
> media weather "voice" on the air. In fact, there are some stories of how
> any other media weren't given "right" to enter a RACES net. Now, the
tides
> have turned and nearly all stations, TV *and* radio have hams--and all of
> them (that I know of) are allowed onto the RACES nets.
>
> That aside, I am not sure there would be anything wrong with a media
outlet
> using reports from ham radio. However, I believe that it is wrong for us
to
> repeat the things we hear on local commercial media outlets and on public
> service frequencies.

I missed this post yesterday. Are you suggesting that IF a
ham is listening to WABC-FM (New York City) and hears
a traffic alert about an accident at milepost 56 on I-80,
that the ham should not (or is prohibited from)
let other hams know what was reported? There is no
such prohibition I am aware of...unless you are specifically
talking about direct retransmission of the commercial
broadcast audio.

> We can, however, retransmit items from the NWS, I
> think.

We can, in our own words, retransmit (as part
of a QSO...not as a one way broadcast) just about anything.
That'd include the latest stock quote, news items,
weather reports or whatever.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1542. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 14:08:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9eo6v$82i$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40815

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cba4ba3_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020414231604.07832.00001542@mb-mv.aol.com...
> > In article <3cb9aa89_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >> Those guidelines are quite clear. We can use ham radio to order a
> > >> pizza, but we can't use it to sell a pizza. The fact that the person
> at
> > >> Domino's who answers the phone when you place the autopatch call
> > >> is "selling" pizza doesn't constitute use of amateur radio to
> deliberately
> > >> advertise and market his product. If the amateur him/herself is in
the
> > >> role of a "customer," then his/her use of ham radio to avail
> him/herself
> > >> of such goods and services is perfectly OK. In the case of my
> > >> accountant getting directions, there is no issue, since the
> professional
> > >> details of the visit would not enter into the content of the
> conversation.
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >>
> > >
> > >If the ham was working at the pizza place and you called, you'd both be
> in
> > >that gray area. If your accountant is a ham and going to your house
for
> the
> > >purpose of providing you with a service for which he is going to
charge,
> > >you'd be in the gray area.
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > As usual, you are totally incorrect. Neither example is even remotely
> > "gray." If a licensed amateur is employed at a Domino's Pizza, answers
> > the phone, and it's a ham radio friend of his on the autopatch ordering
> > a pizza, then the only relationship that exists is the normal merchant/
> > customer relationship.

>
> How could it be proven that the ham
> who works at the pizza shop, and his
> buddy making the calls, is not doing so
> to "advertise" the pizza shop,
> Larry?

Technically it can't...BUT, apparently the FCC doesn't
consider that possibility, however probable or
improbable, to warrant not allowing the autopatch pizza
ordering. Perhaps when the FCC issued its clarification
on the pizza order via autopatch, you should have
filed opposing comment to warn the FCC of such a
clandestine advertising effort.

> > They can, during the phone/autopatch QSO,
> > talk about ham radio, use call signs, and order the pizza right down to
> > the last anchovy, and still never be anything but absolutely, perfectly
> > legal under Part 97 Rules.
>
> That is *your* interpretation. I think there are more than a few (no I am
> not going to count them Jim) who would disagree with you...however, simply
> stated, I just simply disagree with you.

Then you disagree with the FCC itself since the FCC has
weighed in on the OK for exxactly what Larry describes.

> And, hmmmmm, the guy asking for the weather report pretty much lives in
the
> same area I do...why in the hell does he need a weather report? It could
be
> pouring down rain where I am, and bright and sunny where he is. My answer
> to him would be, "give it a few minutes and see if anything changes. Get
> back to us if it does, because then maybe it'll have changed here, too."

You are applying your own value judgement now
to which you are entitled..BUT the comments as
to the topic of weather are not at all based on any legalities.

> And, why would any fool driving
> around in a city, near a city, around a
> city, think that there is going to be
> anything but traffic jam conditions on
> all the main roads into and out of that city?

On many occasions, the daily traffic nets I participated
in saved me many hours of commute time by allowing
me to avoid major traffic problems.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1543. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 14:14:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9eo70$82i$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40814

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020415080705.19000.00000862@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3cba4ba3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> (K3LT wrote):
>
> >> As usual, you are totally incorrect. Neither example is even remotely
> >> "gray." If a licensed amateur is employed at a Domino's Pizza, answers
> >> the phone, and it's a ham radio friend of his on the autopatch ordering
> >> a pizza, then the only relationship that exists is the normal merchant/
> >> customer relationship.
> >>
> >
> >How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and his
> >buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
> >Larry?
>
> Simple. If the individuals involved do not make a point of mentioning the
name
> or location of the pizza shop any more than necessary, they are not
> advertising.

But even the FCC didn't place such a narrow restriction
on the pizza order scenario. Clearly when the pizza
shop answers the phone, they will likly state something
akin to: Hello, Joey's Pizza Shop, how can I help you?

Frankly, Kim's personal interpretation of what the
prohibition on using ham radio for pecuniary interests
means has been taken to ridiculous extremes. What
seems totally amazing is that Kim even ignores the
FCC rulings that have already addressed several of
the specific scenarios she claims are violations.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1544. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 14:17:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9end2$j6j$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 40810

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>
> >QYM "Your mama!"
> >QGM "Your Grandma!"
> >QSC "Your sister's in love with a carrot!"
>
> Dick Carroll can use QSH. :-)
>

QHS? "Did you soak your head yet, Ed?"
QSH. "I can tell, you didn't".

1545. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 14:18:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9enep$j6j$1@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 40811

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Your record of accurate reading others posts here is not exactly
> >sterling, Ed.
>
> Sure it is, Dick. That is just another twist. Care to back it up with enough
> examples to justify your statement?
>
> I thought not...

It won't be necessary for me to quote a darn thing. Your answers to my
posts speak for themselves.

1546. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 14:24:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9eo72$82i$3@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40816

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >I've even heard the "F" word on the CBS network (when they had the
> >Sept 11th fireman special a few weeks ago). The wor[l]d didn't end....
>
> Tell ya what - if a ham is ever in a similar situation as that fireman, I
> won't have a problem with some strong language. Otherwise, it's
> Not Acceptable. And the FCC agrees with me.
>
> The content standards for broadcast services and the ARS are different,
> and should be different. The BC folks have scheduled programs and warnings
> that certain shows may be offensive or inappropriate. Amateur radio has no
> such controls/protections, so hams must behave in a "G-rated" fashion on
the
> air. That's just the way it is.
>
> Yes, some hams cuss on the air. Some even make a point of it, or think
it's OK,
> or a freedom of speech issue. None of those excuses is valid. Not to the
FCC,
> anyway.
>
> The end result of cussing on the air is to damage the image of the ARS
with the
> public and the FCC, and to give ammunition to the enemies of the ARS.
That's
> why it's Not Acceptable.
>
> Here's a scenario to consider:
>
> Suppose a commercial radio service wants the FCC to reallocate 146-148 MHz
to
> them. Of course hams try to defend that half of 2 meters, pointing to the
large
> number of repeaters in that segment, public service, etc.
>
> The commercial folks then provide the FCC with tapes of hams cussing on
the
> repeaters, chiding, teasing and "busting on" other hams for innocuous and
> perfectly legal conversations about weather and traffic, and other Not
> Acceptable behavior. How are hams going to argue against that?

>
> What good is ARRL's "Big Project" if, when we try to demonstrate ham radio
to
> young people and their parents and teachers, the sort of thing described
above
> comes through the 'speaker? You don't get a second chance to make a first
> impression.
>
> Not Acceptable behavior doesn't just move Amateur Radio "one step closer
to
> extinction" - it's more like a full gallop in that direction.

Jim,

Well said...and the only thing I'd add again is that
if everytime a ham speaks on that ham
should consider that his/her voice is being
listened to by one or more children, then
perhaps the potty mouths amongst us might wake
up and act in a more civil manner.

I am not offended at all by vulgar language and
accept it in the proper context and situatiuons..on
the air as a ham is not one of them.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1547. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 14:28:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9eo29$ks0$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 40812

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > So try this one- why do you think that so small a percentage of US hams
> >ever join ARRL?
>
> 1. Your reason: They feel the ARRL HQ staff are elitists.
>
> 2. How many of the non-members do you think are not active as hams at all?

Probably half of all licensed hams are not active for whatever reason,
including SK status. I know of no way to "prove" that any more than you
do.

I
> meet a number of licensed electronics engineers in my dealings with industry on
> RFI matters that tell me they haven't been on the air in years. (That dealing
> with industry on RFI matters must be part of my caring more about myself than
> ham radio...)

Ed I had come to believe that you didn't number among the snobs at HQ.
You just work there, right? Hope I wasn't wrong.

Unless you have an assignment as the singular HQ poster here to RRAP
(the very occasional presence of Jon Bloom teh exception) your presence
here helps to confirm that.

>
> 3. What percentage of those that are not members do you think became licensed,
> but never became active hams? I personally know about 3 or 4, and they are not
> really interested. Do you really expect them to be members?
>
> 4. What percentage of those that are not members are not even alive? With the
> 10-year expiration period, those that become silent keys can retain their
> license for 9.999 years.
>
> 5. What percentage of those that are not members may be in some financial
> straits and are choosing not to pay for membership before they pay for
> groceries.
>
> 6. And some small percentage of non-members are letting their membership lapse
> to hold out for a book offer for ARRL to sign up again.
>
> > I really believe I know. And the answer wouldn't be
> >complimentary.

> >It is simply that they don't believe the elitists who populate HQ care
> >about members interests nearly as much as they do for their own.

There are all sorts of reasons why hams do, and do not do all sorts of
things.

>
> Most of your conclusions are "simply" true -- too simply to be plausible.

If you believe that a majority of hams don't view ARRL HQ as being
largely populated by elitists, you really do need to do *something* with
your head. Maybe get it into the game. It's been the reality for the 45+
years I've been licensed.

1548. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 14:29:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9eo4l$ks0$1@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 40813

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > Bending with the wind and merely before the slightest breeze are quite
> >different. Sometimes the slight breeze (few) trumps a heavy wind (the
> >majority)
>
> What would be in it for ARRL to go along with a minority view?

Evidently something. Why else would they shield their vote as they
sometimes do on some issues?

1549. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 14:38:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9eoqg$b2$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40817

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
message news:a9eo29$ks0$0@208.206.142.109...
> If you (Ed Hare) believe that a majority of
> hams don't view ARRL HQ as being
> largely populated by elitists, you really
> do need to do *something* with
> your head. Maybe get it into the game.
> It's been the reality for the 45+
> years I've been licensed.

But, once again, we have ONLY Dick's word
on that. Not ONE single supporting bit of
evidence.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1550. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 14:43:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9ep47$if7$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40818

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9eo4l$ks0$1@208.206.142.109...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > > Bending with the wind and merely before the slightest breeze are quite
> > >different. Sometimes the slight breeze (few) trumps a heavy wind (the
> > >majority)
> >
> > What would be in it for ARRL to go along with a minority view?
>
> Evidently something. Why else would they shield their vote as they
> sometimes do on some issues?

Dick,
On the specific point of shielding their vote,
I completely agree.

The by-laws of the ARRL should NOT allow
any vote by the elected representatives to
be shielded or otherwise not recorded by
individual. How else, but by examining a
person't actual voting record can I judge
my future support for that person. ALL votes
should be recorded by individual and by
yea or ney (or absain if applicable).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1551. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 15:42:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBAF4DD.1888857A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40819

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >Your record of accurate reading others posts here is not exactly
> > >sterling, Ed.
> >
> > Sure it is, Dick. That is just another twist. Care to back it up with enough
> > examples to justify your statement?
> >
> > I thought not...
>
> It won't be necessary for me to quote a darn thing. Your answers to my
> posts speak for themselves.

Indeed they do, Dick, indeed they do but probably not the way you think.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1552. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 15:49:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204150749.34863772@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40820

"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:<3cba1803$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020414143444.27399.00000511@mb-mr.aol.com...

> > Why not just chill out and answer the question?

> If it's so all-fired important to you, Jim...

It's not that important. I'm just curious.

> which is really strange because
> it wasn't even your question originally...

You claimed to have worked "all bands" in a discussion where the context
was "all HF bands". To any reasonable and knowledgeable reader, that
must include 30 meters.

>The question I asked was: "What mode did you use on 30 meters?"

>then I'll answer with: I don't
> know.

OK, then. Simple question, simple answer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1553. Re: Onomatopoeia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 17:10:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415131002.04302.00000633@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 40821

In article <3cba4162_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020414210516.07832.00001530@mb-mv.aol.com...
>>
>> Well, I guess I was wrong about that, at least for now. After having
>> spent most of a Summer interviewing for HR positions, I discovered
>> that I was apparently the wrong sex, the wrong age, and the wrong
>> color to get into that particular field.
>
>Oh, that'll get you a cup of coffee for sure. If credentials don't work,
>it's everything else's fault. Have you ever looked back on your repertoire
>of excuses in your posts that you make defending how you have "always been
>passed over?" Maybe you interview really crappy, Larry. Maybe you have a
>really bad personality. Your antics here on this newsgroup certainly aren't
>those preferrably seen in an HR person. Maybe the interviewer was smart
>enough to perceive your failure before you wasted their time and yours.

...he didn't get his much-triumphed "HR job" despite the bragging.

>> In the meantime, this job came
>> along, with much better pay, a complete benefits package,
>> retirement, etc. So I took it, and discovered that I like it. Forgive me
>> for disappointing you.

He got *a* job. The rationalizations will never stop... :-)

Human Resorce Management (where Larrie was heading according
to voluminous postings) pays _much_ better than driving busses.

Ooops...let me rephrase that into Rollspeak...HR Management
(personnel departments) pays much better than "paratransit
specialists." :-)

>> >Now you hock a loogie on the newsgroup floor and call yourself
>> >a "SPLATOO."
>>
>> And, by the way, I've even refined my job title while retaining the
>> same acronym. I'm now a "Special Passenger Lift-Adapted
>> Transit Omnibus Operator (SPLATOO).
>>
>> >It's poetic. In fact, it's onomatopoesy!!!
>>
>> Is that anything like onomatopoeiasy? (Note to Kim: An
>> onomatopoeia is the naming of a thing by the sound it makes.

>> Just didn't want you scratching your head too hard over this
>> one!)

>I am certain, Larry, that your vocabulary is a far cry from mine and even I
>had to look this up. Incidentally, I'm not so sure your or Len's use of the
>word, nor its spelling, was quite up to measure. Here ya go, maybe this
>will help:
>
>Onomatopoeia
>
>Definition
>Onomatopoeia is a figure of speech in which the sound of a word echoes the
>thing it describes. It is a form of symbolism in sound.

>NB! 'Onomatopoeia' is derived from the Greek term 'make a word'.

Ahem...sometimes I am still astonished at the lack of folks to
connect humorous wordplay in here...or that folks is sooooo
up-tight about things.

Look up the definition for "poesy." Then connect it with the word
"onomatopoeia." ("poesy" is an old form of "poetry") Larrie waxes
so poetic with his self-descriptors he should have applied for a job
with Johnson's Wax company. :-)

"Onomatopoesy" is more elegant than the NYC-ethnic "hocking a
loogie on the floor" but, as Larrie described himself, it is
"sinonymic" with what prospective employers did for him. :-)
:-) :-)

1554. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 19:00:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gum79ge.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 40822

On Sun, 14 Apr 2002 23:24:37 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Assuming that is so. Clay referenced:
>The National Association for Amateur radio...he did not
>state it as you have above, to wit, ARRL - the national
>association for AMATEUR RADIO.

Has Clay been on this group long enough to realize that we are the
National Association of NitPickers ??

<ggg>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1555. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 19:00:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gum6xnd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 40823

On Sun, 14 Apr 2002 22:38:25 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and his
>buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
>Larry?

How could it be proven that when I mention on the air that I am
using an ICOM IC-229 that I am not advertising for ICOM?

Context, my dear friend....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1556. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 19:41:48 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CBB2CFF.8060859@psu.edu>
Source record: 40824

Its the darn argument that is the molehill! This will obviously continue until you or Jim decide to quit posting on it, or until the rest of us get so fed up that we filter both of you out. That's something I don't want to do, but I don't think there's much left.

Maybe y'all can change it to a discussion of how many angels can dance on the head of a pin?

- Mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:

> You think 200,000 Techs are a molehill? Shame on you, Hans. Techs are a
> good 30% of the ARS mountain which is *NOT* a small percentage. Without
> the Techs, the ARS population would be in decline.

1557. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 19:55:00 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <a9fb6k$p9u$1@mycroft.cmhnet.org>
Source record: 40825

In article <20020412172715.13688.00000592@mb-da.aol.com>,
N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>What error? What part of the statement is in error?
>
>"So the creation of medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test
>from the Tech license brought about just 4% more growth in a decade."
>
>Just exactly what in that statement is not true?

What is not true is that you can't prove that medical code waivers and the dropping of the code test from the Tech license brought about 4% more growth.

There might have been any number of factors present, and it's unlikely that I, Cecil, or anyone else can list every single possible variable. A difference in population growth, different policies on recruiting by the ARRL, more AR operators bringing in people, more testing sites, more testing dates, fewer testing sites, fewer testing dates, more congestion in the CB frequencies -- any of these (and I don't have any idea which, if any, are true) *might* have caused changes in the number of Tech licenses issued.

The point is that unless you can *prove* (and I don't believe you can) that the two factors you state were not only causal, but instrumental in the change, you've proved nothing. And even if you managed to prove dropping the code requirement was both causal and instrumental, factoring in other issues might also change growth, so your statement would still be false.

(For example, what if there were 10% fewer testing sites available, and because of that, fewer people received licenses because they didn't want to travel to a testing site. Maybe growth would have been almost 38%, instead of 34%.)

You might well be correct in your assumption, and in fact, I suspect that dropping the code requirement drew a number of people to get licenses, but I don't see how it can be proven by you or anyone else.

Sean.

1558. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 20:11:21 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb33eb$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 40826

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CBAD059.37FF7718@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > "S. Hanrahan" wrote:
> > >
> > > Yes, the ex-AA8DP.
> > >
> > > I knew him going back to early 1993, when I started checking into the
> > > 3905 Century Club WAS Net when I was still licensed as KB7PKE.
> > >
> > > He wasn't as radical then, but things started going downhill around
> > > 1995. He didn't check in as often, and was often heard up the band
> > > between 3930 and 3950.
> >
> > So what's he wanted for?
>
> A host of weapons charges including emptying a 30 round magazine from
> an automatic rifle into a highway patrol vehicle with the officer
> hiding behind it. (attempted murder of a police officer)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Sure glad he's not a radical PCTA :-)

Carl - wk3c

1559. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 23:21:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb6329_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40829

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a9fi4h0gno@enews1.newsguy.com...
> If the ARRL is willing to provide the tapes, there are approximately 6
> different broadcast TV stations that I currently work with in promotion of
> our club, and amateur radio in general. If there is any audio tapes/carts
> for radio I would also work with the radio stations in the area I would
also
> take those to the radio stations I deal with.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
>
> www.qsl.net/w8kea
>
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
>

Just thought about this one. Do the cable companies still have to provide "public access" channels for general use? I remember the last time I had cable (uh, years ago) they had to under agreement with the cities. There was a guy down here who used to strap his video recorder to his truck and he'd drive up and down Lancaster Ave in Ft. Worth and have a hour show on the shops on the street and the history.

If the cable channels do still have to do that, wonder how many hams would be willing to do ham shows on those channels?

Kim W5TIT

1560. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 23:28:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb64b9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40830

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >I've even heard the "F" word on the CBS network (when they had the
> >Sept 11th fireman special a few weeks ago). The wor[l]d didn't end....
>
> Tell ya what - if a ham is ever in a similar situation as that fireman, I
> won't have a problem with some strong language. Otherwise, it's
> Not Acceptable. And the FCC agrees with me.
>

Yeah, but it's OK to talk about breaking the law for most hams. What an
irony.

>
> The content standards for broadcast services and the ARS are different,
> and should be different. The BC folks have scheduled programs and warnings
> that certain shows may be offensive or inappropriate. Amateur radio has no
> such controls/protections, so hams must behave in a "G-rated" fashion on
the
> air. That's just the way it is.
>

I think it's a lot looser than you realize, in some areas. I've heard some
pretty risque language on simplex frequencies around here, and even from
some pretty "prominent" hams.

>
> Yes, some hams cuss on the air. Some even make a point of it, or think
it's OK,
> or a freedom of speech issue. None of those excuses is valid. Not to the
FCC,
> anyway.
>
> The end result of cussing on the air is to damage the image of the ARS
with the
> public and the FCC, and to give ammunition to the enemies of the ARS.
That's
> why it's Not Acceptable.
>

Yet, the use of "it sucks" or "screw it" or "like Hades," etc., is fairly
frequent. It may be "illegal" to curse on ham radio, but it is implied all
the time.

>
> What good is ARRL's "Big Project" if, when we try to demonstrate ham radio
to
> young people and their parents and teachers, the sort of thing described
above
> comes through the 'speaker? You don't get a second chance to make a first
> impression.
>
> Not Acceptable behavior doesn't just move Amateur Radio "one step closer
to
> extinction" - it's more like a full gallop in that direction.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Part of the ARRL's Big Project should probably be to mention that, just as in other life experiences, there are good and bad in ham radio. Part of "teaching" is to inspire the right choices.

And, I don't think cursing on the air--even out and out cursing--moves the ARS anywhere but where it's been for years.

Kim W5TIT

1561. Re: Onomatopoeia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 23:28:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020415192847.00480.00003949@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40828

>Subject: Re: Onomatopoeia
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/15/02 13:10 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020415131002.04302.00000633@mb-bh.aol.com>

>He got *a* job. The rationalizations will never stop

And when will YOUR "rationalizations" ever stop? Like trying to make up
some excuses as to how "personal radio services" meand "strictly recreational'?

>Ahem...sometimes I am still astonished at the lack of folks to
>connect humorous wordplay in here...or that folks is sooooo
>up-tight about things.

You mean like being called Nazis, jackbooted thugs, elitists, etc
etc...??? Yeah, Guess we get a bit worked up over "petty stuff" like that?

But then you ARE pretty liberal with the hurtful adjectives, only to cry
"foul!" when they come back at you.

No smileys...You're a creep.

1562. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 23:32:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb65ba_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40831

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020415080705.19000.00000862@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3cba4ba3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> (K3LT wrote):
>
> >> As usual, you are totally incorrect. Neither example is even remotely
> >> "gray." If a licensed amateur is employed at a Domino's Pizza, answers
> >> the phone, and it's a ham radio friend of his on the autopatch ordering
> >> a pizza, then the only relationship that exists is the normal merchant/
> >> customer relationship.
> >>
> >
> >How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and his
> >buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
> >Larry?
>
> Simple. If the individuals involved do not make a point of mentioning the
name
> or location of the pizza shop any more than necessary, they are not
> advertising.
>
> >> They can, during the phone/autopatch QSO,
> >> talk about ham radio, use call signs, and order the pizza right down to
> >> the last anchovy, and still never be anything but absolutely, perfectly
> >> legal under Part 97 Rules.
> >
> >That is *your* interpretation.
>
> Not just Larry. It is the FCC's interpretation.
>
> >I think there are more than a few who would disagree with you..however,
simply
> >stated, I just simply disagree with you.
>
> Then you disagree with the FCC's stated policy as well.
>

Actually, I do disagree with the FCC on this. I don't think ordering
anything over the air should be allowed.

>
> Because in many situations traffic flows smoothly even a rush hour.

>

I can absolutely assure you that there are no smooth operations here during our several hours of rush.

>
> Kim, you have chosen to live a long way from where you work, in a city with
> inadequate roads and all-but-nonexistent transit. Your choice has pretty
> much guaranteed you a long, frustrating, energy-inefficient, air-polluting
> commute. Perhaps it bothers you that other hams in other places (like Larry)
> have made different choices and don't have to got through that sort of commute
> every working day.
>
> In short, jealousy.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

1563. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 23:34:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb6638_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40832

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020415083558.01955.00003570@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> > I never got the name or call
> >sign of the enraged NCTA YL who led the pack of attack dogs ...
>
> How convenient.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

See? Having a risque callsign is far more likely to be remembered by
Larry...although that isn't a plus in my book...LOL

Kim W5TIT

1564. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 23:37:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb66b5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40833

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9emjvsfs1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cb9b236$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > We can, however, retransmit items from the NWS, I
> > think.
>
> We can, in our own words, retransmit (as part
> of a QSO...not as a one way broadcast) just about anything.
> That'd include the latest stock quote, news items,
> weather reports or whatever.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

It is my understanding that we absolutely *cannot* retransmit things on emergency frequencies (police in particular).

Kim W5TIT

1565. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 23:40:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb6790_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40834

Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9eo70$82i$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> Frankly, Kim's personal interpretation of what the
> prohibition on using ham radio for pecuniary interests
> means has been taken to ridiculous extremes. What
> seems totally amazing is that Kim even ignores the
> FCC rulings that have already addressed several of
> the specific scenarios she claims are violations.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Bill, I think you are a little prone here to extremism yourself. I've said a few times, and you've chosen to ignore, that I don't mean to imply they *are* violations. I have said I don't care to get tangled in any kind of test of whether or not they are violations.

I *KNOW* it is legal to order pizza; *you* are ignoring the fact that Larry's (I think) scenario includes TWO hams on an autopatch--one of whom works at the pizza place. There is *potential* for abuse there, that is all I imply.

Kim W5TIT

1566. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-15 23:45:12 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb689e$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40835

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gum6xnd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 14 Apr 2002 22:38:25 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and his
> >buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
> >Larry?
>
> How could it be proven that when I mention on the air that I am
> using an ICOM IC-229 that I am not advertising for ICOM?
>
> Context, my dear friend....
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

It cannot be proven. And, what *if* you are known--for example--to own stock in ICOM? Or, you work at an ICOM store? And, what *if* you keep mentioning ICOM over and over again on the air? It's probably not illegal at all. However, "we" all know what "you" are doing and what "you" are doing is probably unethical in *context* of the rules.

Kim W5TIT

1567. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 01:20:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9fudkqbp1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40836

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cbb66b5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a9emjvsfs1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3cb9b236$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > We can, however, retransmit items from the NWS, I
> > > think.
> >
> > We can, in our own words, retransmit (as part
> > of a QSO...not as a one way broadcast) just about anything.
> > That'd include the latest stock quote, news items,
> > weather reports or whatever.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> It is my understanding that we absolutely *cannot* retransmit things on
> emergency frequencies (police in particular).

Are you suggesting that if I have a scanner and
hear that there's an accident at 5th and Main
that I can't mention it to another ham...or anyone else
for that matter?

If yes, please let us know what FCC rule applies.
If one exists, it is not likly in Part 97 at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1568. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 01:26:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9fup1$11o$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40837

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in
message news:3cbb6790_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a9eo70$82i$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > Frankly, Kim's personal interpretation of what the
> > prohibition on using ham radio for pecuniary interests
> > means has been taken to ridiculous extremes. What
> > seems totally amazing is that Kim even ignores the
> > FCC rulings that have already addressed several of
> > the specific scenarios she claims are violations.
>
> Bill, I think you are a little prone here to
> extremism yourself. I've said
> a few times, and you've chosen to ignore,
> that I don't mean to imply they
> *are* violations. I have said I don't care
> to get tangled in any kind of
> test of whether or not they are violations.

Fair enough.

> I *KNOW* it is legal to order pizza;
> *you* are ignoring the fact that
> Larry's (I think) scenario includes TWO
> hams on an autopatch--one of whom
> works at the pizza place. There is *potential*
> for abuse there, that is all I imply.

Sorry, but that potential is a fantasy. The person at the
other end of an autopatch is just a "person" at that
point with no different status because he/she might also
hold a ham license.

As to potential for abuse...again, not at all apparently
in the eyes of the FCC.

Your mileage may vary.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1569. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 01:37:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9fvd5$kh1$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40838

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cbb64b9_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> > <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
> >
> > >I've even heard the "F" word on the CBS network (when they had the
> > >Sept 11th fireman special a few weeks ago). The wor[l]d didn't end....
> >
> > Tell ya what - if a ham is ever in a similar situation as that fireman,
I
> > won't have a problem with some strong language. Otherwise, it's
> > Not Acceptable. And the FCC agrees with me.
> >
>
> Yeah, but it's OK to talk about breaking the law for most hams. What an
> irony.

??? Who is talking about breaking the law?

> > The content standards for broadcast services and the ARS are different,
> > and should be different. The BC folks have scheduled programs and
warnings
> > that certain shows may be offensive or inappropriate. Amateur radio has
no
> > such controls/protections, so hams must behave in a "G-rated" fashion on
> > on the air. That's just the way it is.
>
> I think it's a lot looser than you realize, in some areas. I've heard
some
> pretty risque language on simplex frequencies around here, and even from
> some pretty "prominent" hams.

Which is a shame. Role modles those folks are not.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1570. Transmitter/Repeater Hunters?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 02:14:49 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <tOLu8.3960$I81.2064477384@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40839

Any good transmitter / repeater hunters in Southern California / Los Angeles area? I'm working on a project that could be of interest.

LARS121

1571. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 02:25:47 UTC
From: Rich <Rich@Richwebsitexxx.com>
Message-ID: <a9g22r$4bc$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 40840

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message

> Has Clay been on this group long enough to realize that we are the
> National Association of NitPickers ??
>
> <ggg>
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

LOL! Although I've disagreed with you in the past on many
things Phil, this time you are indeed right on the money. Speaking
of the hobby as a whole, we are NitPickers on most everything, and
this is also why I haven't attended any ham radio club meetings in the
last 15 years.

Rich

1572. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 02:31:10 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <O1Mu8.697$n51.168204303@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40841

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020412080705.27399.00000474@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3CB67418.633B1F2F@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >> > The Tech PLus itself is no longer issued but you can get the
privleges
> >> > simply by passing the code test. It adds CW in four bands and phone
at
> >> > 28.3-28.5 200 watts.
> >> >
> >>
> >> A huge "however" here, though: if you ever intend to upgrade to General
> >> after passing your 5wpm test, you *must* do it within one year of
passing
> >> the CW test or you must do it all over again.
> >>
> >>
> >
> >So you might as well study up and take the general written at the same
> >VE session as the code test. If you pass the written, that "locks it
in"
> >for as long as you keep your license renewed. And you get more
> >spectra to operate in.
> >
> All true and correct. The General written is just 35 multiple-choice
questions
> and gets you lots more bands, modes and spectrum than a Tech-with-HF. And
> paying the VE fee gets you one try at it anyway.
>
> And while you're at it, try the Extra written even if you haven't studied
for
> it. It's good practice, costs nothing but your time and you might pass it.
Back
> in the summer of '68, when I went to the FCC office to upgrade from Tech
to
> General by passing the 13 wpm code test, the examiner said 'why not try
the
> Advanced while you're here?" I hadn't studied for it at all but a 14 year
old
> kid did not say no to The Man, so I took it - and passed easily. Same
thing
> could happen to you.
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> > GREAT STORY! - LARS121
>

1573. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 02:56:20 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <opMu8.10194$3z3.994454@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40842

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> Didn't the FCC stop issuing actual station licenses some
> years back?

No. Read the second paragraph of the "Conditions of Grant" on the back of your FCC form 660. Each of us is issued a station license (and a callsign for that station).

On the same document (read the first paragraph of the "CoG") individuals are issued an operator license.

Some station licenses (Clubs, Mil Rec) are granted station licenses, including a call sign, but not an operator license. Thus you can see that the call sign is assigned to the station, and not to the operator.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1574. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:09:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb988b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40849

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9fudkqbp1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cbb66b5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a9emjvsfs1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3cb9b236$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > We can, however, retransmit items from the NWS, I
> > > > think.
> > >
> > > We can, in our own words, retransmit (as part
> > > of a QSO...not as a one way broadcast) just about anything.
> > > That'd include the latest stock quote, news items,
> > > weather reports or whatever.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > It is my understanding that we absolutely *cannot* retransmit things on
> > emergency frequencies (police in particular).
>
> Are you suggesting that if I have a scanner and
> hear that there's an accident at 5th and Main
> that I can't mention it to another ham...or anyone else
> for that matter?
>
> If yes, please let us know what FCC rule applies.
> If one exists, it is not likly in Part 97 at all.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >

You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might want to
pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on this.
Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the message.
However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's attempted
insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:

How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur station shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably be furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to me that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be furnished alternatively through other radio services" category...

And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:

97.113 (again):
(e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the general public and originated from United States Government stations and communications, including incidental music, originating on United States Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators. Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of normal amateur radio communications.

I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention to "*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than* an amateur station..."

Now, here's the quiz: can ya guess *why* we shouldn't/cannot retransmit things we hear on broadcast stations?

Kim W5TIT

1575. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:12:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020415231242.20665.00000604@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 40848

In article <3cba4ba3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and his
>buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
>Larry?

If there were a reasonable suspicion of that, then the matter would
have to be directed to the FCC through the local OO's. Then, the
FCC would have to examine the evidence and make a ruling. It is
not likely that such an investigation would change the Part 97 rules
involving the use of amateur radio to order things from businesses
via autopatch. Any blatant violators would be dealt with in the
usual way, and everyone else could continue as usual.

>> They can, during the phone/autopatch QSO,
>> talk about ham radio, use call signs, and order the pizza right down to
>> the last anchovy, and still never be anything but absolutely, perfectly
>> legal under Part 97 Rules.

>That is *your* interpretation.

I didn't interpret a darn thing, Kim -- I just know what the rules are.

>I think there are more than a few (no I am
>not going to count them Jim) who would disagree with you...however, simply
>stated, I just simply disagree with you.

So far, Kim, you seem to be quite alone in your disagreement.

>> Again, I warn you -- you are not qualified to determine "gray areas"
>> with regard to ham radio communications. I am. You are not. Stay
>> out of this. You are beyond your depth. Go back to chiding people
>> for wishing to get a WX report on your local repeater. At least there,
>> you can act like a big shot know-it-all repeater cop, without being
>> among others who realize what a fool you are making of yourself --
>> except for the guy asking for the WX report.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT

>Hope the vocabulary lesson on Onomatopoeia will help expand your brain a
>little. It needs a whole lot more than a little expansion, but that'll be a
>start...

Kim, I learned the meaning of "onomatopoeia" when I was in
elementary school. And yes, my brain does need expanding, but
more than a little. I can use all the learning I can get, and I seek

it constantly. I will never be done with my ongoing learning
process. You, OTOH, seem to know-it-all already.

>And, hmmmmm, the guy asking for the weather report pretty much lives in the
>same area I do...why in the hell does he need a weather report? It could be
>pouring down rain where I am, and bright and sunny where he is. My answer
>to him would be, "give it a few minutes and see if anything changes. Get
>back to us if it does, because then maybe it'll have changed here, too."

You have just described 99% of the SKYWARN reports I've heard.
Pure genius.

>And, why would any fool driving around in a city, near a city, around a
>city, think that there is going to be anything but traffic jam conditions on
>all the main roads into and out of that city? Good grief, Larry.

Don't look now, Kim, but could they perhaps be trying to *avoid* said
traffic jams? I don't know about the DFW area, but I'll bet there are
many ways to get from Point A to Point B, given helpful assistance from
fellow hams who know the local area. I have received such help many
times via amateur radio.

>Discussions of medical conditions are not OK for you, but discussions of
>weather and traffic are. So, as usual, everyone must think and act like
>you. Thank goodness, your will not be done.

My *will* is not done any more than anyone else's, Kim -- but I'm sure
yours always is, isn't it? That's because you're a much better person
than I am, right? Well, keep on thinking that, Kim -- it's the source of
a lot of amusement in this newsgroup!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1576. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:12:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020415231243.20665.00000605@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 40843

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gum6xnd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>>How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and his
>>buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
>>Larry?
>
> How could it be proven that when I mention on the air that I am
> using an ICOM IC-229 that I am not advertising for ICOM?
>
> Context, my dear friend....

Phil:

In that context, there's one heckuva lot of "advertising" being done
on ham radio frequencies!

Are you going to call out the Radio Kops, or shall we leave that
to Kim?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1577. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:12:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020415231243.20665.00000606@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 40846

In article <3cbb65ba_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>I can absolutely assure you that there are no smooth operations here during
>our several hours of rush.
>
>>
>> Kim, you have chosen to live a long way from where you work, in a city
>with
>> inadequate roads and all-but-nonexistent transit. Your choice has pretty
>> much guaranteed you a long, frustrating, energy-inefficient, air-polluting
>> commute. Perhaps it bothers you that other hams in other places (like
>Larry)
>> have made different choices and don't have to got through that sort of
>commute
>> every working day.
>>
>> In short, jealousy.

Jim:

If that's the case, let Kim be jealous of this: My "commute" to work
is 3.5 miles one way, usually takes from 10 - 12 minutes, and I have
free, dedicated parking. I fill the gas tank on my '01 Toyota Corolla LE
every three weeks, and it usually takes 9 gallons. This includes my
weekly commuting and all other incidental driving during days off, etc.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1578. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:12:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020415231244.20665.00000607@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 40845

In article <3CBA4F43.7126153F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Allow me to point out that *everything* a person has to do to become
>> a radio amateur is "voluntary."
>
>Allow me to point out that passing an exam is NOT voluntary for
>licensed amateur radio operators - it is required.

Allow me to point out that *becoming* a licensed amateur radio
operator, and meeting the licensing requirements to do so, is not
required - it is voluntary. An action which is required within the
confines of pursuing a voluntary activity is undertaken in a
voluntary manner, or not at all. If not, then the privileges attached
to that action will not be received.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1579. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:12:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020415231244.20665.00000608@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 40847

In article <20020415060653.09489.00000516@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>Bill:
>>
>>It occurred at the 1995 Maryland ARRL State Convention at the
>>Timonium Hamfest, Timonium, Maryland. Then ARRL Atlantic
>>Division Director Kay Craigie, WT3P, and then ARRL Vice President
>>Hugh Turnbull, W3ABC, were the ARRL officials present. You
>>could ask if they recall the incident. I never got the name or call
>>sign of the enraged NCTA YL who led the pack of attack dogs that
>>were set on me the minute I mentioned "code testing" -- mainly
>>because she never stopped yelling long enough for me to do so.
>>
>Larry,
>
>Maybe, just maybe, the ARRL folks let the YL spew for a reason. They
>may have thought that by carrying on that way in a public forum, she
>destroyed her credibility and simply made herself look foolish.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

If that was their intention, they certainly succeeded. In fairness to
Hugh and Kay, I don't think they could have gotten that lady to calm
down if they wanted to. However, once the jeremiad was over, they
should have at least made some statement indicating disapproval
for her attack. That didn't happen. I have had a difficult time
understanding how they could allow this to happen, and my dealings
with either of them since the incident has been limited to cool,
detached courtesies, and little else. I believe that they owe me an
apology, but I'm certainly not going to ask for one.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1580. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:12:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020415231245.20665.00000609@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 40844

In article <20020415083558.01955.00003570@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>> I never got the name or call
>>sign of the enraged NCTA YL who led the pack of attack dogs ...
>
>How convenient.

It had nothing to do with convenience, Ed. I simply didn't observe a call sign badge on her, and she did not identify herself by name or call sign at any time during her tirade.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1581. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:13:35 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb9990_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40850

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9fvd5$kh1$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cbb64b9_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> >
> > I think it's a lot looser than you realize, in some areas. I've heard
> some
> > > pretty risque language on simplex frequencies around here, and even from
> > > some pretty "prominent" hams.
>
> Which is a shame. Role modles those folks are not.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Well, you're right. But many of the newly initiated hams look up to these
so-called "leaders" and kind of just brush aside the poor operating
practices. Yep, it's a pity...

Kim W5TIT

1582. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:17:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbb9a97_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40851

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9fvd5$kh1$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cbb64b9_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > >
> > > Tell ya what - if a ham is ever in a similar situation as that
fireman,
> I
> > > won't have a problem with some strong language. Otherwise, it's
> > > Not Acceptable. And the FCC agrees with me.
> > >
> >
> > Yeah, but it's OK to talk about breaking the law for most hams. What an
> > irony.
>
> ??? Who is talking about breaking the law?
>

Oh. Maybe those transmissions aren't allowed in your area...just joking,
just joking. You know, those where you hear a ham mentioning that he is
able to go at least 10-15 mph above the posted speed limit? Or those who
are talking about "skipping work" that day (no, not illegal, but teaching
what to the youngsters?) And other such things...

If we're going to uphold standards for the younguns...shouldn't we stop
justifying which are good to uphold and which we can kinda shove under the
carpet--or try to?

I guess I am an incurable idealist.

Kim W5TIT

1583. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:42:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9g6it$r44$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 40853

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <20020415083558.01955.00003570@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >> I never got the name or call
> >>sign of the enraged NCTA YL who led the pack of attack dogs ...
> > >
> > >How convenient.
>
> It had nothing to do with convenience, Ed. I simply didn't observe
> a call sign badge on her, and she did not identify herself by name
> or call sign at any time during her tirade.
>

And those mortified HQ folk, desperate to end this scene, didn't ask
her to ID.

1584. Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:50:51 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ubn6qli88bu52a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40852

Hello, all!

Passed the General Written tonight using primarily the QRZ site to prepare, due to lack of time. Hope to take the code and Extra exam a month from now, after a lot of CW practice with a home-made keyer that will work with a 2m transceiver. Delays in getting this keyer to work (bad soldering technique on my part) have slowed things down there.

Val Germann
KC0MUB

1585. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 03:51:38 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <edNu8.10269$3z3.1001954@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40854

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

>
> I can absolutely assure you that there are no smooth operations here
during
> our several hours of rush.
>

I guess it all depends on your interpretation of "smooth".

I have an engineering group located at our facility in Richardson, about 2 miles off US75. I regularly fly to DFW and drive to visit them, often arriving during at DFW morning rush time, and leaving Richardson in late afternoon for the return to DFW. Only rarely do I find myself traveling less than the posted limits on your highways.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1586. Re: Transmitter/Repeater Hunters?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 04:38:58 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204160438060.20178-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 40855

On Tue, 16 Apr 2002, Lars121 wrote:
>Any good transmitter / repeater hunters in Southern California / Los Angeles
>area? I'm working on a project that could be of interest.

Not in Los Angeles.

The T-hunters that I have heard of are mainly out in the desert areas.

1587. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 04:49:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBBAD5D.FC306F83@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40856

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Allow me to point out that *everything* a person has to do to become
> >> a radio amateur is "voluntary."
> > >
> > >Allow me to point out that passing an exam is NOT voluntary for
> > >licensed amateur radio operators - it is required.
>
> Allow me to point out that *becoming* a licensed amateur radio
> operator, and meeting the licensing requirements to do so, is not
> required - it is voluntary.

One cannot volunteer to become a licensed amateur radio operator. One
must meet the requirements. You may feel that it is voluntary but it
doesn't matter how you *feel*. To be a licensed amateur radio operator,
everyone must meet the requirements whether he/she likes them or not and
whether he/she agrees with them or not.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1588. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 05:11:34 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <aoOu8.10435$3z3.1021708@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40857

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> One of the most humorous conversations I've ever heard
> on ham radio is that of a discussion about the corona
> balls on top of antennas...hilarious and they do it with a
> straight voice!!

What is hilarious about corona balls? Why shouldn't
they be discussed with a straight face?

1589. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 06:25:24 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9gg2u$os2$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40858

"Rich" <Rich@Richwebsitexxx.com> wrote in message
news:a9g22r$4bc$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
>
> > Has Clay been on this group long enough to realize that we are the
> > National Association of NitPickers ??
> >
> > <ggg>
> >
> > ---
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
>
> LOL! Although I've disagreed with you in the past on many
> things Phil, this time you are indeed right on the money. Speaking
> of the hobby as a whole, we are NitPickers on most everything, and
> this is also why I haven't attended any ham radio club meetings in the
> last 15 years.
>

The letter "p" in "nitpickers" is never capitalized.

Thank you.

Corry

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"No nation can preserve its freedom in the midst of continual
warfare." -James Madison

1590. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 08:52:57 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a9h3si2jqs@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40864

Kim, I think the important distinction with what words that can be said over the ham bands, usuing broadcast radio and television as the benchmarch, is that we may be able to say those words, but have the dignity and self-respect to not say the words....

I, myself am no angel.... I accidentally said the word "hell" before. But quickly apologized for it.... I suppose if I am talking to someone right before a car crash, I may vent a few more, kinda like Bill Cosby's comedy line.... "First ya say it, then ya do it (in an accident)"

One benefit of amateur radio amongst the many I have found is that it has helped me curb my language outside of amateur radio.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> Aw, this question of "did you say" is really an exercise in semantics.
> Except for the few instances in which people *really do* refrain from
> cursing or implying cursing, it is everywhere on the bands. What is the
> difference between hearing the phrase, "screw that" and "f___ that?" To
me,
> there is none, as the implication is equal to its counterpart. One of the
> most humorous conversations I've ever heard on ham radio is that of a
> discussion about the corona balls on top of antennas...hilarious and they
do
> it with a straight voice!! Once again, too, these same people that
discuss
> the corona balls are the same people who'd likely tell others that
> discussions of politics and religion, etc., are not good on ham radio.
> Balderdash, I say. I wonder if balderdash is a good example of
> Onomatopoeia? Oh well, that's another thread also...
>
> If only George Carlin were a ham...we could tell him that it's his
> *responsibility* (referring to another thread wherein it is implied that
> famous people have a responsibility to promote ham radio) to amateur radio
> to put out a list of, oh heck...what was it, Seven Curse words? Whatever
it
> was, ham radio could double it...LOL
>
> And, yes, you are right. Anything that is transmitted over public

airwaves
> is equal to what can be said over ham radio...at least that is my
> understanding of the legality of language in ham radio. If Howard Stern
can
> say what he says on broadcast radio, then we could also say it over ham
> radio. Not that we should, but we could. I can't remember their
callsigns
> now, but there used to be two attorneys who are hams and would have really
> early drivetimes (like 5AM). One morning they got into this very
discussion
> and it was their conclusion that it would be hard to press the issue of
hams
> using "curse" words over the air, when broadcast radio does it.
>
> It really boils down to a matter of interpretation...my "screw" is your
> "f___" and your "ahole" is my "asshole." Ewww, that didn't come out
right,
> eh? OHMYGAWD, neither did that...LOL I better stop while I'm
> behind...whoops, there I go again.
>
> (By the way, the above stuff could have been said on ham radio)... :)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1591. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 09:44:27 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <bhsnbu0jcp7n8bsvkim9t4dil6kicjfoac@4ax.com>
Source record: 40859

On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:28:30 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>

>Yet, the use of "it sucks" or "screw it" or "like Hades," etc., is fairly
>frequent. It may be "illegal" to curse on ham radio, but it is implied all
>the time.

You've got a call sign of TIT's and complain about implications?
Idealism should start at home...

1592. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 11:47:52 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbc1213_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40860

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:bhsnbu0jcp7n8bsvkim9t4dil6kicjfoac@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:28:30 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >> In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> >> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
> >>
>
> >Yet, the use of "it sucks" or "screw it" or "like Hades," etc., is fairly
> >frequent. It may be "illegal" to curse on ham radio, but it is implied
all
> >the time.
>
> You've got a call sign of TIT's and complain about implications?
> Idealism should start at home...

Oh, not at all am I complaining. I really don't care what "kind of
language" people use on the air. I have a tuning knob and an on/off button.
What I am pointing out--that you've totally let go over your head in your
angst to turn this into a callsign issue--is that "we" say "we" are good
people and that "we" don't condone cursing on the air. Yet, "we" have our
implications in language every day, as noted above.

You might be one of those people I am talking about. You apparently have a
problem with my callsign, yet you probably use language every day that
implies cursing. Have you ever had occasion to mention that you are
speeding on the highway? My callsign is legal, your speeding is not.

Go a little slower and be a lot more analytical in what I am saying before
you "think you have it." :)

Kim W5TIT

1593. Re: Onomatopoeia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:09:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416080938.01968.00003578@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40861

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>And when will YOUR "rationalizations" ever stop? Like trying to make up
>some excuses as to how "personal radio services" meand "strictly
>recreational'?

"Strictly?" Of course not, at least not for the Service as a whole. But for the majority of its participants, I imagine that "recreational" is the word that best describes their use of Amateur Radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1594. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:12:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416081215.01968.00003579@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40867

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> > Bending with the wind and merely before the slightest breeze are quite
>> >different. Sometimes the slight breeze (few) trumps a heavy wind (the
>> >majority)

>> What would be in it for ARRL to go along with a minority view?

> Evidently something.

If it was "evident," perhaps you would be able to tell us what it is.

Is this another one of those "It must be a conspiracy because Ed isn't telling
us about it" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1595. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:14:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416081407.01968.00003580@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40868

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> >Your record of accurate reading others posts here is not exactly
>> >sterling, Ed.

>> Sure it is, Dick. That is just another twist. Care to back it up with
>enough
>> examples to justify your statement?

>> I thought not...

> It won't be necessary for me to quote a darn thing. Your answers to my
>posts speak for themselves.

And I still think not.

Another Carroll generality that is unsupportable by anything resembling fact...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1596. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:15:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416081553.01968.00003581@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40862

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Unless you have an assignment as the singular HQ poster here to RRAP
>(the very occasional presence of Jon Bloom teh exception) your presence
>here helps to confirm that.

And this is confirmed in your mind by the fact that I keep telling you that my presence here is personal.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1597. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:17:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416081740.01968.00003582@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40866

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>then I'll answer with: I don't
>> know.

>OK, then. Simple question, simple answer.

Well, it really isn't that simple.

Kim, I am curious too... you said that the mode you used on 30 meters was neither CW nor digital. Then what mode was it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1598. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:18:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416081829.01968.00003583@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40863

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>If the ARRL is willing to provide the tapes, there are approximately 6
>different broadcast TV stations that I currently work with in promotion of
>our club, and amateur radio in general.

Great. I suggest that you ask ARRL to provide you with the tapes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1599. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:21:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416082144.01968.00003584@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40869

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>And those mortified HQ folk, desperate to end this scene, didn't ask
>her to ID.

Larry didn't say whether there was anyone from ARRL HQ there, Dick. Is your paranoia about ARRL HQ people getting a bit out of hand that you imagine them in control of everything?

In realilty, if a Director or SM were there, the HQ staffer would keep his or her mouth shut most of the time.

Perhaps I could give you a bit of "ARRL 101" to explain the structure of the organization so you wouldnt' be so easily confused.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1600. Re: Onomatopoeia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:43:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416084330.07494.00003608@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 40870

>Subject: Re: Onomatopoeia
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 04/16/02 08:09 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020416080938.01968.00003578@mb-df.aol.com>

>"Strictly?" Of course not,...(SNIP)

My point, exactly, Ed. However lesser informed persons have insisted that
said radio services (those "strictly" for "recreation") exist.

I could, by that rationale, state that certain Public Service frequencies
are "strictly recreational" since when I use them, it is in the line of duty of
volunteer work done for my own personal satisfaction (ie: "recreation")

>I imagine that "recreational" is the word
>that best describes their use of Amateur Radio.

But NOT "strictly".

73

Steve, K4YZ

1601. Addendum in Praise of Local Club!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:46:42 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ubo67b1339j0fa@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40865

When I got to the station of the local club, where they offer testing and other training the Monday night following the monthly meetings, there were two of us hoping to take a test. It was tax night and one of the scheduled VECs was unavoidably absent. A few phone calls were made and a member drove nearly 20 miles, each way, on the spur of the moment, to complete the examination team. Both of us passed!

Val
KC0MUB

1602. For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 12:57:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416085741.07506.00003516@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 40871

For those who like to moan and whine about Amateur Radio's death throes, I can't help but wonder how they rationalize thier rants when NASA, the most conservative of any technology based agency in the world, see's fit to incorporate it into it's multi-billion dollar pet.

Also...for those (or "the one") who always whine about how little Amateur radio get's any media exposure, here's another prick in the balloon.

QUOTE:

Amateur Radio Hits the Big Screen (Again) in New Imax Film Space Station (Apr 15, 2002) -- Amateur Radio again is getting a role on the silver screen, this time in the new IMAX film called Space Station. The film--the first 3D IMAX movie--includes a segment depicting the Amateur Radio on the International Space Station (ARISS) program in action.

UNQUOTE:

1603. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 13:05:04 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <tm6obu4uf4bcc5sg0jllg6p4fl79vt712h@4ax.com>
Source record: 40872

On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 21:26:32 -0400, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>Fair enough.
>
>> I *KNOW* it is legal to order pizza;
>> *you* are ignoring the fact that
>> Larry's (I think) scenario includes TWO
>> hams on an autopatch--one of whom
>> works at the pizza place. There is *potential*
>> for abuse there, that is all I imply.
>
>Sorry, but that potential is a fantasy. The person at the
>other end of an autopatch is just a "person" at that
>point with no different status because he/she might also
>hold a ham license.
>
>As to potential for abuse...again, not at all apparently
>in the eyes of the FCC.
>
>Your mileage may vary.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK
>
>

I think it's fair to say that any radio contact bears with it the
"potential" for abuse. Autopatch contacts bear a greater risk of
abuse, as they are often conducted with an unlicensed party on the
hardwired end of the conversation. An autopatch contact with a ham on
the phone SHOULD be "safer" than a "normal" autopach, as both parties
should be aware of the rules and regs regarding amateur radio.

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1604. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 13:05:04 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <vv6obu83tilm3df7cdvh1c89mpuubopa0f@4ax.com>
Source record: 40873

On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:32:51 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>> advertising.
>>
>> >> They can, during the phone/autopatch QSO,
>> >> talk about ham radio, use call signs, and order the pizza right down to
>> >> the last anchovy, and still never be anything but absolutely, perfectly
>> >> legal under Part 97 Rules.
>> >
>> >That is *your* interpretation.
>>
>> Not just Larry. It is the FCC's interpretation.
>>
>> >I think there are more than a few who would disagree with you..however,
>simply
>> >stated, I just simply disagree with you.
>>
>> Then you disagree with the FCC's stated policy as well.
>>
>
>Actually, I do disagree with the FCC on this. I don't think ordering
>*anything* over the air should be allowed.

So is it safe to say that you don't think swap nets should be allowed
on the air? If so, exactly how can you justify that position?

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1605. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 13:05:04 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <567obuo47r5d960m0744voag8havmutikp@4ax.com>
Source record: 40874

On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 22:09:15 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>> >
>> > Kim W5TIT
>> >
>
>You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might want to
>pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on this.
>Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the message.
>However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's attempted
>insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:
>
>How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur station
>shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably be
>furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to me
>that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be furnished
>alternatively through other radio services" category...

I'm in the car, in a QSO with my buddy three miles ahead of me on
2-meter simplex. I'm on my way to an appointment which I cannot
afford to be late for. He notes that there's an accident at his
location with traffic at a standstill, and an exit ramp between he and
I. From exactly WHICH "other radio service" am I going to get the
information advising me to take that exit and save myself from having
to sit in traffic?

>
>And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little
>here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:
>
>97.113 (again):
>(e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
>any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
>propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
>general public and originated from United States Government stations and
>communications, including incidental music, originating on United States
>Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth
>stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
>from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
>retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
>Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
>conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
>normal amateur radio communications.

Kim, I believe the intent of this is to prevent the duplication of the broadcast, but NOT to inhibit the relaying of the INFORMATION. Example... By your interpretation of this reg, it would be illegal for me to mention on the local repeater that I heard on the television that Robert Urich had just died. Now that sounds rather ridiculous, doesn't it? Now, if I had RECORDED the audio portion of that news story and then RETRANSMITTED it over the air, I would clearly be in violation of the statute cited above, AS WELL as in violation of any and all copyright laws protecting the television station's right to their material.

Exceptions to this would be any information that was obtained from intercepted cordless phone conversations and illegally intercepted cell-phone conversations. These transmissions are protected under law and information cannot be used from the interception of them.

Public safety transmissions (Police, Fire, Ambulance, etc.) are NOT protected and therefore information contained within their transmissions CAN be relayed. The key word here is PUBLIC. The police KNOW there are scanner listeners out there, that's why they have "discreet" frequencies...

>
>I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention to
>"*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than* an
>amateur station..."

Again, Kim... The statute refers to the SIGNAL and not the INFORMATION.

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1606. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part One

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 13:14:32 UTC
From: phranqueopinion2@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416091432.00480.00004041@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40875

If you want to promote ham radio, try operating a kids day station at a mall. Our club did that last year, we set up in the center of an outdoor mall, we ran HF, Two Meters and PSK 31 on 20 meters. We also spent some money on a both that people could no miss (around $400,00) We also got a good supply of hands from ARRL. inluding around 100 Archie comic books. I just with the ARRL did a better job of promoting kids day. I is hard to find on the ARRL web site, and they do not mention in the Magazine until one month before it happens. Until I mentioned to our club members, most of which have been ARRL members for quite a few years, they had not heard of Kids Day. This year Kids Day is on June 15th. THere is also one in Juanuary.

1607. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part Two

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 13:17:48 UTC
From: phranqueopinion2@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416091748.00480.00004042@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40876

>The name of the project is "THE ARRL Amateur Radio Education Project."

I wonder why ARRL does not include Kids Day as part of this project.

1608. Re: It's been 2 years since restructuring now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 13:24:54 UTC
From: johniacono2@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416092454.00480.00004047@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40877

>The world didn't end....
>

I may have ended for those who though a code speed of 5wpm would be the down fall of ham radio. I also upraded to General two years ago. It seems that the only idiots I hear have been hams that have been around a long time.

1609. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 16:21:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204160821.29ce75fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40878

Here are are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by
individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of April 15, 2002:

Novice - 38,858 (decrease of 10,471)
Tech - 238,903 (increase of 33,509)
Tech Plus - 80,971 (decrease of 47,889)
General - 138,989 (increase of 26,312)
Advanced - 85,790 (decrease of 13,992)
Extra - 99,872 (increase of 21,122)
Total - 683,383 (increase of 8,561)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1610. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 16:28:26 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <kujobu4kaog8jvkk8oqh1eijvrjmdhk0cr@4ax.com>
Source record: 40879

On Tue, 16 Apr 2002 06:47:52 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:bhsnbu0jcp7n8bsvkim9t4dil6kicjfoac@4ax.com...
>> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:28:30 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
>> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> >> In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> >> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>> >>
>>
>> >Yet, the use of "it sucks" or "screw it" or "like Hades," etc., is fairly
>> >frequent. It may be "illegal" to curse on ham radio, but it is implied
>all
>> >the time.
>>
>> You've got a call sign of TIT's and complain about implications?
>> Idealism should start at home...
>
>Oh, not at all am I complaining. I really don't care what "kind of
>language" people use on the air. I have a tuning knob and an on/off button.
>What I am pointing out--that you've totally let go over your head in your
>angst to turn this into a callsign issue--is that "we" say "we" are good
>people and that "we" don't condone cursing on the air. Yet, "we" have our
>implications in language every day, as noted above.

No, actually I think it's funny as hell. I hope you live up to your
call sign.
>
>You might be one of those people I am talking about. You apparently have a
>problem with my callsign, yet you probably use language every day that
>implies cursing. Have you ever had occasion to mention that you are
>speeding on the highway? My callsign is legal, your speeding is not.

I have no problem whatsoever with tits. They are one of my favorite
subjects. I don't do illegal things and if I did, I wouldn't discuss
them in public. I'm not insipid enough to whine about innuendo with a
vanity call sign of TIT's either though.

>
>Go a little slower and be a lot more analytical in what I am saying before
>you "think you have it." :)

I"m not sure I'd want it even if you offered it to me. ;-)

1611. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 19:00:43 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CBC74DA.E6A5273D@psu.edu>
Source record: 40880

Its all in how they look at things. There are a few things about the
ARS that aren't so good. There are a lot of things about it that are
great. It says a lot about a person in what they focus upon.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> For those who like to moan and whine about Amateur Radio's death throes, I
> can't help but wonder how they rationalize thier rants when NASA, the most
> conservative of any technology based agency in the world, see's fit to
> incorporate it into it's multi-billion dollar pet.
>
>

1612. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part One

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 19:06:39 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CBC763E.F560B0D8@psu.edu>
Source record: 40881

Of all the promotions I've been involved in, Kids day is probably the least effective. Most parents were in too much of a hurry to let their kids stop and work a radio. It was kind of sad, because the kids were slowing down to look and the parents were chiding them or in some cases grabbing an arm to get them out of the area and wherever they were going.

But then I've never considered the Amateur Radio Service much of a kids hobby anyhow.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Phranqueopinion2 wrote:
>
> If you want to promote ham radio, try operating a kids day station at a mall.
> Our club did that last year, we set up in the center of an outdoor mall, we ran
> HF, Two Meters and PSK 31 on 20 meters. We also spent some money on a both that
> people could no miss (around $400,00) We also got a good supply of hands from
> ARRL. inluding around 100 Archie comic books. I just with the ARRL did a better
> job of promoting kids day. I is hard to find on the ARRL web site, and they do
> not mention in the Magazine until one month before it happens. Until I
> mentioned to our club members, most of which have been ARRL members for quite a
> few years, they had not heard of Kids Day. This year Kids Day is on June 15th.
> THere is also one in Juanuary.

1613. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 19:21:00 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CBC799C.9E3491DD@psu.edu>
Source record: 40882

I see these as pretty good numbers, Jim. The classes I expected to decline have done so, and there is a small but healthy overall growth.

This makes me wonder about a couple of the mantras given out by various people regarding becoming a ham.

We need lots more Hams!

A slow growth is just about the best thing I can think of. The only reason I can think of for wanting double digit growth is that it would be a part of a spectrum grab.

We need to get kids to be Hams!

I always thought the ARS was more of an adult thing. Kids can participate, and can make excellent hams, but most definitely, most kids are not cut out for this. I think that the kids who want to become hams seek the ARS out, not the other way around.

- Mike KB3EIA -

N2EY wrote:
>
> Here are are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by
> individuals on the dates listed:

1614. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 19:58:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guo1f92.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 40883

On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 22:25:47 -0400, Rich wrote:

>Speaking
>of the hobby as a whole, we are NitPickers on most everything, and
>this is also why I haven't attended any ham radio club meetings in the
>last 15 years.

C'mon down to our club meetings ...we have plenty of nits to pick and
plenty of folks who aren't hesitant about it, either!

All done in a courteous manner with smiles on our faces.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

Home of the OTVARC

1615. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 19:58:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guo2944.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 40884

On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:45:12 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>It cannot be proven. And, what *if* you are known--for example--to own
>stock in ICOM? Or, you work at an ICOM store? And, what *if* you keep
>mentioning ICOM over and over again on the air? It's probably not illegal
>at all. However, "we" all know what "you" are doing and what "you" are
>doing is probably unethical in *context* of the rules.

If it's not "illegal" there's no basis of any controversy.

End of case.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1616. Re: Who is National Association of Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 19:58:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guo1lj3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 40885

On Tue, 16 Apr 2002 01:25:24 -0500, Unclaimed Mysteries wrote:

>The letter "p" in "nitpickers" is never capitalized.
>
It's not capitalized, it's upper case to make NitPickers an
unregistered service mark of r.r.a.p.

>Thank you.

Ter welcome.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1617. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 19:58:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guo3tu6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 40886

On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 22:09:15 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>Now, here's the quiz: can ya guess *why* we shouldn't/cannot retransmit
>things we hear on broadcast stations?

Originally the rule was "no other class of station" Period.

In the mid-70s a few well-placed "space groupies" who were radio
amateurs employed at NASA Goddard Space Center near Washington DC
cajoled (with appropriate pressure) the appropriate FCC Bureau chief
to get the rule amended to cover NASA space communications for their
own personal/hobby interests. Some of us at the Commish' who were
train-chasing-and-photographing nuts tried to get the same treatment
for rebroadcasting railroad radio communications for our hobby use.

We were told not pnly "no" but "hell no".

The fix was in and is still in.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1618. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 19:58:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guo2ss5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 40887

On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 21:20:26 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Are you suggesting that if I have a scanner and
>hear that there's an accident at 5th and Main
>that I can't mention it to another ham...or anyone else
>for that matter?
>
>If yes, please let us know what FCC rule applies.
>If one exists, it is not likly in Part 97 at all.

Try 47 U.S.C. s. 605 pertaining to interception and divulgence of
communications without authorization by the sender.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1619. Dear ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 20:10:50 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0204161210.adffcd1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40888
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dear ARRL,

I don't know if this fellow (see below) is a member of your
organization or not, but he is certainly making a nuisance of himself
in the rec.radio.cb newsgroup by continually advertising his "10 meter
amps" to CBers.

I thought hams were supposed to police themselves? If so, someone
should take this disgrace to amateur radio aside and let him know what
harm he's doing to the citizens band.

Sincerely,

Aaron H. Voobner

==========
Subject: HF AMPLIFIERS
From: NI4L ni4l@charter.net
Date: Tue, Apr 16, 2002 6:34 PM
Message-id: <3CBC6E9A.7199795C@charter.net>

FS TRANSEL NITRO 300A 10 meter amp. looks and works great.
its pretty heavy. 250.00 + shipping

FOR SALE PALOMAR 300A AMP
Works good, Looks good, 10-40 meters, seprate power supply.
250.00 + shipping.
have pics of amps

--

NI4L CUSTOM RESONANT DIPOLE
LEGAL LIMIT ++ CUSTOM MADE CENTER FED DIPOLE
Made with the same components used by our military forces today
Custom made to YOUR FREQUENCY of operation
Let me take the hassle out of making a RESONANT DIPOLE for you.
Click here for more info... http://www.angelfire.com/nb/ni4l/
==========

1620. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 21:55:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416175519.00480.00004147@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 40889

>Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
>From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 04/16/02 15:00 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3CBC74DA.E6A5273D@psu.edu>

>There are a few things about the
>ARS that aren't so good.

Sure there is, Mike, but at the end of the day, which outweighs the other
by a long way?

>It says a lot about a person in what they focus upon.

I'm focusing upon the fact that NASA has Ham Radio on board an orbiting
space station and they're bragging about it...and I bet there ain't a cellphone
within 300 miles of it!~

73

Steve, K4YZ

1621. FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-16 23:55:31 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <TR2v8.2029$7d4.322998386@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40890

I knew I read this on the FISTS site. Brian
---

http://www.fists.org/declare.html
The North American contingent of FISTS, the International Morse Preservation Society, in formal balloting of its membership approved the following declaration of purpose and policy by a 95 to 5 percent margin. FISTS is the first grass-roots organization worldwide to formally support, and call for, a restoring of exam standards of any kind.

1622. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:00:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kW2v8.2039$tl4.323503240@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40891

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ubn6qli88bu52a@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> Passed the General Written tonight using primarily the
> QRZ site to prepare, due to lack of time. Hope to take
> the code and Extra exam a month from now, after a lot
> of CW practice with a home-made keyer that will work
> with a 2m transceiver. Delays in getting this keyer to
> work (bad soldering technique on my part) have slowed
> things down there.
>
> Val Germann
> KC0MUB

Val, it would appear that you're putting the cart before the donkey. Blow off the theory and the rules and get crackin' on the code. If you pass the code, they'll "just give" you a real live HF license, according to Bruce and Larry. If you know the code you don't have to worry about the rest.

1623. Re: It's been 2 years since restructuring now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:03:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zZ2v8.2043$Ys4.323926271@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40892

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CBA4FAE.FC2D03BA@ix.netcom.com...
> And as far as I can tell, HF has not gone down
> the toilet, become CB or such.
>
> And I found that I do most of my operating on HF
> nowadays since I got my upgrade 2 years ago.
>
> The world didn't end....

Well -yew- just wait. Bruce and Larry cudn't be rong. Its gonna happen
suner or later. Mark my werds.

Or sumptin' like that.

1624. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:07:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416200755.19503.00000726@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 40893

In article <3CBC799C.9E3491DD@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>I see these as pretty good numbers, Jim. The classes I expected to
>decline have done so, and there is a small but healthy overall growth.

Yes, there has been some slight growth since restructuring, but it all happened
in
the first 10 months or so after the restructuring. The total peaked early in
2001 and
have hovered in the neighborhood of 683,000 ever since.

There was growth before the restructuring, too. Check out

http://www.ah0a.org

and note the growth from Sept 1998 to March of 2000 (just before restructuring
went
into effect.

Note also that the FCC has been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs since April 2000,
at
a rate of over 500 per month.
>
> This makes me wonder about a couple of the mantras given out by various
>people regarding becoming a ham.
>
>We need lots more Hams!
>
> A slow growth is just about the best thing I can think of. The only
>reason I can think of for wanting double digit growth is that it would
>be a part of a spectrum grab.

I think what really matters is the growth of amateur on-air activity, and the
type of
activity. Having a million hams isn't going to make much difference if most of
them
are never on the air - or if they behave in such a way as to damage the ARS
when
they do get on the air.

>We need to get kids to be Hams!
>
> I always thought the ARS was more of an adult thing. Kids can
>participate, and can make excellent hams, but most definitely, most kids
>are not cut out for this. I think that the kids who want to become hams
>seek the ARS out, not the other way around.

Depends on what you mean by "kid"..

I got my Novice at age 13, Tech and Advanced at age 14 and Extra at age 16. Would
have done it earlier but for lack of information and resources. Amateur radio led me
to a career and many wonderful friendships, accomplishments and experiences. It has
always been a service for all ages, and should remain so. But kids will only know about
it if we tell them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1625. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:10:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <I33v8.2050$OF4.324712591@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40894

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412211415.02551.00001638@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <qN5t8.1209$uv.63042947@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Someone PLEASE start NTI, HELL I will even Donate to this cause, and
you
> >dont
> >> even have to give me some Phoney NTI number.
> >
> >OK Larry, since all your doomsaying isn't doing it, you might as well
start
> >the organization that will fufill your prophesy.
>
> Brian:
>
> Don't look now, but it was Bruce saying ....

And the difference is?

1626. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:11:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <153v8.2052$vJ4.324922559@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40895

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cb780ec$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:VP5t8.1213$By.63245497@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3CB43D09.7845E5B9@psu.edu...
> > > I think maybe the ulterior motive on some peoples part here is that if
> > > enough idiots who know nothing about rf safety get on the air, they
will
> > > accidentally remove themselves from the gene pool? 8^)
> > >
> > > I'm pretty surprised that some hams seem to have such a underlying
> > > hatred for their hobby.
> > >
> > > - Mike - KB3EIA
> >
> > Not so much a hatred for their hobby as much as an unreconcilable loss
of
> > stature. The only way to save face is to destroy it.
> >
>
> EWwwwwwww...what a point to ponder. Hadn't thought of that one but I
> suppose that anyone who is that steadfastly glued to a "hobby" would
> certainly be capable...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Absolutely. I nailed that one. Very much like the possessive boyfriend
whose girlfriend wants to leave him...

1627. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:14:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%73v8.2056$QI4.324881431@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40896

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412231107.02551.00001672@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <Jyst8.1704$3z3.151405@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >In 2000 they changed Morse testing back to the 1912 requirement of
> >5WPM, and the number of classes to 3.
> >
> >"Ain't it awful what they've done to us?"
>
> Hansl:
>
> Actually, it is! We went from a clear superior licensing system, with
> reasonable, applicable, and highly achievable standards, to the
> dumbed-down standards of 90 years ago. Of all the incidents you
> relate on your timeline, Restructuring will go down in history as the
> greatest travesty ever visited on the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

It won't even register on the historical scale. You won't be vindicated.

1628. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:15:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <V83v8.2060$bR4.325393630@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40897

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412211413.02551.00001635@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <nvot8.1046$LT6.187787463@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> QWE? Can you copy Morse code?
> >> QWE I am a Welfare Extra - PSE QRS
> > >
> > >Wonder when Larry will jump on here and give us a "QFU?'
>
> Brian:
>
> I wasn't going to, but it looks like you did!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Predictable.

1629. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:17:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416201748.01955.00003880@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40898

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>A slow growth is just about the best thing I can think of. The only
>reason I can think of for wanting double digit growth is that it would
>be a part of a spectrum grab.

I agree. We saw explosive growth just after the NCT license -- more new hams
than could ever be properly Elmered. I think that reasonable growth is the
best course for the Amateur Radio Service.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1630. Re: It's been 2 years since restructuring now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:19:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416201932.01955.00003881@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40899

From: johniacono2@aol.com (Johniacono2)

>It seems that the
>only idiots I hear have been hams that have been around a long time.

Unfortunately, there are idiots to be found occasionally from both old-time and new hams. The licensing structure and its exams have never served as an idiot filter.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1631. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part One

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:20:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020416202046.01955.00003883@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 40900

From: phranqueopinion2@aol.com (Phranqueopinion2)

>I just with the ARRL did a better
>job of promoting kids day. I is hard to find on the ARRL web site, and they
>do
>not mention in the Magazine until one month before it happens.

I do hope you sent this to your ARRL Division Director.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1632. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:23:31 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7g3v8.2071$U45.326339722@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40951

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412211413.02551.00001634@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <_Zot8.1070$%Y7.192240753@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> There is absolutely nothing "gray" about utilizing amateur radio to
> >> facilitate routine commuting by the dissemination of traffic reports by
> >> radio amateurs. Shudder all you want, but this is about as black &
> >> white as any policy discussion we've had here. Traffic reporting is
> >> a perfectly valid and legal amateur radio activity. End of Story. If
> >> you think it is not, provide some convincing proof, or at least a valid
> >> argument. So far, all you've done is to make yourself seem to be
> >> totally unqualified to offer any opinion at all on this subject.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >But wouldn't the message carry more weight if it were sent in Morse Code?
>
> Brian:
>
> Morse/CW is a mode not normally used to pass highway traffic
> reports on VHF/UHF repeaters.

Lets set a precedence.

> I'm surprised you don't realize that
> fact.

I have it on good authority that the mode is more important than the
message.

> I always believe in using the appropriate mode for the particular
> application being pursued at the moment.

You misquote yourself.

1633. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:25:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Uh3v8.2074$335.326228006@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40952

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412211412.02551.00001633@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <LRot8.1066$6E7.190889179@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Isn't this just special? She thinks that because ham radio is useful
> >> for emergencies it supposed to be reserved solely for them. Neat!
> > >
> > >Just as special as Dixie and Larrie imagining an emergency where the only
> > >possible solution is CW, and forcing 650,000 people to learn it because
of a
> > >vivid imagination.
> >
> > Brian:
> >
> > More realistically (as opposed to your inane attempts at castigating Dick
> > and I for offering valid reasons for knowing the code), there are many
> > possible "emergency" situations where Morse/CW may, indeed be the
> > "best" mode to choose at the time.for a variety of reasons. If there are
> > not any radio amateurs who know how to use the mode, then that
> > particular emergency communications incident will result in failure, with
> > possibly adverse consequences to life and property. When we get to
> > the point where nobody is learning the Morse code due to a lack of a
> > license testing requirement, then we have lost a valuable emergency
> > communications capability. Of course, I guess you would call that
> > progress, wouldn't you, Brian?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT

What did the Coast Guard call it?

1634. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:28:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Rk3v8.2079$Sc5.326833338@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40953

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020413015210.29991.00002349@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 04/13/02 00:57 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020413005748.01569.00000050@mb-mg.aol.com>
>
> >
> >Now go specialize your paratransit, loogie hocker.
>
> Lennie...WHAT where you saying about being a professioanl, name
calling,
> etcetcetc?
>
> THIS is "profesional"...???

Nope, -this- is "profesSional"

1635. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 00:40:20 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Uv3v8.2097$tD5.328452195@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40954

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9end2$j6j$0@208.206.142.109...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
> >
> > >QYM "Your mama!"
> > >QGM "Your Grandma!"
> > >QSC "Your sister's in love with a carrot!"
> >
> > Dick Carroll can use QSH. :-)
> >
>
>
>
> QHS? "Did you soak your head yet, Ed?"
> QSH. "I can tell, you didn't".

QKS "Go Soak you hemmoroids in Kerosene"
QKS? "Did you Soak your hemmoroids in Kerosene like I told you to?"

1636. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:00:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CBCD73D.5864F6E2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 40955

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> here's another prick in the balloon.

"Hehe..... You said 'prick'".... - Beavis :-)

1637. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:02:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbcda5a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40956

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020415231242.20665.00000604@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3cba4ba3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
>
> >I think there are more than a few (no I am
> >not going to count them Jim) who would disagree with you...however,
simply
> >stated, I just simply disagree with you.
>
> So far, Kim, you seem to be quite alone in your disagreement.
>

I haven't decided if it's pitiful or hilarious that you seem to be using
this newsgroup as the all-inclusive source for people who think a certain
way...

Kim W5TIT

1638. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:05:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbcdaf8$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40957

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020415231243.20665.00000606@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3cbb65ba_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >I can absolutely assure you that there are no smooth operations here
during
> >our several hours of rush.
> >
> >>
> >> Kim, you have chosen to live a long way from where you work, in a city
> >with
> >> inadequate roads and all-but-nonexistent transit. Your choice has
pretty
> >> much guaranteed you a long, frustrating, energy-inefficient,
air-polluting
> >> commute. Perhaps it bothers you that other hams in other places (like
> >Larry)
> >> have made different choices and don't have to got through that sort of
> >commute
> >> every working day.
> >>
> >> In short, jealousy.
>
> Jim:
>
> If that's the case, let Kim be jealous of this: My "commute" to work
> is 3.5 miles one way, usually takes from 10 - 12 minutes, and I have
> free, dedicated parking. I fill the gas tank on my '01 Toyota Corolla LE
> every three weeks, and it usually takes 9 gallons. This includes my
> weekly commuting and all other incidental driving during days off, etc.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Let me assure you that Jim is quite wrong. I was raised in the country and
am country through and through. As development encroaches upon this area,
my husband and I have even toyed with the idea of moving about 20-25 miles
further east.

Nope, it's ideal to drive from the heart of downtown Dallas to the cattle in
the country and I wouldn't trade it for the world. Traffic jams are my
haven in the morning and evenings...they don't bother me at all.

Kim W5TIT

1639. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:11:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbcdc56_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40961

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:edNu8.10269$3z3.1001954@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> >
> > I can absolutely assure you that there are no smooth operations here
> during
> > our several hours of rush.
> >
>
> I guess it all depends on your interpretation of "smooth".
>
> I have an engineering group located at our facility in Richardson, about 2
> miles off US75. I regularly fly to DFW and drive to visit them, often
> arriving during at DFW morning rush time, and leaving Richardson in late
> afternoon for the return to DFW. Only rarely do I find myself traveling
> less than the posted limits on your highways.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

The Richardson area is where I've worked the longest in my career. You are lucky to be in that part of town driving West, presumably on IH-635 to get to the airport or East on IH-635 to get to Richardson. In either case, the traffic there is usually not that bad. On I-35, I-30, Hwy 114 (up your way--would be the road around Las Colinas, etc.), Hwy 75 in any direction coming into or out of Dallas, *any* of the veins that are near downtown, going to or from Richardson from the East (traveling west on IH-635 in the morning, or East in the evening, are all pretty bad. Average speed with no additional problems is anywhere from 20-25. Note I said average...because I'd say 635 is the worst, at a crawl most of the way to Richardson.

I'm sure you'll feel the pinch with the new High-5 going in up there, too.

Kim W5TIT

1640. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:13:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbcdce7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40963

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a9h3si2jqs@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Kim, I think the important distinction with what words that can be said
over
> the ham bands, usuing broadcast radio and television as the benchmarch, is
> that we may be able to say those words, but have the dignity and
> self-respect to not say the words....
>
> I, myself am no angel.... I accidentally said the word "hell" before. But
> quickly apologized for it.... I suppose if I am talking to someone right
> before a car crash, I may vent a few more, kinda like Bill Cosby's comedy
> line.... "First ya say it, then ya do it (in an accident)"
>
> One benefit of amateur radio amongst the many I have found is that it has
> helped me curb my language outside of amateur radio.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
>
> www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the
site
> please)
>
>
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
>

Yep, I think so. I think getting hung up on language is secondary to some of the real crap that goes on over the air, and we've had lots of fun on our own repeater...when we "forget" where we are.

At any rate, you wouldn't want to be at one of our dinners, then, because we let loose in person... ;)

Kim W5TIT

1641. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:15:18 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbcdd53_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40964

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020416081740.01968.00003582@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >>then I'll answer with: I don't
> >> know.
>
> >OK, then. Simple question, simple answer.
>
> Well, it really isn't that simple.
>
> Kim, I am curious too... you said that the mode you used on 30 meters was
> neither CW nor digital. Then what mode was it?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

That was actually a snied comment. I actually have no idea if I've ever
been on 30...I don't think I have, since 30 meters is strictly digital, is
it not? I haven't done any digital.

Kim W5TIT

1642. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:16:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9im2s$k4q$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40958

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cbb988b_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a9fudkqbp1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3cbb66b5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a9emjvsfs1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > >
> > > > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3cb9b236$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > > We can, however, retransmit items from the NWS, I
> > > > > think.
> > > >
> > > > We can, in our own words, retransmit (as part
> > > > of a QSO...not as a one way broadcast) just about anything.
> > > > That'd include the latest stock quote, news items,
> > > > weather reports or whatever.
> > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > Bill K2UNK
> > >
> > > It is my understanding that we absolutely *cannot* retransmit things
on
> > > emergency frequencies (police in particular).
> >
> > Are you suggesting that if I have a scanner and
> > hear that there's an accident at 5th and Main
> > that I can't mention it to another ham...or anyone else
> > for that matter?
> >
> > If yes, please let us know what FCC rule applies.
> > If one exists, it is not likly in Part 97 at all.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might want to
> pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on
this.
> Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the
message.
> However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's attempted

> insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:
>
> How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur
station
> shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably
be
> furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to me
> that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be furnished
> alternatively through other radio services" category...

Who cares, so what...that does NOT make the discussion of traffic
illegal.

> And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little
> here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:
>
> 97.113 (again):
> (e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
> any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
> propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
> general public and originated from United States Government stations and
> communications, including incidental music, originating on United States
> Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth
> stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
> from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
> retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
> Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
> conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
> normal amateur radio communications.
>
> I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention to
> "*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than* an
> amateur station..."
>
> Now, here's the quiz: can ya guess *why* we shouldn't/cannot retransmit
> things we hear on broadcast stations?

Bzzzt...wrong!

If I tell another ham something I heard, I am NOT retransmiting
a "program" or "signal".... in other words...not applicable.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1643. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:19:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbcde45_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40965

"AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:567obuo47r5d960m0744voag8havmutikp@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 22:09:15 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
>
> >> >
> >> > Kim W5TIT
> >> >
> >
> >You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might want
to
> >pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on
this.
> >Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the
message.
> >However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's attempted
> >insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:
> >
> >How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur
station
> >shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably
be
> >furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to
me
> >that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be
furnished
> >alternatively through other radio services" category...
>
> I'm in the car, in a QSO with my buddy three miles ahead of me on
> 2-meter simplex. I'm on my way to an appointment which I cannot
> afford to be late for. He notes that there's an accident at his
> location with traffic at a standstill, and an exit ramp between he and
> I. From exactly WHICH "other radio service" am I going to get the
> information advising me to take that exit and save myself from having
> to sit in traffic?
>

I believe that question, a form of protest it sounds like, would be best
directed to the FCC.

> >
> >And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little
> >here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:
> >

> >97.113 (again):
> >(e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
> >any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
> >propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
> >general public and originated from United States Government stations and
> >communications, including incidental music, originating on United States
> >Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth
> >stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
> >from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
> >retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
> >Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
> >conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
> >normal amateur radio communications.
>
> Kim, I believe the intent of this is to prevent the duplication of the
> broadcast, but NOT to inhibit the relaying of the INFORMATION.
> Example... By your interpretation of this reg, it would be illegal
> for me to mention on the local repeater that I heard on the television
> that Robert Urich had just died. Now that sounds rather ridiculous,
> doesn't it? Now, if I had RECORDED the audio portion of that news
> story and then RETRANSMITTED it over the air, I would clearly be in
> violation of the statute cited above, AS WELL as in violation of any
> and all copyright laws protecting the television station's right to
> their material.
>

Perhaps that is all the stipulation is saying: that the actual audio cannot
be retransmitted.

> Exceptions to this would be any information that was obtained from
> intercepted cordless phone conversations and illegally intercepted
> cell-phone conversations. These transmissions are protected under law
> and information cannot be used from the interception of them.
>
> Public safety transmissions (Police, Fire, Ambulance, etc.) are NOT
> protected and therefore information contained within their
> transmissions CAN be relayed. The key word here is PUBLIC. The
> police KNOW there are scanner listeners out there, that's why they
> have "discreet" frequencies...
>
> >
> >I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention to
> >"*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than* an
> >amateur station..."
>
> Again, Kim... The statute refers to the SIGNAL and not the
> INFORMATION.
>
>
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR

> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

Perhaps...

Kim W5TIT

1644. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:21:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9im85ret0@208.207.71.151>
Source record: 40959

mike coslo wrote:
>
> Its all in how they look at things. There are a few things about the
> ARS that aren't so good. There are a lot of things about it that are
> great. It says a lot about a person in what they focus upon.

It says even more about a person in what he deliberately focuses away
from, and ingores.

1645. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:23:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9ima6ret1@208.207.71.151>
Source record: 40960

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Unless you have an assignment as the singular HQ poster here to RRAP
> >(the very occasional presence of Jon Bloom teh exception) your presence
> >here helps to confirm that.
>
> And this is confirmed in your mind by the fact that I keep telling you that my
> presence here is personal.

Sure it is, Ed. And as you said, your boss knows you'd never say
anything that would work against League policy.

1646. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:23:12 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbcdf42_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40966

"AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:vv6obu83tilm3df7cdvh1c89mpuubopa0f@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:32:51 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >>
> >> Then you disagree with the FCC's stated policy as well.
> >>
> >
> >Actually, I do disagree with the FCC on this. I don't think ordering
> >*anything* over the air should be allowed.
>
> So is it safe to say that you don't think swap nets should be allowed
> on the air? If so, exactly how can you justify that position?
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

A swap net is not "ordering" something over the air. What I mean by that is, if it OK to order pizza, then it is OK for me to call the local furniture store and tell them I'll be there to pick some furniture up, call the office supply store and tell them to get the following items ready because I'm on my way to pick them up, etc., etc. If you think not, what would you say is the difference between ordering pizza or the chair we'd like to sit in while we eat it?

Swap nets are just fine... The R&R mention that the rule directly addresses those items that generate a profit. Most of us cannot sell our equipment at a profit, right?

Kim W5TIT

1647. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:24:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9imdhret2@208.207.71.151>
Source record: 40962

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> >Your record of accurate reading others posts here is not exactly
> >> >sterling, Ed.
>
> >> Sure it is, Dick. That is just another twist. Care to back it up with
> >enough
> >> examples to justify your statement?
>
> >> I thought not...
>
> > It won't be necessary for me to quote a darn thing. Your answers to my
> >posts speak for themselves.
>
> And I still think not.
>
> Another Carroll generality that is unsupportable by anything resembling fact...
>

Do you really believe that all other readers here fail to note your
dishonesty in deliberatly changing the wordings and meanings of my
posts? I sure don't.

1648. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:26:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbce003_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40967

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.guo2944.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:45:12 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >It cannot be proven. And, what *if* you are known--for example--to own
> >stock in ICOM? Or, you work at an ICOM store? And, what *if* you keep
> >mentioning ICOM over and over again on the air? It's probably not
illegal
> >at all. However, "we" all know what "you" are doing and what "you" are
> >doing is probably unethical in *context* of the rules.
>
> If it's not "illegal" there's no basis of any controversy.
>
> End of case.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

heh heh is that kind of like saying if there's money in it for you, then
there's no controversy, Phil? :o

Kim W5TIT

1649. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:29:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbce08b$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40968

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.guo2ss5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 21:20:26 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Are you suggesting that if I have a scanner and
> >hear that there's an accident at 5th and Main
> >that I can't mention it to another ham...or anyone else
> >for that matter?
> >
> >If yes, please let us know what FCC rule applies.
> >If one exists, it is not likly in Part 97 at all.
>
> Try 47 U.S.C. s. 605 pertaining to interception and divulgence of
> communications without authorization by the sender.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Ah, there, too... I always see folks wanting to look just at Part 97 of
Title 47. There's so much more meat in the other sections...

Kim W5TIT

1650. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:34:09 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbce1ed_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40969

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9im2s$k4q$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cbb988b_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a9fudkqbp1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3cbb66b5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:a9emjvsfs1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3cb9b236$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > > > We can, however, retransmit items from the NWS, I
> > > > > > think.
> > > > >
> > > > > We can, in our own words, retransmit (as part
> > > > > of a QSO...not as a one way broadcast) just about anything.
> > > > > That'd include the latest stock quote, news items,
> > > > > weather reports or whatever.
> > > > >
> > > > > Cheers,
> > > > > Bill K2UNK
> > > >
> > > > It is my understanding that we absolutely *cannot* retransmit things
> on
> > > > emergency frequencies (police in particular).
> > >
> > > Are you suggesting that if I have a scanner and
> > > hear that there's an accident at 5th and Main
> > > that I can't mention it to another ham...or anyone else
> > > for that matter?
> > >
> > > If yes, please let us know what FCC rule applies.
> > > If one exists, it is not likly in Part 97 at all.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might want
to
> > pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on

> this.
> > Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the
> message.
> > However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's attempted
> > insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:
> >
> > How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur
> station
> > shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could
reasonably
> be
> > furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to
me
> > that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be
furnished
> > alternatively through other radio services" category...
>
> Who cares, so what...that does NOT make the discussion of traffic
> illegal.
>
> > And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little
> > here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:
> >
> > 97.113 (again):
> > (e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
> > any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
> > propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
> > general public and originated from United States Government stations and
> > communications, including incidental music, originating on United States
> > Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth
> > stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
> > from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
> > retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
> > Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
> > conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
> > normal amateur radio communications.
> >
> > I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention to
> > "*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than* an
> > amateur station..."
> >
> > Now, here's the quiz: can ya guess *why* we shouldn't/cannot retransmit
> > things we hear on broadcast stations?
>
> Bzzzt...wrong!
>
> If I tell another ham something I heard, I am NOT retransmiting
> a "program" or "signal".... in other words...not applicable.
>
> Cheers,

> Bill K2UNK
>

Well, that's the Part 97 part that I quoted. See Phil Kane's post. By the way...it's my regarded opinion that the reason we shouldn't/can't do this is twofold: liability and the fact that the FCC did not want to be dragged into court continuously when amateurs repeat things over the air that are either copyrighted or that end up being "mistakes" by the media.

Kim W5TIT

1651. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:35:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbce22b$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40971

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9ima6ret1@208.207.71.151...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >Unless you have an assignment as the singular HQ poster here to RRAP
> > >(the very occasional presence of Jon Bloom teh exception) your presence
> > >here helps to confirm that.
> >
> > And this is confirmed in your mind by the fact that I keep telling you
that my
> > presence here is personal.
>
>
> Sure it is, Ed. And as you said, your boss knows you'd never say
> anything that would work against League policy.

Ed, Gads!!! Can you think of anything that you disagree with the ARRL on?
Make him shut the hell up...LOL

Kim W5TIT

1652. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 02:49:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CBCE2C4.E1AC1917@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40970

N2EY wrote:
>
You were definitely motivated to get your licenses the way you did.

I think we all had some defining moment that we decided this was
something interesting to do. Most of us wish we had started sooner. But
I don't think we should be too hopeful of our displays at malls to
attract kids to the hobby. I suspect the potential hams will find their
way there whether we do that or not.

- Mike KB3EIA -

> In article <3CBC799C.9E3491DD@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> >We need to get kids to be Hams!
> >
> > I always thought the ARS was more of an adult thing. Kids can
> >participate, and can make excellent hams, but most definitely, most kids
> >are not cut out for this. I think that the kids who want to become hams
> >seek the ARS out, not the other way around.
>
> Depends on what you mean by "kid"..
>
> I got my Novice at age 13, Tech and Advanced at age 14 and Extra at age 16.
> Would
> have done it earlier but for lack of information and resources. Amateur radio
> led me
> to a career and many wonderful friendships, accomplishments and experiences. It
> has
> always been a service for all ages, and should remain so. But kids will only
> know about
> it if we tell them.

1653. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 03:41:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBCEED2.A2758BD8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40972

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Do you really believe that all other readers here fail to note your
> dishonesty in deliberatly changing the wordings and meanings of my
> posts? I sure don't.

Dick, maybe you should take some English lessons. Your statements
speak for themselves. It doesn't do any good to deny them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1654. Space Ham [was: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 04:06:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417000646.29664.00000620@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 40974

In article <20020416085741.07506.00003516@mb-cc.aol.com>, somebody writes:

> For those who like to moan and whine about Amateur Radio's death throes,
>I can't help but wonder how they rationalize thier rants when NASA, the most
>conservative of any technology based agency in the world, see's fit to
>incorporate it into it's multi-billion dollar pet.

Heh. The first hurdle in trying to decipher the above is to get over "most conservative," a ludicrous description...except to those never having worked in any part of the US space program. :-)

The next hurdle in understanding is "multi-billion dollar pet," in an apparent reference to the Space Transportation System or STS, popularly known as "shuttle." As of October 31, 2000, there had been 100 shuttle flights, 75 since the Challenger explosion-crash. As of 2001, of 414 humans who had flown in space, 261 were Americans and most of those flew on shuttle. The International Space Station or ISS will require 44 total shuttle missions to complete construction, more afterwards to rotate crews and bring up fresh supplies. ISS is a consortium of 16 nations and the prime mover of crews, materials, and supplies for it is the US STS. The only other nation capable of ferrying anything to it at present is Russia.

While the biggest budgetary item in NASA is, at present, STS, NASA still bosses the unmanned spacecraft flights which includes the DSN or Deep Space Network for bringing in data via radio from unmanned craft. NASA continues with space research in materials, techniques, testing for both space and aeronautics (aeronautics is the second "a" in NASA).

The third hurdle is "incorporate." By dictionary definition, "incorporate" means to "combine, include, embody" or to "combine together in a single whole, merge." At *NO* time was NASA or USAF BMC or USA space efforts (Huntsville, AL) ever dependent on amateur radio to fulfill any missions, flights, or test programs.

> Also...for those (or "the one") who always whine about how little
>Amateur radio get's any media exposure, here's another prick in the balloon.

<snip of IMAX blurb>

IMAX cannot be shown in conventional motion picture theaters, only at certain theaters. There are now more motion picture theaters fitted for new digital forms of conventional movies than there are IMAX theaters in the USA.

The unfortunate fact (for amateur radio publicity) is that exposure of ham radio to the US public is almost nil in all popular media.

It should be fairly obvious that NASA requests some astronauts to get amateur radio licenses for NASA publicity purposes, not to advance or sponsor amateur radio activity. NASA must continually seek all avenues of public awareness of its expensive programs to remain a part of the US government's various programs.

"ARISS in action" as a phrase is part of the usual self-promotional spin done by the ARRL. That's fine for amateur radio but means absolutely nothing for NASA or the STS since they have their own infrastructure for communications, tracking, data retrieval in at least a three-tiered backup system for STS or any other program. Ham radio from the ISS or STS is an on-going publicity program, a part of NASA and the space agencies of the other 15 nations in the ISS consortium. Ham radio is NOT a "vital part" of space programs.

1655. Recreation [was Onomatopoeia]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 04:06:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417000647.29664.00000621@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 40973

In article <20020416080938.01968.00003578@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>>And when will YOUR "rationalizations" ever stop? Like trying to make up
>>some excuses as to how "personal radio services" meand "strictly
>>recreational'?
>
>"Strictly?" Of course not, at least not for the Service as a whole. But for
>the majority of its participants, I imagine that "recreational" is the word
>that best describes their use of Amateur Radio.

Not applicable to certain minds within the US ARS, Ed. :-)

Those minds abhor anyone "enjoying" a hobby. Everything has
to be selfless devotion to duty in the "service." They must
continue to wear a "uniform" complete with rows of service
ribbons, insignia, march in ranks to martial music on a parade
ground, and fight the imaginary wars which threaten their
perceived status as some "5th military service branch" of the US.

As the old Roman cloth makers said to Ceasar in the Coleseum
cloth contest: "We who are about to dye salute you!" :-)

Meanwhile, about 500K+ model aircraft flyers and surface
vehicle modelers are happily enjoying, note ENJOYING, the
ability to remote control their craft through Part 95 regulations.
I believe that's called "recreation" or something like that.

Perhaps they should be ashamed of actually enjoying their
hobby, unlike some in the US ARS busy trying to get
everyone to march to their military music. Tsk, tsk, the
nerve of some non-ARS groups actually getting a radio
service for pure enjoyment!!! :-)

1656. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 05:01:39 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a9jmt422hcn@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40986

Good idea Kim, actually I was thinking that with all that money being spent on the "defense of ham radio", that they might have actually have had produced video and/or audio promo tapes.

There is cable access channels available here in the Mid-Michigan area, although I do not know how many people *actually* watch those channels except shut-ins. But I am going to become a member of the organization that runs the City Of Midland area public access channel, and my goal is to create a promo tape.

I am currently working on creating a report/paper form of my activities as a public relations person for our amateur radio club and would be willing to share that knowledge with others when I finally get it in printed/printable form.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cbb6329_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:a9fi4h0gno@enews1.newsguy.com...
> > If the ARRL is willing to provide the tapes, there are approximately 6
> > different broadcast TV stations that I currently work with in promotion
of
> > our club, and amateur radio in general. If there is any audio
tapes/carts
> > for radio I would also work with the radio stations in the area I would
> also
> > take those to the radio stations I deal with.
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> >
> > www.qsl.net/w8kea
> >
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> >

> >
>
> Just thought about this one. Do the cable companies still have to provide
> "public access" channels for general use? I remember the last time I had
> cable (uh, years ago) they had to under agreement with the cities. There
> was a guy down here who used to strap his video recorder to his truck and
> he'd drive up and down Lancaster Ave in Ft. Worth and have a hour show on
> the shops on the street and the history.
>
> If the cable channels do still have to do that, wonder how many hams would
> be willing to do ham shows on those channels?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1657. Re: Recreation [was Onomatopoeia]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 05:30:14 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <GL7v8.12786$3z3.1228384@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40975

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Those minds abhor anyone "enjoying" a hobby. Everything has
> to be selfless devotion to duty in the "service." They must
> continue to wear a "uniform" complete with rows of service
> ribbons, insignia, march in ranks to martial music on a parade
> ground, and fight the imaginary wars which threaten their
> perceived status as some "5th military service branch" of the US.
>

Damn, how'd I miss all that? I've been licensed since the early 60's and never heard of uniforms, marching, or any of that. My Mom, who was first licensed in 1930 never told me about those things either.

I guess Leonard is telling tall stories again! Crank that organ, old Sir.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1658. Sucks To Be Lennie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 08:30:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417043056.13104.00004511@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 40976

>Subject: Recreation [was Onomatopoeia]
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/17/02 00:06 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020417000647.29664.00000621@mb-bk.aol.com>

>>>And when will YOUR "rationalizations" ever stop? Like trying to make up
>>>some excuses as to how "personal radio services" meand "strictly
>>>recreational'?
>>
>>"Strictly?" Of course not, at least not for the Service as a whole. But for
>>the majority of its participants, I imagine that "recreational" is the word
>>that best describes their use of Amateur Radio.
>
>Not applicable to certain minds within the US ARS, Ed. :-)
>
>Those minds abhor anyone "enjoying" a hobby. Everything has
>to be selfless devotion to duty in the "service." They must
>continue to wear a "uniform" complete with rows of service
>ribbons, insignia, march in ranks to martial music on a parade
>ground, and fight the imaginary wars which threaten their
>perceived status as some "5th military service branch" of the US.

Thank you for your "outsider's view", Lennie.

And that's EXACTLY what it is.

>Meanwhile, about 500K+ model aircraft flyers and surface
>vehicle modelers are happily enjoying, note ENJOYING, the
>ability to remote control their craft through Part 95 regulations.
>I believe that's called "recreation" or something like that.

And I agree. They enjoy it wholeheartedly and do something that I
immensely admire.

However that does NOT negate the fact that YOU have stated that there is a
radio service created by the FCC for "strictly" recreational purposes.

I have asked you REPEATEDLY to please cite the service created for
STRICTLY recreational purposes. You have not. You either lied or made a
mistake, and I am trying to figure out which it is.

>Perhaps they should be ashamed of actually enjoying their
>hobby, unlike some in the US ARS busy trying to get
>everyone to march to their military music. Tsk, tsk, the
>nerve of some non-ARS groups actually getting a radio
>service for pure enjoyment!!!

Ashamed of what? Of course not.

The one who SHOULD be ashmed is a near-octogenarian who cannot be man enough to admit he made a mistake without perpetuating his his mistake.

And that would be Leonard H. Anderson...Loser.

1659. What's It Like To be That Old and THAT Bitter, Lernnie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 09:12:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417051223.13104.00004517@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 40977

Subject: Space Ham [was: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying]
From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
Date: 04/17/02 00:06 Eastern Daylight Time
Message-id: <20020417000646.29664.00000620@mb-bk.aol.com>

In article <20020416085741.07506.00003516@mb-cc.aol.com>, K4YZ writes:

>> For those who like to moan and whine about Amateur Radio's death throes,
>>I can't help but wonder how they rationalize thier rants when NASA, the most
>>conservative of any technology based agency in the world, see's fit to
>>incorporate it into it's multi-billion dollar pet.

Lennie the Loser retorts:

>Heh. The first hurdle in trying to decipher the above is to get over "most
>conservative," a ludicrous description...except to those never having
>worked in any part of the US space program.

NASA is >NOT< conservative in it's practices? It is >NOT< conservative in
it's technical tolerances nor whom it allows to fly in it's spacecraft?

Geez, Your Putziness...I didn't think THAT required any "deciphering".

>The next hurdle in understanding is "multi-billion dollar pet,"...

Only you required any assistance there, Lennie.

>While the biggest budgetary item in NASA is, at present, STS,
>NASA still bosses the unmanned spacecraft flights which
>includes the DSN or Deep Space Network for bringing in data
>via radio from unmanned craft. NASA continues with space
>research in materials, techniques, testing for both space and
>aeronautics (aeronautics is the second "a" in NASA).

No, Your Foolishness...The second "a" in NASA is "Administration".

Details, you idiot...details...That's why you hardly ever get it
right...You don't pay attention, even to what YOU write. That's why you can't
scam your trash in here without severe criticism.

>The third hurdle is "incorporate." By dictionary definition,
>"incorporate" means to "combine, include, embody" or to
>"combine together in a single whole, merge." At *NO* time
>was NASA or USAF BMC or USA space efforts (Huntsville,
>AL) ever dependent on amateur radio to fulfill any
>missions, flights, or test programs.

I know asking you to substantiate your assertions is foolhearty, but I will do it only so that others can see your reluctance to back up even your own stupid assertions....WHERE did I or anyone else SAY that NASA had ever been "dependent" on Amateur Radio to fulfill any mission criteria???

Also, I note that the design and installation of ARISS system antennas IS an integral part of ISS design. Ergo ARISS >>IS<< incorporated to the International Space Station. This is further substantiated by the issuance of callsigns TO the ISS by several of the nations who underwrite the ISS, therefore the operation of Amateur radio in space is recognized as important by more than on national government.

>> Also...for those (or "the one") who always whine about how little
>>Amateur radio get's any media exposure, here's another prick in the balloon.

<snip of IMAX blurb>

>IMAX cannot be shown in conventional motion picture theaters, only at
>certain theaters. There are now more motion picture theaters fitted for
>new digital forms of conventional movies than there are IMAX theaters
>in the USA.

Which still does not negate the fact that MILLIONS of people (per IMAX accounts of visits-per-year) will see IMAX presentations every year....And not "only" in the United States, mind you...

>The unfortunate fact (for amateur radio publicity) is that exposure of
>ham radio to the US public is almost nil in all popular media.

But NOT as "nil" as the amount of exposure as Lennie the Loser has.

>It should be fairly obvious that NASA requests some astronauts to
>get amateur radio licenses for NASA publicity purposes, not to
>advance or sponsor amateur radio activity. NASA must continually
>seek all avenues of public awareness of its expensive programs to
>remain a part of the US government's various programs.

NOW I GET IT! it's just a PUBLICITY STUNT! Kinda like pole sitting or wing walking!

Suuuuuuuuure, Lennie! NASA has nothing better for it's flight staff to do than pass Amateur Radio examinations for "publicity"...As if walking in space and creating orbiting laboratories isn't enough. It's a well known fact that most Americans don't lend ANY credibility to ANY astronaut that doesn't hold an Amateur license....(coughcough..snickersnicker...Suuuuure Lennie!)

Of course I guess YOU would be the one to find some "negative" side to programs like ARISS that allow some form of direct communication between the crews and school children...Nothing like spoiling the minds of kids who might have otherwise wasted thier time on useless pursuits like aerospace engineering, medecine, etc, huh, Lennie...???

>"ARISS in action" as a phrase is part of the usual self-promotional
>spin done by the ARRL. That's fine for amateur radio but means
>absolutely nothing for NASA...(SNIP)

But...but...but...LENNIE! Above you just claimed it was a publicity stunt for NASA...I ASSUME that you meant that it was intended to create some sort of positive reaction by the unwashed masses towards an otherwise expensive program.

If THAT was the intent, then it very certainly DOES mean "something" to NASA!

>or the STS since they have their own
>infrastructure for communications, tracking, data retrieval in at least
>a three-tiered backup system for STS or any other program.

The use of Amateur Radio to communicate directly with the now decommissioned MIR and STS missions was widely published. It is a fact. it happened. Guess good-old simplex FM voice STILL has a place in radiocommunications, huh, Your Foolishness?

> Ham
>radio from the ISS or STS is an on-going publicity program, a part
>of NASA and the space agencies of the other 15 nations in the ISS
>consortium. Ham radio is NOT a "vital part" of space programs.

Again....You are asked to cite WHO (other than YOU) said it "was" a "vital" part of the program, Lennie.

Do you go out of yourway to LOOK bitter, Lennie? If so, you are doing a good job.

1660. A Moment of Silence On 11 Sept 2002?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 09:28:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417052825.13104.00004525@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 40978

Below is an item I read on "eHam". I think it's an Outstanding idea.

73

Steve Robeson, K4YZ

QUOTE:

September 11, 2002 Radio Silence
Ray J. (AC5KD) on April 14, 2002
View comments about this article!

I am just as saddened and angry at the events of September 11th as anyone is. On the afternoon of the 11th, I went to get the largest American flag I could find so that I could drive with it flying above my truck. I attached the flag to a pole, and then bound the pole to my High Sierras screwdriver antenna, which is in the bed of my truck, so that I could fly our flag up high as I drove from city to city. That is what I did to honor the victims of the 11th, as well as to demonstrate my unstoppable surge of patriotism that we all felt that day.

As ham radio operators, we are daily ambassadors to the rest of the world. We set examples of how Americans truly feel, think, and act, when we speak of our ways over the radio. For some people, ham radio is their only way to get a true sense of how Americans are. I have many friends around the world, and I am very intent on showing as many people as possible, how the events of September 11th have brought our country together, and how it did not weaken us, but strengthen us.

I would like to ask American ham radio operators to help me to show the world how unified and patriotic we can be; how we honor our American brothers and sisters, and how serious we are about September 11th as a nation. On September 11th 2002 at 8:45 am, I would like to propose a few moments of radio silence on all amateur bands, by all American radio operators who wish to make a statement to the rest of the world. I know there will be moments of silence made by thousands of people at that time, so let us make ham radio a part of that. The world will remember those who died as they hear our moments of silence, as we pay our respects to the victims of the terrorists. The world will see a unified and enormous demonstration of American devotion and pride for our country. They will know why we are called the United States of America.

Thanks to all, Ray AC5KD

END QUOTE

1661. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 10:31:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417063104.20500.00003275@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 40979

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> >Unless you have an assignment as the singular HQ poster here to RRAP
>> >(the very occasional presence of Jon Bloom teh exception) your presence
>> >here helps to confirm that.

>> And this is confirmed in your mind by the fact that I keep telling you that
>>my presence here is personal.

> Sure it is, Ed. And as you said, your boss knows you'd never say
>anything that would work against League policy.

That is a far cry from "assignement as singular poster," Dick. Did you twist it
on purpose, or are you really that confused?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1662. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 10:33:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417063300.20500.00003276@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 40980

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Do you really believe that all other readers here fail to note your
>dishonesty in deliberatly changing the wordings and meanings of my
>posts? I sure don't.

I bet lots more of them note that you often don't say what you mean.
"Assignment by ARRL as the rrap poster" vs "You have said that you will not use
your posts to undermine ARRL policy sort of things."

Talk about chaning meaning...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1663. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 10:34:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417063402.20500.00003277@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 40981

From: "W5TIT - Kim"

>I don't think I have, since 30 meters is strictly digital, is
>it not? I haven't done any digital.

You could have said that about 10 exchanges ago, Kim.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1664. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 10:36:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417063657.20500.00003278@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 40982

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> Morse/CW is a mode not normally used to pass highway traffic
>> reports on VHF/UHF repeaters.

>I have it on good authority that the mode is more important than the
>message.

If that good authority really told you that the mode is more important than the message in formal traffic handling, find another authority. He or she is wrong.

The mode is, for most hams, more important than the message in casual opearating. In casual operating, most people set out to operate a mode rather than set out to tell someone about their weather.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1665. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 10:54:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417065433.09489.00000574@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40983

In article <3cbc1213_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:bhsnbu0jcp7n8bsvkim9t4dil6kicjfoac@4ax.com...
>> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:28:30 -0500, "Kim"
>> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> >> In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> >> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Oh, not at all am I complaining. I really don't care what "kind of
>language" people use on the air. I have a tuning knob and an on/off button.

Then why don't you practice what you preach, Kim?

Your radio sets have a tuning knob and a power switch. But when someone
shows up on the repeater you frequent and talks about traffic conditions, you
"chide", "tease" "make fun of them" "bust their ....", etc. rather than tuning
away
or turning off. You've told us you do these things, so your saying "do as I
say, not as I do".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1666. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 10:54:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417065434.09489.00000575@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 40984

In article <20020416081740.01968.00003582@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
(Kim wrote:)
>>>then I'll answer with: I don't
>>> know.
>
(N2EY wrote:)
>>OK, then. Simple question, simple answer.
>
>Well, it really isn't that simple.
>
>Kim, I am curious too... you said that the mode you used on 30 meters was
>neither CW nor digital. Then what mode was it?

You're forgetting something, Ed. When Kim wrote that she "worked all bands lots of times" (in the context of HF amateur bands"), her definition of "all bands" does not include 30 meters.

73 de Jim, N2EY.

1667. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 11:40:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204170340.3d7d123d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40985

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:<O1Mu8.697$n51.168204303@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020412080705.27399.00000474@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > And while you're at it, try the Extra written even if you haven't studied
> > for it. It's good practice, costs nothing but your time and you might pass > > it.

> > Back in the summer of '68, when I went to the FCC office to upgrade from
> > Tech to General by passing the 13 wpm code test, the examiner said 'why not
> > try the Advanced while you're here?" I hadn't studied for it at all but a
> > 14 year old kid did not say no to The Man, so I took it - and passed
> > easily. Same thing could happen to you.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > > GREAT STORY! - LARS121

If you liked that, you may like what happened two years later....

Back then, one of the requirements for Extra was two years' experience
as a
General or higher. So exactly two years after getting the Advanced I
was back
at the FCC office to try the Extra. Exams were only Monday-Wednesday,
8 AM
sharp. 30 days' mandatory wait to re-try if you failed anything. As a
16 year old highschool kid, I knew that a failure would mean waiting
for Christmas or
even the next summer for another go.

There was a pretty large group waiting in the anteroom of the office
on that August morning. At precisely 8:00 AM The Man comes out and
asks "anyone for 20 wpm code?" Just one hand went up - mine. I
followed The Man into the exam room.
Code tests were given at a long table at one end of the exam room.

He explained the code test procedure: "Write what you hear on this
paper with this pencil. You get exactly 5 minutes and when the code
stops, put the pencil
down. You need 100 or more consecutive correct characters to pass."

The code came from a small machine that read a punched paper tape and
fed sets of headphones. Code speed was set by changing drive spindles
of various diameters in the machine. The Man loaded the machine, told
me to put on the phones and started the machine.

The code was LOUD in the 'phones and I started right in, putting down every letter in big block printing. It was easier than I expected - I was getting every letter with no problem! The Man watched closely, then came around behind me and watched over my shoulder as I copied. Then he went over to the machine, looked at it carefully, and abrupthly shut it off.

"Pretty easy, huh, kid"? he asked.

"Uh, yeah" was all I could mumble.

"It should be. That was 13 wpm. Here's 20".

And he quickly swapped drive spindles, restarted the machine, and the real test began.

Yes, I passed. Also the 20 wpm sending and the written, and then home to wait for the mailman.

Did he just forget, or was he rattling my chain a bit? I'll never know.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1668. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 12:47:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417084758.22507.00004378@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 40987

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Did he just forget, or was he rattling my chain a bit? I'll never
>know.

I can't imagine that anyone who regularly administers those tests would not have been able to tell readily that the code speed was wrong. When Mike Tracy, the Lab's current test engineer, was the W1AW night/weekend op, he couldn't copy much above about 15 wpm, but could easily tell whether the code speed was correct.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1669. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 12:55:06 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <j4sqbugf9cqn23mjrk5hu1chtmmspagloi@4ax.com>
Source record: 40988

On Tue, 16 Apr 2002 21:23:12 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>
>A swap net is not "ordering" something over the air. What I mean by that
>is, if it OK to order pizza, then it is OK for me to call the local
>furniture store and tell them I'll be there to pick some furniture up, call
>the office supply store and tell them to get the following items ready
>because I'm on my way to pick them up, etc., etc. If you think not, what
>would you say is the difference between ordering pizza or the chair we'd
>like to sit in while we eat it?

Dunno, seems like the same thing to me...

>
>Swap nets are just fine... The R&R mention that the rule directly addresses
>those items that generate a profit. Most of us cannot sell our equipment at
>a profit, right?
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Well, in 1997 I bought a Swan 350 for $165. In 1998 I sold it for
$200 and bought a Kenwood TS-520. After buying an external VFO-520
for $75, I turned around and sold THAT combination for $300 and bought
myself an IC-720A. So actually, yes... we CAN sell our equipment at
a profit - provided we bought it for a bargain to begin with...

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1670. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 16:23:37 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CBDA18A.B82E27C6@psu.edu>
Source record: 40989

Interesting. I see that their recommendation on the CW tests has been adopted.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> I knew I read this on the FISTS site. Brian
> ----------
>
> http://www.fists.org/declare.html
> The North American contingent of FISTS, the International Morse Preservation
> Society, in formal balloting of its membership approved the following
> declaration of purpose and policy by a 95 to 5 percent margin. FISTS is the
> first grass-roots organization worldwide to formally support, and call for,
> a restoring of exam standards of any kind.

1671. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 16:44:05 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CBDA657.59EE6693@psu.edu>
Source record: 40990

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

> Yep, I think so. I think getting hung up on language is secondary to some
> of the real crap that goes on over the air, and we've had lots of fun on our
> own repeater...when we "forget" where we are.

I don't know if it is exactly a "hang-up", Kim. There might be anyone listening on the other end, and they might have any sort of standards for language. We have some 9 and 10 year old hams in our area. I certainly don't want to be responsible for enlarging their vocabulary in that direction. So it is a matter of proper manners at least to keep the language clean. I hope we don't swear in front of little kids - and little kids are listening to the radio.

> At any rate, you wouldn't want to be at one of our dinners, then, because we
> let loose in person... ;)

Now that's a different matter entirely. I have occasions that I have to get the "attention" of one of my hockey team members, and I can blister their ears with the profanity. There is a time and place.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1672. ARNewsline 1287 - April 12 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 18:07:00 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417140700.07867.00007571@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 40991

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1287 - April 12 2002

(Note: Producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF is away on business this week. ARNewsline™ Report 1287 was produced and recorded in New Orleans Louisiana by Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA)

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1287 with a release date of Friday, April 12th, 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Another threat to the 2.4 Gigahertz band. This time it comes from the FCC. That story is first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1287 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RADIO LEGISLATION: FCC PROCEEDING PUTS NEW PRESSURE ON AMATEUR MICROWAVE BAND

The FCC has again targeted Amateur Radio's primary allocation at 2390 to 2400 MHz for possible sharing or use by other radio services. Newslines Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details:

--

According to the ARRL Letter, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking known as WT Docket 02-55 has been presented by the FCC. The Letter says that it invites comments on either sharing the 2390 to 2400 MHz band with public safety services being displaced from 800 MHz or moving amateurs elsewhere.

The N-P-R-M identifies 2390 to 2400 MHz as an "Unlicensed P-C-S Band." Unlicensed, asynchronous P-C-S devices were authorized there in 1995, but Amateur Radio remains primary.

Why the action now? The FCC says that its receiving an increasing number of reports of incidents of harmful interference to public safety systems in the 800 MHz band. To alleviate the problem, the Commission now is looking into restructuring 800 MHz and moving some occupants elsewhere. And 2390 to 2400 MHz could be where those users get moved.

But says the FCC, that’s only one piece of spectrum being considered. One place its not looking is the adjacent 2385 to 2390 MHz band. The FCC says it can’t consider 2385 to 2390 MHz because that part of the band is slated to be auctioned off.

This is the second threat to the ham radio allocation in less than a year. Just last summer, the FCC invited comments on its proposals to reallocate some

spectrum in the 2390 to 2400 MHz amateur segment for possible use by unspecified mobile and fixed services. The Commission has also proposed 2390 to 2400 MHz and other bands to support the introduction of advanced wireless systems, including so-called third-generation or 3 G mobile systems. The FCC also has asked for comments on whether amateurs could share the band with government users.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

WT Docket 02-55 was released in mid-March but not yet available for public response. The FCC will officially invite comments for 30 days after the NPRM is published in the Federal Register. Reply comments will be due 60 days following publication in the Federal Register. The ARRL says that it plans to file comments in this proceeding. (ARRL)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC MAY MANDATE FASTER CONVERSION TO DTV

Federal regulators may look for ways to mandate faster transition to all-digital television if the TV industry fails to move quickly enough on its own. This, according to a Federal Communications Commission official speaking on Friday April 5th.

The comments are from Ken Ferree, chief of the FCC’s Media Bureau. And what he has said adds emphasis to a proposal by the agency's chairman that aims to bring digital TV to more American viewers.

FCC Chairman Michael Powell has challenged everyone involved in the digital conversion, including television networks, local network-affiliated stations, cable and satellite service providers and equipment manufacturers to voluntarily meet a series of goals on the way to a 2006 deadline.

Accordng to Ferree, Powell’s proposal, which was sent to Capitol Hill and the industry on Thursday April 4th is an effort by the FCC to pressure the industry into voluntary compliance. He says that Chairman Powell believes exposing more consumers to the technology of digital television will stimulate them to demand more and thus jump-start development. (Published report)

**

FCC TO UTILITY: STOP INTERFERING WITH HAM RADIO

The FCC has told GPU Energy Corporation of Morristown, New Jersey to clean up the harmful interference that the utility is causing to several area radio amateurs. In a letter to GPU Energy the FCC said that incidental interference from its Part 15 devices to operations of authorized stations cannot be tolerated and that use of the devices cannot resume until the harmful condition is corrected.

According to the W5YI Report, those hams complaining have been unable to find a satisfactory remedy through the GPU complaint resolution process. They turned

to the FCC which investigated. Now the FCC has told GPU that unresolved interference complaints may constitute a rules violation that could lead to fines. The FCC urged GPU Energy to contact the ARRL for advice in resolving the issues. (W5YI)

**

INDUSRTY NEWS: NEW DEALER & MANUFACTURERS GROUP FORMED

During the informal annual industry meeting of Amateur Radio manufacturers held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin and hosted by AES during Superfest 2002, the industry decided to create a formalized and official industry group for dealers and manufacturers.

The American Association of Radio Enthusiasts (AARE) was formed as a non-profit corporation for the promotion of amateur radio and emergency communications into areas outside of amateur radio and to provide a conduit for dealers and manufacturers to exchange ideas, to work together on projects, to help ham radio grow and to double the number of hams in 5 years.

Members of this group will be the manufacturers and dealers of radio and emergency products. The group will be ‘the voice’ of the manufacturers and dealers in radio, much like the American Radio Relay League is the voice of each ham radio operator. (AARE)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Peoria Amateur Radio Club Repeater serving Peoria Illinois.

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE CONVENTION SCENE: HAMFESTS ARE SAFE

The ham radio convention season is in full swing, but some radio amateurs are asking if it’s safe to attend them. President Bush says that we have to put 9/11 behind us and all Americans have to resume normal life. Most of us have, and the shows are going on. But regardless if it’s the OSCARS or a tiny hamfest, event planners are now taking a closer look at show security. This includes the giant Dayton Hamvention. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, looks at what they are doing to keep you safe as you enjoy ham radio’s greatest show on Earth:

--

If you travel by air, or even visit your local police department, you have seen heightened security measures in place since the terror attacks of last September 11th. And while nobody expects an al-Quida sponsored assault on a hamfest, law enforcement and planners of even the smallest events cannot dismiss the possibility either.

A few weeks ago, the Dayton Hamvention mailed out a promotional flyer. One of the items it contained was an area dealing with show security. In reality, what was shown is nothing more than an update to what's been in place for several years, but as the magic weekend of May 17th to the 19th approaches, its important to take a look at what the Hamvention will be doing to make your stay safe and secure.

The rules in effect are the same we have all been living with since 911. Be prepared to show photo I-D upon request. Also be prepared to have vehicles, merchandise and personal items searched. This may be especially true of large containers such as backpacks.

Do you carry a weapon for self protection? Sorry, but no weapons will be permitted into the area. Hamvention says that even applies if you have a license to carry a concealed weapon. Leave the weapon at home. You won't be permitted in with it.

Nor can you bring in any ammunition, explosives, chemical or incendiary devices. Also banned are alcoholic beverages, drugs and burglary tools.

This year there will be tighter scrutiny of vendors as they bring truckloads of merchandise into the flea market and exhibit halls. Since most of you will arrive well after merchandise is in place, this will have little impact on the average attendee.

And very important. Everyone must display at all times, so it's clearly visible, a Hamvention badge or ticket.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Henry Feonberg, K2SSQ.

--

Garry Matthews, KB8GOL, is Executive Director of Hamvention 2002. He recently told CQ Magazine that the planners are trying to take common-sense precautions to provide security for a show of this size. Matthews adds that 99% of Hamvention attendees will not notice anything different from past years. The most important thing is to know that Hamvention 2002 and every other ham radio show is doing everything to keep you safe. (CQ)

**

THE CONVENTION SCENE: NO BIG ACTS AT HAMVENTION 2002 BANQUET

Speaking about Hamvention 2002, the planners say that you have spoken. As a result there will be no big name acts at this years grand awards banquet. Jim Graver, KB8PSO, is the General Chairman of Hamvention 2002:

--
Graver: "This year we are returning to tradition of years past and will not have a post banquet entertainment."
--

A few years ago, the Hamvention added concerts by top talents to its famed Saturday night gathering. Among those who have appeared are Joe Walsh and the Smothers Brothers. And even though the entertainment has been well received,

there has been a call from the ham community to get back to basics. And says Graver, so it shall be.

--
Graver: “We have gotten feedback from our attendees saying that they would like to have the same banquet that they used to have years ago. So, in 2002, the Hamvention is going to deliver just that: A banquet with great food, a celebration of the award winners, fantastic guest speakers and of course prize drawings.”
--

Jim Graver has a lot more to say about Hamvention 2002 and what will be happening this year. You can hear it in Part 2 of Hap Holly’s exclusive interview with KB8PSO. Just take your web browser over to www.rainreport.com and click on this weeks special. Or call area code 847-827-7246. That’s 847-827-R-A-I-N. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RADIO LAW: DIREC-TV SUES RADIO PERSONALITY OVER ALLEGED SIGNAL PIRACY

DIREC-TV Inc. is taking a New York City radio personality to court. This as it files suit against WFAN radio personality Sid Rosenberg alleging he violated the Digital Millennium Copyright Act and the Federal Communications Act by stealing its programming.

DIREC-TV says that on March 11th, while talking with Don Imus on the "Imus in the Morning" show on MSNBC, Rosenberg allegedly said he had used an illegally modified access card to steal DIREC-TV.

Although air personality Imus is said have told him what the was doing is "dishonest" and constitutes "stealing," Rosenberg allegedly continued to "boast" about using the illegally modified access card to watch movies and sports.

DIREC-TV says that with this lawsuit it is sending Mr. Rosenberg a very clear message. One that says using an illegally modified access card to receive DIRECTV programming is stealing and it violates federal law. Larry Rissler, vice president of DIREC-TV's Signal Integrity office adds that the company has a transcript of the program and what he calls Mr. Rosenberg's brazen comments on national television of stealing DIREC-TV programming. (DIREC-TV release)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: STEVE DIMSE K4HG HONORED BY NOAA

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has named Steve Dimse, K4HG, of Tucson Amateur Packet Radio, as recipient of one of its Environmental Hero Awards for the year 2002. Dimse, of Cudjoe Key, Florida is being honored for his volunteer efforts in real-time citizen weather observations.

The data collected by Dimse and other volunteers is used for numerical weather prediction research at NOAA's Forecast Systems Laboratory and for training and research at the National Center for Atmospheric Research. In Florida, the data

is used by National Weather Service’s Weather Forecast Offices for local area prediction. It is also used at Kennedy Space Center for weather prediction in support of launch operations.

Each year the agency presents a number of Environmental Hero Awards to people who don't work for NOAA, but have contributed a great deal to NOAA's ongoing job of providing environmental services to the citizens of the United States. For 2002, Dimse was one of five people chosen for this honor. (NOAA)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: GM3ITN INVITED TO FAULKLAND ISLANDS

Les Hamilton, GM3ITN, has been invited by the Falkland Islands government to visit the islands for the 20th anniversary of their emancipation. Hamelton played an important role in making the liberation happen. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, has more.

--

It was Les Hamilton who first informed the UK government that the islands had been invaded. On the 2nd of April 1982, he received first-hand reports that the Argentine flag was flying over the islands. Les was therefore the first person outside the islands and Argentina to know that an invasion had taken place. He phoned the Ministry of Defense, who informed then Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

GM3ITN remained in contact with VP8 stations even during the period of occupation, passing vital information on to the MoD. Les and his wife Pilar also intercepted Argentinean radio communications, which Pilar - a university lecturer in the Spanish language - translated for the MoD.

Jeramy Boot,G4NJH.

--

The Hamiltons will be flying to Port Stanley for the 20th anniversary celebrations which take place on June 14th. Until recently, Les Hamilton's role had been a closely-guarded secret, known only by senior British politicians, military intelligence officers and a select group of radio amateurs. (GB2RS)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

**

HAMVENTION 2002: THE HARA ARENA STORY

Earlier in this weeks newscast we spoke about plans for this years Dayton Hamvention. As most of you are aware, Dayton’s HARA Arena has been the home of the Hamvention for many years. As a result the HARA has become as famous as the show it hosts. But there’s a lot more to the HARA story than just the Dayton Hamvention as we learn from Amateur News Weekly’s Jack Parker, W8ISH:

--

The HARA Complex is as unique as its history. In 1956, a dance hall called the Wampler Ballarena was built as the cornerstone of what is now a six building exhibition center. Originally, the location was a thriving, family-owned fruit orchard. Today it is a thriving, family-owned entertainment, conference and exhibition facility.

Very few entertainment complexes are privately owned. Even fewer are family owned. You see HARA was named by founding brothers Harold and Ralph Wampler. The arena building, built in 1964, ushered in entertainment to the Dayton area never seen before. The Rolling Stones, Elton John, The Who, Neil Diamond, The Beatles, The Grateful Dead have all played at the facility.

The HARA has survived and prospered by combining the professionalism of one of the areas largest exhibition centers with the care and personal concern of a family business. Because of this the HARA has been the catalyst to successful hockey in Ohio's Miami Valley. The Dayton Gems and later, the Dayton Bombers, have both enjoyed success while on the HARA ice. But, most agree, the one event that has put HARA ARENA on the map worldwide, is the Dayton Hamvention. It’s where the Amateur Radio Community and a family owned business meet to carry on a wonderful tradition.

For Amateur News Weekly, Im Jack Parker, W8ISH

--

Today, the HARA Arena remains the home to many high profile events for the Dayton area. This includes Disney On Ice, Sesame Street Live, the Silver Sticks Hockey team and of coarse the Dayton Hamvention. And, contrary to rumors on the Internet, the Hamvention says that it’s there to stay. (ANW)

**

EMBARRASSING TECHNOLOGY: SPYWARE DEBACLE DISCLOSED

Call it a gotch’ya. This as thousands of Internet users who thought they were installing a program for sharing music and other computer files apparently accepted a program at the same time that tracked their Web surfing habits.

The tracking program, or spyware, linked Internet users to an on-line sweepstakes game called Click-Till-U-Win. But the site was also collecting data on other recent cyberspace visits by the surfer’s computer.

Spyware is a clandestine computer program downloaded to your computer without your knowledge that can track your Internet-surfing habits without your consent. These types of programs exist in the open elsewhere on the Internet, but in this case there was no disclosure and no option to reject.

Now at least three companies are posting new versions of their software on the web without the tracking programs. And one of the web sites is actually offering visitors to its site an apology. (Computing Technology)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: BRITISH HAM RESCUED BY HAM RADIO

Turning to international news, word that a ham radio operator and his wife on board a yacht that ran aground have been rescued. This, thanks to the efforts of radio amateurs on the Maritime Mobile Service Net.

According to reports from the ARRL and GB2RS, Dave Beane, G0TAG, and his wife Sara, were aboard the pleasure craft Tao when it ran aground on a reef off the north coast of Cuba on the 26th of March. Apparently their initial call for assistance to the Cuban authorities had no response.

So they turned to ham radio and the 20 meter Maritime Mobile Services Net. Radio amateurs in the United States and in the Virgin Islands were able to alert the authorities in Havana via the US Coast Guard and the Swiss Embassy in Washington. Later reports via amateur radio indicated the couple had been rescued and that efforts to salvage the vessel were under way. (ARRL, GB2RS, Q-News)

**

SPACE AND SCIENCE: SPACE REFERIGERATOR

SpaceDaily reports that when Space Shuttle Endeavour blasted into space recently it carried aboard the world's smallest version of a relatively new type of refrigerator. Called a pulse-tube cryocooler, the device was designed, built and tested under an agreement between the National Institute of Standards and Technology's Boulder Laboratories, Lockheed Martin Corporation and NASA's Ames Research Center. (ANS)

**

DX

In D-X, A major international DXpedition will activate Melish Reef in the Coral Sea, east of Queensland, Australia, between the 12th and 22nd of April. The callsign will be VK9ML. Q-S-L as directed on the air. (OPDX)

And UR5EAW reports that the Islands of Ukraine on the Air Award Program Expedition will take place from May 1st through August 31st. The call sign to be use is E-M-11-E. The expedition will cover the Dniper River islands, the islands of the Black Sea and the Azov Sea. More info is on the web at www.qsy.to/ur5eaw. The QSL manager is UR5EAW : Shevchenko Alexander, Pelina str. 29, Dnepropetrovsk 49107 UA, Ukraine. (UR5EAW)

**

A NEWSLINE FOLLOW-UP: A POLITICALLY DISORGANIZED 11 METER CLASS D SERVICE - PART 3

Over the past two weeks, Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, has been looking at the not so political side of 11 meter Class-D C-B. In this third and final installment, David explores the reasons that there is little chance of C-B ever becoming a major two way radio political power:

--
The Citizens band radio service has a unique distinction. For all the years it has existed...for all the people who have bought and used 11 meter radios...for all of the public exposure CB has obtained TV, radio and the movies, 11 meter Class D C-B remains the only major radio service in the U-S without political representation in Washington. No support either before the FCC or Congress.

In the mid 19-70s, the Government held conferences to find better ways to use C-B. Today's Government leaders give it no attention. Congress and local governments are tired of consumer complaints against C-B operators running illegal power and who interfere with all sorts of consumer electronic gear. As a result, federal regulations are now in place that give almost any law enforcement official the ability to shut a C-B operator down. The C-B operator can appeal, but it is a long, and costly process.

So why is nobody on 11 meters seriously attempting to organize users of the band? As one former CB enthusiast suggests: Perhaps it's the sheer diversity of the CB radio community. CB has over-the-road truckers, sidebanders, emergency monitors, numerous private nets, the occasional family highway trip, and the usual assortment of troublemakers. Each of these groups operate separately and independently of the others with apparently little knowledge or regard for other uses of the band.

Whatever the real reason or reasons, one simple fact remains. When it comes to having a voice before the FCC and Congress, CB radio is out in the cold. Chances seem slim it will ever have such a voice. And without that, C-B operators like Gary D. White in Illinois are likely to continue to face Disorderly Conduct charges for disturbing anyone by transmitting on the 11 meter Class D Citizens Band.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm David Black, KB4KCH.

--

In closing, a word to those who have written. Some with questions. Other to add their own commentary. We sincerely appreciate your taking the time to write. You perspectives have been included in this final wrap-up. We thank you for your help in telling the story. (ARNewsline)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2002 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year award is now open. No significant changes from last year. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our website at www.arnewsline.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA saying welcome to the year 2002, 73, and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

1673. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 18:41:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204171041.13fdbd74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40992

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020417084758.22507.00004378@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Did he just forget, or was he rattling my chain a bit? I'll never
> >know.
>
> I can't imagine that anyone who regularly administers those tests would not
> have been able to tell readily that the code speed was wrong.

He wasn't wearing the 'phones - I was. I don't know if he could hear
it.

However, I would not put it past ol' Joe Squelch to do something like
that just so there'd be no doubt that a kid with an Extra knew his/her
stuff cold.

That was August, 1970, Philadelphia Custom House at 2nd and Chestnut
Streets, 10th floor.

> When Mike Tracy,
> the Lab's current test engineer, was the W1AW night/weekend op, he couldn't
> copy much above about 15 wpm, but could easily tell whether the code speed was
> correct.

I think it was Mike who gave us the Hq. tour back in '93.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1674. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 18:43:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204171043.6259a073@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40993

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<TR2v8.2029$7d4.322998386@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>...
> I knew I read this on the FISTS site. Brian
> ----------
>
> http://www.fists.org/declare.html
> The North American contingent of FISTS, the International Morse Preservation
> Society, in formal balloting of its membership approved the following
> declaration of purpose and policy by a 95 to 5 percent margin. FISTS is the
> first grass-roots organization worldwide to formally support, and call for,
> a restoring of exam standards of any kind.

Tell the rest of the story, then, and the context.

The issue was the use if multiple choice code tests. And the date was 1992,
when FISTS had less than 1000 members, about 350 of them in the USA.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1675. Space Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 21:53:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417175320.06459.00000641@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 40995

In article <20020417051223.13104.00004517@mb-ct.aol.com>, someone writes:

>>> For those who like to moan and whine about Amateur Radio's death
>throes,
>>>I can't help but wonder how they rationalize thier rants when NASA, the
>most
>>>conservative of any technology based agency in the world, see's fit to
>>>incorporate it into it's multi-billion dollar pet.
>
> Lennie the Loser retorts:
>
>>Heh. The first hurdle in trying to decipher the above is to get over "most
>>conservative," a ludicrous description...except to those never having
>>worked in any part of the US space program.
>
> NASA is >NOT< conservative in it's practices? It is >NOT< conservative
>in it's technical tolerances nor whom it allows to fly in it's spacecraft?

Space flight is definitely NOT for everyone. NASA's policy is
not to accept anyone or to take risks with astronaut's lives.

STS 51J (Challenger) had a flaw in basic human judgement on
a lower management level that allowed a faulty condition to
continue. The investigation that followed resulted in some
drastic changes in policies and procedures, including dismissal
of some NASA personnel directly involved. Challenger had
already flown 7 times before the final tragedy.

> Geez, Your Putziness...I didn't think THAT required any "deciphering".

You cannot apply "conservative" to spaceflight in terrestrial terms.
Micro-gravity is not a normal human environment. One out of three
trained, sometimes experienced astronauts suffer some form of
space sickness at the beginnings of micro-gravity. The majority of
humans simply cannot tolerate micro-gravity for more than a few
seconds; that's the reason for the specially outfitted military 707
dubbed the "Vomit Comet." It weeds out the incapable from those
that might survive.

You cannot take ordinary terrestrial construction electronics and
expect all to survive in micro-gravity. Circuit boards and exposed
conductors must be coated or sealed to prevent "floaters" of
tiny conductive debris from shorting out adjacent conductors.

>>The next hurdle in understanding is "multi-billion dollar pet,"...
>

> Only you required any assistance there, Lennie.

The Apollo "moon rocket" program was the most expensive
program directed by NASA. Apollo has long been cancelled.
Shuttle cost less. Shuttle continues and the long-term
budget expenditures in total are now more than for Apollo.

>>via radio from unmanned craft. NASA continues with space
>>research in materials, techniques, testing for both space and
>>aeronautics (aeronautics is the second "a" in NASA).
>
> No, Your Foolishness...The second "a" in NASA is "Administration".

I mistyped the parenthesis statement, intended to say
"aeronautics is the second LETTER in NASA."

NASA = National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

> Details, you idiot...details...That's why you hardly ever get it
>right...You don't pay attention, even to what YOU write. That's why you
>can't scam your trash in here without severe criticism.

Heh heh heh...the little monkey's fists are clenched so tight,
the clenching extends to teeth clamped shut in anger!

If one were to make an "issue" of typos, the little monkey would
lose by a wide margin since it makes so many of them.

>>The third hurdle is "incorporate." By dictionary definition,
>>"incorporate" means to "combine, include, embody" or to
>>"combine together in a single whole, merge." At *NO* time
>>was NASA or USAF BMC or USA space efforts (Huntsville,
>>AL) ever dependent on amateur radio to fulfill any
>>missions, flights, or test programs.
>
> I know asking you to substantiate your assertions is foolhearty, but I
>will do it only so that others can see your reluctance to back up even your
>own stupid assertions....WHERE did I or anyone else SAY that NASA had ever
>been "dependent" on Amateur Radio to fulfill any mission criteria???

That was in the implication by use of the word "incorporate."

> Also, I note that the design and installation of ARISS system antennas
>IS an integral part of ISS design. Ergo ARISS >>IS<< incorporated to the
>International Space Station. This is further substantiated by the issuance
>of >callsigns TO the ISS by several of the nations who underwrite the ISS,
>therefore the operation of Amateur radio in space is recognized as important
>by more than on national government.

Error! Tsk, tsk, tsk. The last line should be "by more than ONE national..."
:-)

Ham radio on shuttle was of the "shack on a belt variety," getting
a handheld next to a large window. The ISS is largely enclosed by

conductive structures with no "picture window" viewports, only
relatively small apertures suitable for image recording apparatus
(cameras to ordinary mortals). Amateur radio on the ISS requires
power (that power is limited), a means to carry the RF into/out-of
the skin of the ISS, and an antenna location that does not interfere
with anything else that IS vital to the ISS. In addition, the EMI from
any such space "ham shack" cannot interfere with regular ISS
communications or telemetry. All that was pre-planned on the
ground and the extra payload mass accounted for (all payload
mass is precious).

ISS planning is for long durations of research crews who will live
in space for months at a time. Crew planning is to allow all to
have some form of recreation when not being required to work on
projects. It can be reasonable to assume that amateur radio
facilities, albeit quite limited, serve the following purposes:
Recreation coupled with some limited publicity of such
recreation for showing that the consortium's member nations
are doing more than spending money on a seemingly-useless
project (no direct benefits to terrestrial life).

>>IMAX cannot be shown in conventional motion picture theaters, only at
>>certain theaters. There are now more motion picture theaters fitted for
>>new digital forms of conventional movies than there are IMAX theaters
>>in the USA.
>
> Which still does not negate the fact that MILLIONS of people (per IMAX
>accounts of visits-per-year) will see IMAX presentations every year....And
>not "only" in the United States, mind you...

How many IMAX theaters are there? Count them up and relate tham
to "conventional" motion picture theaters. IMAX is still quite limited
and in only a few urban centers.

>>The unfortunate fact (for amateur radio publicity) is that exposure of
>>ham radio to the US public is almost nil in all popular media.
>
> But NOT as "nil" as the amount of exposure as Lennie the Loser has.

...try to stay on the subject or at least part of the subject. The above
is nothing but the usual gratuitous heckling signifying nothing but
the monkey's psychological aberration..

>>It should be fairly obvious that NASA requests some astronauts to
>>get amateur radio licenses for NASA publicity purposes, not to
>>advance or sponsor amateur radio activity. NASA must continually
>>seek all avenues of public awareness of its expensive programs to
>>remain a part of the US government's various programs.
>
> NOW I GET IT! it's just a PUBLICITY STUNT! Kinda like pole sitting or
>wing walking!

Both "pole sitting" and "wing walking" were private showmanship
publicity stunts done beginning in the Great Depression times.
The monkey was born in the mid-1950s, well after that fact.
"Wing-walking" is still an activity done at air shows. Air shows
are almost all private endeavors designed for entertainment.
The analogue is rejected.

> Suuuuuuuuure, Lennie! NASA has nothing better for it's flight staff to
>do than pass Amateur Radio examinations for "publicity"...As if walking in
space
>and creating orbiting laboratories isn't enough.

Most astronauts granted an amateur radio license hold a no-code-test
Technician license. They are all knowledgeable about the general
fields of technology and the specifics of a few dozen questions on the
Technician license test would be simply another technical work task
to learn in the hundreds of hours of preparation common to all
astronauts. Part of the "preparation" includes classroom work on how
to present a "positive image" of their space assignments (tone down
remarks on spacesickness or micro-gravity waste elimination tasks).
There is no problem in their "classroom work" on getting qualified
instructors on radio or even radio fundamentals; astronauts use NASA
radios as part of their communications with the ground. Amateur radio
is simply an extension of normal radio in space.

"Walking in space" (being in a vacuum environment in a spacesuit
which has been engineered by others over a quarter century of such
environmental exposure) is no longer a "new" thing. Alexei Leonov
did that first in March 1965, Ed White was the first American to do so
in June 1965 (Gemini 4, both he and spacecraft commander Jim
McDivitt had to wear full space suits due to Gemini capsule
configuration). Creating orbital laboratories is done on the ground
first and has been an integral part of nearly all Mercury, Gemini,
Apollo, Soyuz, Apollo-Soyuz, and Skylab flights from the beginning.
This is essential since micro-gravity cannot yet be fully simulated
on the terrestrial surface.

Between April 1961 and October 2000 there have been 133 manned
spaceflights and 4,901 separate payload flights (each payload a part
of a rocket flight). Manned spaceflight is 41 years old this month and
no longer a novelty in itself.

>It's a well known fact that
>most Americans don't lend ANY credibility to ANY astronaut that doesn't hold
>an Amateur license....(coughcough..snickersnicker...Suuuuure Lennie!)

Irresponsible claim. No such thing.

> Of course I guess YOU would be the one to find some "negative" side to
>programs like ARISS that allow some form of direct communication between the
>crews and school children...Nothing like spoiling the minds of kids who might
>have otherwise wasted thier time on useless pursuits like aerospace
>engineering, medecine, etc, huh, Lennie...???

There should be nothing at all negative about amateur radio as a
form of both recreation and entertainment and information for
school children, but that is largely restricted to individual schools
and some classrooms therein when a ground amateur is available
to demonstrate. There is NO wide exposure to such amateur
communications with space.

NASA has made available a wealth of information on all aspects of
spaceflight and associated technologies to schools and teachers
since the days of Apollo-Soyuz. Those explain FAR more about
aerospace engineering, space medicine, and other technologies to
far more school children than some transient event of having a class
"talk to someone in space." That material is available to ordinary
mortals (non-teachers) through the US Government Printing Office
for a very low price.

>>"ARISS in action" as a phrase is part of the usual self-promotional
>>spin done by the ARRL. That's fine for amateur radio but means
>>absolutely nothing for NASA...(SNIP)
>
> But...but...but...LENNIE! Above you just claimed it was a publicity stunt
>for NASA...I ASSUME that you meant that it was intended to create some sort
>of positive reaction by the unwashed masses towards an otherwise expensive
>program.

That seems to be the intent. It has no other purpose than being
PR and a form of recreation for ISS crew members.

> If THAT was the intent, then it very certainly DOES mean "something" to
>NASA!

Wrong conclusion based on not understanding the aims and general
structure of the ISS mission.

There are physical limitations to the mass of the ISS, electrical power
demands, internal heat dissipation, plus EMI from "other" radio
equipment that must be met. Such is not "conservative" as in a
difference between conservative and liberal, but just a physical fact of
life in an orbital space environment.

> The use of Amateur Radio to communicate directly with the now
>decommissioned MIR and STS missions was widely published.

MIR was not "decommissioned." It was abandoned and burned
up in the atmosphere in the Pacific (video was widely publicized
at the time). STS is still on-going and is the prime-mover for parts
supplies, and crew relief for the ISS. STS is expected to live on
past 2008.

The "use of amateur radio" on STS was only "widely published" in
the specific amateur radio media. The public is well aware of the
normal NASA radio communications with shuttle through hundreds
of available video and audio feeds live and on-line since the first
Mercury in May of 1961.

>It is a fact. it
>happened. Guess good-old simplex FM voice STILL has a place in
>radiocommunications, huh, Your Foolishness?

There was never any dispute on modes. Since Shepard's first Mercury flight, voice communications started with AM using what amateur's call "VOX" (to avoid the need for push-to-talk) with ground-space return to make it "semi-duplex." In various configurations of capsules over several programs this was shifted to FM and forms of pulse modulation to digitized voice. At the same time there was personal medical telemetry on a separate circuit plus telemetry of the capsule on another radio circuit. The Apollo LEM-command-module combination had digitized voice and telemetry in a sort-of duplex arrangement with pseudo-random noise added to improve the signal-to-noise ratio.

> Again....You are asked to cite WHO (other than YOU) said it "was" a
>"vital" part of the program, Lennie.

Use of the word "incorporate" in the first monkey posting indicates an implication that it was so.

Amateur radio in space is a voluntary effort by amateurs and an essentially-free-ride for amateur radio in general since the various agencies give free payload space. The payload costs are enormous and the entire world amateur radio "community" ought to be very grateful for anything boosted into orbit by any space agency. It is my opinion that amateur radio organizations have no right whatsoever in even implying that amateur radio is "vital" to any space mission.

ANY amateur radio equipment carried into space, any mission, is a freebie given by the various space organizations. Be grateful for, not boastful about such gratuities.

1676. Re: Recreation [was Onomatopoeia]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 21:53:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417175321.06459.00000642@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 40994

In article <GL7v8.12786$3z3.1228384@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Damn, how'd I miss all that? I've been licensed since the early 60's and
>never heard of uniforms, marching, or any of that. My Mom, who was first
>licensed in 1930 never told me about those things either.

"Never heard of it?!?" Heh heh heh...you haven't been reading
things in here very close, old salt... :-)

Mother never told you there'd be days like this?

She never told you to "dress right...dress!" in formation? :-)

>I guess Leonard is telling tall stories again! Crank that organ, old Sir.

You betcha...and the monkey is still trying to dance, his
little fists still clenched in a death-grip inside that jar. :-)

1677. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 22:01:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417180113.08044.00003844@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 40996

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>I have occasions that I have to
>get the "attention" of one of my hockey team members, and I can blister
>their ears with the profanity. There is a time and place.

Ditto with me and the guys on the #59 pit crew. At the racetrack, if you can't cuss, you don't get any respect. Let's just say I am well respected since I came out with the ultimate combination!

However, on this forum, if memory serves, the worst I have done is a "damn" and maybe a "hell" in a reasonable context. And I would not use the latter on the air, except perhaps in a religious context.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1678. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 23:48:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbe0a56_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40997

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a9jmt422hcn@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Good idea Kim, actually I was thinking that with all that money being
spent
> on the "defense of ham radio", that they might have actually have had
> produced video and/or audio promo tapes.
>
> There is cable access channels available here in the Mid-Michigan area,
> although I do not know how many people *actually* watch those channels
> except shut-ins. But I am going to become a member of the organization
that
> runs the City Of Midland area public access channel, and my goal is to
> create a promo tape.
>
> I am currently working on creating a report/paper form of my activities as
a
> public relations person for our amateur radio club and would be willing to
> share that knowledge with others when I finally get it in
printed/printable
> form.
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
>
> www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the
site
> please)
>
>
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>

Man, that sounds like a blast. You know, it may be a little controversial, but you could even do a "show" with interviews of hams who stormspotting, DXpeditions, build gear, etc. How 'bout one called "Hamming ISN'T all Radio." Why? Because there's topics that some (LOL) hams know a lot about, like grounding for example. A show on grounding could interest nearly anyone, and could end up getting them interested in ham radio...

Kim W5TIT

1679. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 23:50:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbe0acc_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40998

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020417065433.09489.00000574@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3cbc1213_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:bhsnbu0jcp7n8bsvkim9t4dil6kicjfoac@4ax.com...
> >> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:28:30 -0500, "Kim"
> >> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> >> >> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >Oh, not at all am I complaining. I really don't care what "kind of
> >language" people use on the air. I have a tuning knob and an on/off
button.
>
> Then why don't you practice what you preach, Kim?
>
> Your radio sets have a tuning knob and a power switch. But when someone
> shows up on the repeater you frequent and talks about traffic conditions,
you
> "chide", "tease" "make fun of them" "bust their ....", etc. rather than
tuning
> away
> or turning off. You've told us you do these things, so your saying "do as
I
> say, not as I do".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Uh, Jim...in a word: get over it. I *choose* to have fun with folks who
think all there is to talk about is traffic, or think all QSOs have to be
made up of traffic and weather. I *choose* WHEN to use my knobs...you
choose when to yours.

Kim W5TIT

1680. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 23:51:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbe0af5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40999

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020417065434.09489.00000575@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <20020416081740.01968.00003582@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
>
> >
> (Kim wrote:)
> >>>then I'll answer with: I don't
> >>> know.
> >
> (N2EY wrote:)
> >>OK, then. Simple question, simple answer.
> >
> >Well, it really isn't that simple.
> >
> >Kim, I am curious too... you said that the mode you used on 30 meters was
> >neither CW nor digital. Then what mode was it?
>
> You're forgetting something, Ed. When Kim wrote that she "worked all bands
> lots of times" (in the context of HF amateur bands"), her definition of
"all
> bands" does not include 30 meters.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY.
>
>

Jim, what a Dick you're becoming.

Kim W5TIT

1681. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 23:52:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbe0b37$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41000

"AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:j4sqbugf9cqn23mjrk5hu1chtmmspagloi@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 16 Apr 2002 21:23:12 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >
> >A swap net is not "ordering" something over the air. What I mean by that
> >is, if it OK to order pizza, then it is OK for me to call the local
> >furniture store and tell them I'll be there to pick some furniture up,
call
> >the office supply store and tell them to get the following items ready
> >because I'm on my way to pick them up, etc., etc. If you think not, what
> >would you say is the difference between ordering pizza or the chair we'd
> >like to sit in while we eat it?
>
> Dunno, seems like the same thing to me...
>
> >
> >Swap nets are just fine... The R&R mention that the rule directly
addresses
> >those items that generate a profit. Most of us cannot sell our equipment
at
> >a profit, right?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> Well, in 1997 I bought a Swan 350 for $165. In 1998 I sold it for
> $200 and bought a Kenwood TS-520. After buying an external VFO-520
> for $75, I turned around and sold THAT combination for $300 and bought
> myself an IC-720A. So actually, yes... we CAN sell our equipment at
> a profit - provided we bought it for a bargain to begin with...
>
>
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

Good grief, I need you to negotiate a few deals for me...LOL

Kim W5TIT

1682. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-17 23:56:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbe0c33$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40901

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020417180113.08044.00003844@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> >I have occasions that I have to
> >get the "attention" of one of my hockey team members, and I can blister
> >their ears with the profanity. There is a time and place.
>
> Ditto with me and the guys on the #59 pit crew. At the racetrack, if you
can't
> cuss, you don't get any respect. Let's just say I am well respected since
I
> came out with the ultimate combination!
>
> However, on this forum, if memory serves, the worst I have done is a
"damn" and
> maybe a "hell" in a reasonable context. And I would not use the latter on
the
> air, except perhaps in a religious context.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

If I was willing, and I have been on occasion, to do any cursing on the air, I'd use damn *and* hell...but probably not much more than that. I also wouldn't talk out loud about speeding, if I am, or anything that could be misinterpreted by an impressionable mind. I don't think ham radio is the place to announce that we are doing illegal things. Cursing and kids...that's a touchy subject. Around here, you ought to hear some of the language I've heard coming out of little kids' mouths--WHEW!

Kim W5TIT

1683. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 00:13:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CBE0FAF.30C09829@adelphia.net>
Source record: 40902

Depending on your personality, it could have been a big help to you too.
It might be nice to have the chance to warm up some.

- Mike KB3EIA -

N2EY wrote:

> However, I would not put it past ol' Joe Squelch to do something like
> that just so there'd be no doubt that a kid with an Extra knew his/her
> stuff cold.

1684. Re: Dear ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 00:23:09 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <8332ed9ad32dc98ab3cb21cc65981d93.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 40903
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Aaron, I can not argue with you on this one ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1685. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:27:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417212757.16785.00000652@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 40908

In article <a9g6it$r44$0@208.206.142.109>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> It had nothing to do with convenience, Ed. I simply didn't observe
>> a call sign badge on her, and she did not identify herself by name
>> or call sign at any time during her tirade.
>>
>
> And those mortified HQ folk, desperate to end this scene, didn't ask
>her to ID.

Dick:

There were no ARRL HQ staff members present. Mr. Turnbull is/was
a Board member and Vice President; Dr. Craigie was the ATL Div.
Director. Neither of these are "HQ" staff positions. Paid ARRL
staffers have little, if anything, to do with running ARRL Forums at
hamfests and conventions, other than serving as occasional guest
speakers, or giving technical presentations, as Ed often does. I have
attended two of his RFI presentations -- ripping good stuff!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1686. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:27:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417212758.16785.00000653@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 40906

In article <TR2v8.2029$7d4.322998386@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>I knew I read this on the FISTS site. Brian
>----------
>
>http://www.fists.org/declare.html
>The North American contingent of FISTS, the International Morse Preservation
>Society, in formal balloting of its membership approved the following
>declaration of purpose and policy by a 95 to 5 percent margin. FISTS is the
>first grass-roots organization worldwide to formally support, and call for,
>a restoring of exam standards of any kind.

Brian:

OK, so what? This ten year-old declaration was never supported by
the FISTS leadership, since FISTS is not a "political" organization.
Point?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1687. Re: It's been 2 years since restructuring now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:27:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417212759.16785.00000654@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 40905

In article <zZ2v8.2043$Ys4.323926271@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> The world didn't end....
>
>Well -yew- just wait. Bruce and Larry cudn't be rong. Its gonna happen
>suner or later. Mark my werds.
>
>Or sumptin' like that.

Brian:

The "dumbing-down" of the ARS already seems to have affected
your spelling.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1688. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:28:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417212800.16785.00000656@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 40907

In article <7g3v8.2071$U45.326339722@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Morse/CW is a mode not normally used to pass highway traffic
>> reports on VHF/UHF repeaters.
>
>Lets set a precedence.

Brian:

OK, go ahead and set a "precedence" (sic). I'm not going to stand in your way!

>> I'm surprised you don't realize that
>> fact.
>
>I have it on good authority that the mode is more important than the
>message.

I see. Care to provide a direct quote from this so-called "authority" in which he/she actually makes this claim?

>> I always believe in using the appropriate mode for the particular
>> application being pursued at the moment.
>
>You misquote yourself.

I don't see how, Brian -- that looks exactly like what I typed here last night!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1689. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:28:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417212800.16785.00000655@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 40909

In article <3cbb988b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might want to
>pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on this.
>Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the message.
>However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's attempted
>insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:

Kim:

It was no insult, just a statement of obvious fact, further supported by what
you're about to say now:

>How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur station
>shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably be
>furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to me
>that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be furnished
>alternatively through other radio services" category...

I see. Well, I won't duplicate Ray's excellent retort to this little gem of a
fact, except to state that once again, you have proved that you're not
qualified to make judgements as to what "prohibited transmissions" are.

>And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little
>here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:
>
>97.113 (again):
>(e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
>any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
>propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
>general public and originated from United States Government stations and
>communications, including incidental music, originating on United States
>Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth
>stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
>from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
>retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
>Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
>conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
>normal amateur radio communications.
>
>I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention to
>"*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than* an
>amateur station..."
>

>Now, here's the quiz: can ya guess *why* we shouldn't/cannot retransmit
>things we hear on broadcast stations?

That's exactly right, Kim, as long as we're not "retransmitting" the broadcast itself. However, we can *transmit* the data we heard on those broadcasts as much as we want to, as long as we are making it a part of a normal discussion, as opposed to actually playing a recording of the broadcast itself. Therefore, you're still wrong.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1690. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:28:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbe23c2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 40915

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020417212800.16785.00000655@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3cbb988b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might want
to
> >pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on
this.
> >Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the
message.
> >However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's attempted
> >insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:
>
> Kim:
>
> It was no insult, just a statement of obvious fact, further supported by
what
> you're about to say now:
>
> >How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur
station
> >shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably
be
> >furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to
me
> >that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be
furnished
> >alternatively through other radio services" category...
>
> I see. Well, I won't duplicate Ray's excellent retort to this little gem
of a
> fact, except to state that once again, you have proved that you're not
> qualified to make judgements as to what "prohibited transmissions" are.
>
> >And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little
> >here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:
> >
> >97.113 (again):
> >(e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
> >any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
> >propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
> >general public and originated from United States Government stations and

> >communications, including incidental music, originating on United States
> >Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth
> >stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
> >from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
> >retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
> >Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
> >conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
> >normal amateur radio communications.
> >
> >I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention to
> >"*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than* an
> >amateur station..."
> >
> >Now, here's the quiz: can ya guess *why* we shouldn't/cannot retransmit
> >things we hear on broadcast stations?
>
> That's exactly right, Kim, as long as we're not "retransmitting" the
broadcast
> itself. However, we can *transmit* the data we heard on those broadcasts
> as much as we want to, as long as we are making it a part of a normal
> discussion, as opposed to actually playing a recording of the broadcast
> itself. Therefore, you're still wrong.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

You missed Phil Kane's post, didn't you...

Kim W5TIT

1691. Re: Missing Q signals

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:28:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417212801.16785.00000658@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 40904

In article <V83v8.2060$bR4.325393630@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >Wonder when Larry will jump on here and give us a "QFU?'
>>
>> Brian:
>>
>> I wasn't going to, but it looks like you did!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Predictable.

I guess you were.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1692. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:28:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417212801.16785.00000657@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 40910

In article <Uh3v8.2074$335.326228006@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> More realistically (as opposed to your inane attempts at castigating Dick
>> and I for offering valid reasons for knowing the code), there are many
>> possible "emergency" situations where Morse/CW may, indeed be the
>> "best" mode to choose at the time.for a variety of reasons. If there are
>> not any radio amateurs who know how to use the mode, then that
>> particular emergency communications incident will result in failure, with
>> possibly adverse consequences to life and property. When we get to
>> the point where nobody is learning the Morse code due to a lack of a
>> license testing requirement, then we have lost a valuable emergency
>> communications capability. Of course, I guess you would call that
>> progress, wouldn't you, Brian?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>What did the Coast Guard call it?

Brian:

The Coast Guard called it a decision based on the cost involved
in recruiting, training, and providing pay and benefits for code-
trained radio operators. The ARS doesn't have that problem, unless
they're going to start paying us to participate in a voluntary hobbyist
activity.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1693. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:32:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Lmpv8.4179$fY1.75417902@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40911

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204171043.6259a073@posting.google.com...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<TR2v8.2029$7d4.322998386@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>...
> > I knew I read this on the FISTS site. Brian
> > ----------
> >
> > http://www.fists.org/declare.html
> > The North American contingent of FISTS, the International Morse
Preservation
> > Society, in formal balloting of its membership approved the following
> > declaration of purpose and policy by a 95 to 5 percent margin. FISTS is
the
> > first grass-roots organization worldwide to formally support, and call
for,
> > a restoring of exam standards of any kind.
>
> Tell the rest of the story, then, and the context.
>
> The issue was the use if multiple choice code tests. And the date was
1992,
> when FISTS had less than 1000 members, about 350 of them in the USA.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Is FISTS soley interested in promoting the use of Morse/CW, or is it also
interested in the regulating of Amateur Radio?

Brian

1694. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:35:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <oppv8.4180$S%1.75586856@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40912

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020417212758.16785.00000653@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <TR2v8.2029$7d4.322998386@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >I knew I read this on the FISTS site. Brian
> >--
> >
> >http://www.fists.org/declare.html
> >The North American contingent of FISTS, the International Morse
Preservation
> >Society, in formal balloting of its membership approved the following
> >declaration of purpose and policy by a 95 to 5 percent margin. FISTS is
the
> >first grass-roots organization worldwide to formally support, and call
for,
> >a restoring of exam standards of any kind.
>
> Brian:
>
> OK, so what? This ten year-old declaration was never supported by
> the FISTS leadership, since FISTS is not a "political" organization.
> Point?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

The point is that FISTS is not soley a morse/cw use society. FISTS advocate changes to the rules much as do other organizations that get a lot of heat for it. Just more of the old PCTA double standard.

1695. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:36:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Qqpv8.4181$e12.75640097@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40913

Their recommendation was "adopted" because the FCC told the VEC they could
pretty much do anything they wanted regarding exams.

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CBDA18A.B82E27C6@psu.edu...
> Interesting. I see that their recommendation on the CW tests has been
adopted.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > I knew I read this on the FISTS site. Brian
> > ----------
> >
> > http://www.fists.org/declare.html
> > The North American contingent of FISTS, the International Morse
Preservation
> > Society, in formal balloting of its membership approved the following
> > declaration of purpose and policy by a 95 to 5 percent margin. FISTS is
the
> > first grass-roots organization worldwide to formally support, and call
for,
> > a restoring of exam standards of any kind.

1696. Re: It's been 2 years since restructuring now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:39:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_spv8.4183$u32.75726276@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40914

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020417212759.16785.00000654@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <zZ2v8.2043$Ys4.323926271@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> The world didn't end....
> > >
> > >Well -yew- just wait. Bruce and Larry cudn't be rong. Its gonna happen
> > >suner or later. Mark my werds.
> > >
> > >Or sumptin' like that.
>
> Brian:
>
> The "dumbing-down" of the ARS already seems to have affected
> your spelling.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

No Larry, it was the falling sky bouncing off my head that caused my
"dumbing down." Get it?

1697. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:44:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bypv8.4186$r_1.75518185@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40916

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020417212801.16785.00000657@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <Uh3v8.2074$335.326228006@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> More realistically (as opposed to your inane attempts at castigating
Dick
> >> and I for offering valid reasons for knowing the code), there are many
> >> possible "emergency" situations where Morse/CW may, indeed be the
> >> "best" mode to choose at the time.for a variety of reasons. If there
are
> >> not any radio amateurs who know how to use the mode, then that
> >> particular emergency communications incident will result in failure,
with
> >> possibly adverse consequences to life and property. When we get to
> >> the point where nobody is learning the Morse code due to a lack of a
> >> license testing requirement, then we have lost a valuable emergency
> >> communications capability. Of course, I guess you would call that
> >> progress, wouldn't you, Brian?
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >What did the Coast Guard call it?
>
> Brian:
>
> The Coast Guard called it a decision based on the cost involved
> in recruiting, training, and providing pay and benefits for code-
> trained radio operators. The ARS doesn't have that problem, unless
> they're going to start paying us to participate in a voluntary hobbyist
> activity.

When they force an -amateur- to develop an unnecessary skill in a mode that
all other services have previously paid for professionally and then
abandoned, I think its reasonable that they should compensate at at least
the GS-7 or 9 technician level.

73, Brian

1698. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:47:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <cBpv8.4187$jb2.76045532@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40917

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020417063657.20500.00003278@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> Morse/CW is a mode not normally used to pass highway traffic
> >> reports on VHF/UHF repeaters.
>
> >I have it on good authority that the mode is more important than the
> >message.
>
> If that good authority really told you that the mode is more important
than the
> message in formal traffic handling, find another authority. He or she is
> wrong.
>
> The mode is, for most hams, more important than the message in casual
> opearating. In casual operating, most people set out to operate a mode
rather
> than set out to tell someone about their weather.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Weather is necessary if you're on a severe storm net. Otherwise, I like finding interesting people or people doing interesting things and letting them talk.

I'm not a surgeon, so gall bladders hold no real interest. I am, however, a retired weather forecaster, so...

1699. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 01:52:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%Fpv8.4189$4f2.76212335@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40918

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020417212800.16785.00000656@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <7g3v8.2071$U45.326339722@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Morse/CW is a mode not normally used to pass highway traffic
> >> reports on VHF/UHF repeaters.
> >
> >Lets set a precedence.
>
> Brian:
>
> OK, go ahead and set a "precedence" (sic). I'm not going to
> stand in your way!

You stand in my way? I guess I"m not you're favorite black on the bus
anymore.

> >> I'm surprised you don't realize that
> >> fact.
> >
> >I have it on good authority that the mode is more important than the
> >message.
>
> I see. Care to provide a direct quote from this so-called "authority"
> in which he/she actually makes this claim?

Lots of so-called "authorities" on here. Know any?

> >> I always believe in using the appropriate mode for the particular
> >> application being pursued at the moment.
> >
> >You misquote yourself.
>
> I don't see how, Brian -- that looks exactly like what I typed here
> last night!

No, you always believe in declaring preposterous scenarios where the only
possible solution is your favorite mode.

1700. From the Ham X-files.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 02:03:58 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <iQpv8.1656$sf7.785017034@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40919

Because Joseph Schulman K6BWA / KA6UFC's entire career revolves around implantable biomedical devices, and:

1. that I have recovered several devices from infected sites on my person,
2. and that they precisely match his US Patent Office filings and drawings,
3. and because he has 224.840MHz repeaters to the N, S, E and S-E of my residence, all within a 22 mile radius,
4. and (!) because it is documented that due to tissue impedance and bandwidth issues, the 200MHz spectrum is preferred for this application which involves stimulation and recording of human biological signals.....

Allow me to pose this question:

What are the chances that Joseph Schulman K6BWA is NOT in violation of the law as well as FCC regulations??

Additionally, what are the chances that these signal transmissions as described below, could appear to be legitimate encoding or appear similar to repeater configuration commands??

Text from research reports sent to the NIH from K6BWA, Joseph Schulman:
"We have started construction of a implantable device controller that can store arbitrarily long or complex sequences of carrier modulation from a PC and transmit those sequences while maintaining synchronization with the RF oscillator in the coil-driver sub-system (implant circuit)....
"Personal-Trainer��T" Motorola 68HC11 microcontroller... uses a shift register to count RF carrier cycles and generate requests for bytes representing the desired serial carrier states. This strategy greatly simplifies the firmware for the "Personal-TrainerT", but requires PC based software to implement the encoding of the medical device parameters into serial carrier modulations. The necessary software is an addition to our ClinFit software package..."
"Suspended Carrier allows the use of same coil for both incoming and outbound telemetry at the same frequency... by picking up the residual resonance as clock-timing parameters,..

I'm hoping that someone can provide some helpful insight.

Dave Larson "No it's not aliens,... it's a HAM!"
5676 Lindley Ave
Encino, CA 91316
818 881-4580
lars121@pacbell.net

1701. Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 02:21:46 UTC
From: ceejaay1@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e66d27d2.0204171821.1e01896c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 40920

I looked at my license renewal/approval etc, and I have had my
Tech license since 1989 (then renewed in 1992 with a new address)
and my license had said TECH PLUS.

NOW it says PREV license class TECH PLUS, and new license class TECH

how will this differentiate me from other TECHS w/o Tech plus privlidges?
DO I still have TECH plus privledges? I had to take 5wpm code back in 1989
to get my license.

HOW do I prove this.. cj

1702. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 02:22:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9lakdcjt0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 40921

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <a9g6it$r44$0@208.206.142.109>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >> It had nothing to do with convenience, Ed. I simply didn't observe
> >> a call sign badge on her, and she did not identify herself by name
> >> or call sign at any time during her tirade.
> >>
> >
> > And those mortified HQ folk, desperate to end this scene, didn't ask
> >her to ID.
>
> Dick:
>
> There were no ARRL HQ staff members present. Mr. Turnbull is/was
> a Board member and Vice President; Dr. Craigie was the ATL Div.
> Director. Neither of these are "HQ" staff positions. Paid ARRL
> staffers have little, if anything, to do with running ARRL Forums at
> hamfests and conventions, other than serving as occasional guest
> speakers, or giving technical presentations, as Ed often does. I have
> attended two of his RFI presentations -- ripping good stuff!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You guys don't consider a board member/Vice President and another BOD
member, a division director, as "HQ folks"? I sure do. I didn't say
staff member.

1703. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 02:29:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417222955.10628.00001927@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 40922

In article <3cbcdf42_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>What I mean by that
>is, if it OK to order pizza, then it is OK for me to call the local
>furniture store and tell them I'll be there to pick some furniture up, call
>the office supply store and tell them to get the following items ready
>because I'm on my way to pick them up, etc., etc. If you think not, what
>would you say is the difference between ordering pizza or the chair we'd
>like to sit in while we eat it?

All of the above would be perfectly legal transactions to conduct using
an amateur radio autopatch. The "Pizza Patch" paradigm is used only
to illustrate the necessity for the amateur to be participating in the role
of the consumer, not the merchant.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1704. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 02:46:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417224651.10628.00001928@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 40923

In article <Lmpv8.4179$fY1.75417902@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Is FISTS soley interested in promoting the use of Morse/CW, or is it also
>interested in the regulating of Amateur Radio?

Brian:

The former, and definitely not the latter.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1705. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 02:46:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417224652.10628.00001929@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 40924

In article <oppv8.4180$S%1.75586856@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>The point is that FISTS is not soley a morse/cw use society. FISTS advocate
>changes to the rules much as do other organizations that get a lot of heat
>for it. Just more of the old PCTA double standard.

Brian:

What "changes to the rules" does FISTS advocate? From the time I first joined FISTS, the concept that FISTS is a "non-political" organization has been driven home many times. The only thing FISTS "advocates" is the continued use of the Morse/CW mode on-the-air, by providing operating events and awards programs geared exclusively to the CW mode. They "advocate" absolutely nothing as far as political action to influence the FCC to change the amateur radio service rules and regulations with regard to code testing, although they do support the notion of individual members taking their own initiative to do so. You are not demonstrating a very thorough knowledge of how the FISTS organization operates.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1706. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 02:46:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020417224653.10628.00001930@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 40925

In article <bypv8.4186$r_1.75518185@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> The Coast Guard called it a decision based on the cost involved
>> in recruiting, training, and providing pay and benefits for code-
>> trained radio operators. The ARS doesn't have that problem, unless
>> they're going to start paying us to participate in a voluntary hobbyist
>> activity.
>
>When they force an -amateur- to develop an unnecessary skill in a mode that
>all other services have previously paid for professionally and then
>abandoned, I think its reasonable that they should compensate at at least
>the GS-7 or 9 technician level.
>
>73, Brian

Brian:

Well, in that case, it's a good thing that hams are not "forced"
to learn the Morse code! If they were, the FCC would have a
greatly expanded payroll!

BTW -- would I be able to "double dip" and receive my GS-7/9
payments in addition to my military retirement?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1707. Re: Space Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 02:48:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020417224842.06603.00003137@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 40926

>Subject: Space Ham
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/17/02 17:53 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020417175320.06459.00000641@mb-mo.aol.com>

>I mistyped the parenthesis statement, intended to say
>"aeronautics is the second LETTER in NASA."
>
>NASA = National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Ahhh....You made a MISTAKE. I see. OK then. Still a lack of attention to detail... A glaring one at that.

>Heh heh heh...the little monkey's fists are clenched so tight,
>the clenching extends to teeth clamped shut in anger

Geeee, Lennie, NAME CALLING...?!?! So UNLIKE you!

And by the way, was I WRONG? (You just admitted above you erred. And WHERE is the answer on the "strictly recreational" rado service?

>If one were to make an "issue" of typos, the little monkey would
>lose by a wide margin since it makes so many of them.

My occassional transposition of the letter "a" (ie: "ahs" when I meant "has") is a typo.

And my "typos" still don't outweigh your countelss errors of current Amateur Radio POLICY.

>WHERE did I or anyone else SAY that NASA had ever
>>been "dependent" on Amateur Radio to fulfill any mission criteria???
>
>That was in the implication by use of the word "incorporate."

No, Your Spinningness, that was YOUR attempt to obfuscate the fact that Amateur Radio IS a part of the International Space Station. It IS a part of the ISS program. Amateur Radio was designed into the ISS during development.

>This is further substantiated by the issuance
>>of >callsigns TO the ISS by several of the nations who underwrite the ISS,
>>therefore the operation of Amateur radio in space is recognized as important
>>by more than on national government.
>
>Error! Tsk, tsk, tsk. The last line should be "by more than ONE
>national..."

Thank you. However it does not negate the accuracy of the statement.

>Ham radio on shuttle was of the "shack on a belt variety," getting
>a handheld next to a large window.

Yes, the radios were "handheld". However the radios were specifically adapted for the Shuttle, including a special antenna that did fit into the portal. However in no way, shape of form were the radios carried by any of the STS fleet anywhere near the "shack on a belt" as is currently known or used by Radio Amateurs...then or now...

>(Snip).....In addition, the EMI from
>any such space "ham shack" cannot interfere with regular ISS
>communications or telemetry. All that was pre-planned on the
>ground and the extra payload mass accounted for (all payload
>mass is precious).

Nice technical narrative of already known facts snipped. Yes Lennie...those of us who are familiar with the program know this...We know this because we are active in such matters.

AND...THANKS! for validating MY comments vis-a-vis the INTEGRATION of Amateur Radio facilities into ISS...

>> Which still does not negate the fact that MILLIONS of people (per IMAX
>>accounts of visits-per-year) will see IMAX presentations every year....And
>>not "only" in the United States, mind you...
>
>How many IMAX theaters are there? Count them up and relate tham
>to "conventional" motion picture theaters. IMAX is still quite limited
>and in only a few urban centers.

I have no idea how many theaters there are, Lennie. I have been to several, however, both in the United States and Japan.

Can you disprove any of my comments? if not...nice try at obfuscation.

>> But NOT as "nil" as the amount of exposure as Lennie the Loser has.
>
>...try to stay on the subject or at least part of the subject. The above
>is nothing but the usual gratuitous heckling signifying nothing but
>the monkey's psychological aberration..

Your lack of current details and lack of practical experience in Amateur Radio practice and policy IS part of the subject, Your Meaninginglessness. As the foregoing comments have, once again, proven.

>> NOW I GET IT! it's just a PUBLICITY STUNT! Kinda like pole sitting or
>>wing walking!
>
>Both "pole sitting" and "wing walking" were private showmanship
>publicity stunts done beginning in the Great Depression times.
>The monkey was born in the mid-1950s, well after that fact.
>"Wing-walking" is still an activity done at air shows. Air shows
>are almost all private endeavors designed for entertainment.
>The analogue is rejected.

Of course it is, Lennie. It made a fool of you again. Regardless of
"private" or "government" venture, a publicity stunt is a publicity stunt.

Regardless of WHEN it happened.....

>> Suuuuuuuuure, Lennie! NASA has nothing better for it's flight staff to
>>do than pass Amateur Radio examinations for "publicity"...As if walking in
>space
>>and creating orbiting laboratories isn't enough.
>
>Most astronauts granted an amateur radio license hold a no-code-test
>Technician license. They are all knowledgeable about...(SNIP)

Dissertation on the evolution of space walking and the technical
qualifications of the flight staff noted.

YOU made the assertion that this was a publicity stunt (your words). So
why the lengthy diatribe on non-related technical matters now?

>There is NO wide exposure to such amateur
>communications with space.

Sure there is...and getting wider every day. What have YOU done to help
lately? Care to hear what we are doing in SE Tennessee?

>> But...but...but...LENNIE! Above you just claimed it was a publicity
>stunt
>>for NASA...I ASSUME that you meant that it was intended to create some sort
>>of positive reaction by the unwashed masses towards an otherwise expensive
>>program.
>
>That seems to be the intent. It has no other purpose than being
>PR and a form of recreation for ISS crew members.

Oh no? Care to think that one over again? Shall we remind you of the
fire incident on MIR when Amateur Radio WAS used as a back-up to the on-board
systems.

>> If THAT was the intent, then it very certainly DOES mean "something" to
>>NASA!
>
>Wrong conclusion based on not understanding the aims and general
>structure of the ISS mission.

Not at all. The ARISS program DOES mean "something" to the participating
nations and agencies. Compeltely acceptable conclusion.

Perfectly UNacceptable attempt to duck the facts on your part.

>>The use of Amateur Radio to communicate directly with the now
>>decommissioned MIR and STS missions was widely published.
>
>MIR was not "decommissioned."

Sure it was. Certain materials and equipment was removed from the station. And just like a battleship no longer needed, it was "scrapped". Unfortunately the "conventional" means of scrapping the ship were not available.

>The "use of amateur radio" on STS was only "widely published" in
>the specific amateur radio media.

Oh...???

The Wall Street Journal had a piece on it. So has Popular Science, "Discover Channel", "Discovery Wings", CNN and a handful of others. The Chattanooga Free Press cited the use of Amateur Radio onboard the Shuttle at one time, and was later mentioned after the fire on MIR.

Those agencies are "specific amateur radio media"...?

>The public is well aware of the
>normal NASA radio communications with shuttle through hundreds
>of available video and audio feeds live and on-line since the first
>Mercury in May of 1961.

Sure beats millions of miles of string and tin cans, ya think...???

>> Again....You are asked to cite WHO (other than YOU) said it "was" a
>>"vital" part of the program, Lennie.
>
>Use of the word "incorporate" in the first monkey posting indicates
>an implication that it was so.

"Implication"...??? No...It meant, simply, that Amateur Radio HAS been incorporated into the ISS program. The present ARISS operating position WAS designed in from early on. It will INCORPORATE numerous ands, modes and operating combinations. Unless I ahve missed one, three nations have allocated callsigns to it.

Amateur Radio IS "incorporated" into the ISS. YOU made the insinuation that someone (not me) said it was "vital".

Unless YOU can prove that the on-going ARISS operations are bootleg and without approval of the ISS agencies, Amateur radio IS "incorporated" into the ISS program.

Unless YOU can "prove" otherwise...???

>ANY amateur radio equipment carried into space, any mission, is a
>freebie given by the various space organizations. Be grateful for, not
>boastful about such gratuities.

ARISS is not free. Monies have been expended BY the ISS consortium to design and INCORPORATE the equipment into the station.

And >>I<< can be as boastful as I damned well care to be, Lennie.

The "a" in ARISS is "Amateur".

The "r" in ARISS is "Radio".

I AM an Amateur Radio operator. I will never set foot inside ISS, but
the ARISS facilities on ISS will benefit ALL Amateurs that care to participate,
and it has already touched the lives of hundreds of school children around the
world. Which is MORE than anything anyone can say for anything YOU ever did.

I know it sticks in your nasty smelling craw, but thems the facts.

Choke on it.

1708. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 03:16:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9le4d$a3k$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40927

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cbcdf42_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:vv6obu83tilm3df7cdvh1c89mpuubopa0f@4ax.com...
> > On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:32:51 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
> >
> > >>
> > >> Then you disagree with the FCC's stated policy as well.
> > >>
> > >
> > >Actually, I do disagree with the FCC on this. I don't think ordering
> > >*anything* over the air should be allowed.
> >
> > So is it safe to say that you don't think swap nets should be allowed
> > on the air? If so, exactly how can you justify that position?
> >
> > Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> > SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> > 607-733-5745
> > telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000
>
> A swap net is not "ordering" something over the air. What I mean by that
> is, if it OK to order pizza, then it is OK for me to call the local
> furniture store and tell them I'll be there to pick some furniture up,
call
> the office supply store and tell them to get the following items ready
> because I'm on my way to pick them up, etc., etc. If you think not, what
> would you say is the difference between ordering pizza or the chair we'd
> like to sit in while we eat it?
>
> Swap nets are just fine... The R&R mention that the rule directly
addresses
> those items that generate a profit. Most of us cannot sell our equipment
at
> a profit, right?

I know at least one ham who buys equipment that has a problem and almost
always fixes the proble and sells the gear for more than he paid.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1709. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 03:22:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9leba$i0o$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40928

```
"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cbce1ed_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a9im2s$k4q$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3cbb988b_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a9fudk$qbp$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > >
> > > > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3cbb66b5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:a9emjv$sfs$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:3cb9b236$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > > > > We can, however, retransmit items from the NWS, I
> > > > > > > think.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > We can, in our own words, retransmit (as part
> > > > > > of a QSO...not as a one way broadcast) just about anything.
> > > > > > That'd include the latest stock quote, news items,
> > > > > > weather reports or whatever.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Cheers,
> > > > > > Bill K2UNK
> > > > >
> > > > > It is my understanding that we absolutely *cannot* retransmit
things
> > on
> > > > > emergency frequencies (police in particular).
> > > >
> > > > Are you suggesting that if I have a scanner and
> > > > hear that there's an accident at 5th and Main
> > > > that I can't mention it to another ham...or anyone else
> > > > for that matter?
> > > >
> > > > If yes, please let us know what FCC rule applies.
> > > > If one exists, it is not likly in Part 97 at all.
> > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > Bill K2UNK
> > >
```

> > > You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might
want
> to
> > > pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on
> > this.
> > > Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the
> > message.
> > > However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's
attempted
> > > insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:
> > >
> > > How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur
> > station
> > > shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could
> reasonably
> > be
> > > furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems
to
> me
> > > that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be
> furnished
> > > alternatively through other radio services" category...
> >
> > Who cares, so what...that does NOT make the discussion of traffic
> > illegal.
> >
> > > And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little
> > > here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:
> > >
> > > 97.113 (again):
> > > (e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
> > > any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
> > > propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
> > > general public and originated from United States Government stations
and
> > > communications, including incidental music, originating on United
States
> > > Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated
Earth
> > > stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
> > > from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
> > > retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
> > > Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
> > > conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
> > > normal amateur radio communications.
> > >
> > > I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention
to
> > > "*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than*
an

> > > amateur station..."
> > >
> > > Now, here's the quiz: can ya guess *why* we shouldn't/cannot
retransmit
> > > things we hear on broadcast stations?
> >
> > Bzzzt...wrong!
> >
> > If I tell another ham something I heard, I am NOT retransmiting
> > a "program" or "signal".... in other words...not applicable.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
>
> Well, that's the Part 97 part that I quoted. See Phil Kane's post.

Phil Kane posted a part 47 rule. It applies to any
telling of what is heard. The reality, however, is that
thousands of people (especially reporters, ambulance chasers,
lawyers, tow truck operators, etc. listen, act and repeat
what they hear all the time.)

> By the
> way...it's my regarded opinion that the reason we shouldn't/can't do this
is
> twofold: liability

That's a joke. Who and why would there be any liability?

> and the fact that the FCC did not want to be dragged into
> court continuously when amateurs repeat things over the air that are
either
> copyrighted or that end up being "mistakes" by the media.

Why would the FCC be dragged into court at all?

As to copyrighted stuff...on what do you base that
possible claim?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1710. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 03:29:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9lena$tm4$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 40930

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cbe23c2_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020417212800.16785.00000655@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > In article <3cbb988b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might want
> to
> > > >pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on
> this.
> > > >Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the
> message.
> > > >However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's
attempted
> > > >insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > It was no insult, just a statement of obvious fact, further supported by
> what
> > you're about to say now:
> >
> > > >How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur
> station
> > > >shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could
reasonably
> be
> > > >furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to
> me
> > > >that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be
> furnished
> > > >alternatively through other radio services" category...
> >
> > I see. Well, I won't duplicate Ray's excellent retort to this little
gem
> of a
> > fact, except to state that once again, you have proved that you're not
> > qualified to make judgements as to what "prohibited transmissions" are.
> >
> > > >And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little
> > > >here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:
> > > >

> > >97.113 (again):
> > >(e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
> > >any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
> > >propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
> > >general public and originated from United States Government stations
and
> > >communications, including incidental music, originating on United
States
> > >Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth
> > >stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
> > >from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
> > >retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
> > >Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
> > >conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
> > >normal amateur radio communications.
> > >
> > >I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention
to
> > >"*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than*
an
> > >amateur station..."
> > >
> > >Now, here's the quiz: can ya guess *why* we shouldn't/cannot retransmit
> > >things we hear on broadcast stations?
> >
> > That's exactly right, Kim, as long as we're not "retransmitting" the
> broadcast
> > itself. However, we can *transmit* the data we heard on those
broadcasts
> > as much as we want to, as long as we are making it a part of a normal
> > discussion, as opposed to actually playing a recording of the broadcast
> > itself. Therefore, you're still wrong.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> You missed Phil Kane's post, didn't you...
> Kim W5TIT

Kim,
Phil's post DOES NOT apply to broadcast. Here's what Phil
said:
Try 47 U.S.C. s. 605 pertaining to interception and divulgence of
> communications without authorization by the sender.

That is targeted at "interception" of things like police, military,
private, etc transmissions... it has no bearing on what anyone hears
on broadcast radio or TV.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1711. Re: From the Ham X-files.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 03:30:34 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <u5rv8.14972$3z3.1417143@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40929

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote

>
> I'm hoping that someone can provide some helpful insight.
>

Go the the nearest Home Depot hardware outlet and obtain a large metal funnel. Wear it over your head to filter out the offending signals. Use grade 0000 steel wool for padding around any openings.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1712. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 03:37:37 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <5crv8.14981$3z3.1419693@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 40931

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

>
> You guys don't consider a board member/Vice President and another BOD
> member, a division director, as "HQ folks"? I sure do. I didn't say
> staff member.
>

I served two terms as Dakota Division vice director. I always considered
myself a field representative, not an HQ guy.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1713. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 03:47:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBE41C3.CA640AFA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 40932

Bill Sohl wrote:
> I know at least one ham who buys equipment that has a problem and almost
> always fixes the proble and sells the gear for more than he paid.

At a hamfest one time, a ham across the aisle from me bought my HT
and put it on his table for $20 more than he paid me for it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1714. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:07:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418000731.13688.00000737@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 40936

In article <a9eo70$82i$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020415080705.19000.00000862@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> In article <3cba4ba3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> (K3LT wrote):
>>
>> >> As usual, you are totally incorrect. Neither example is even remotely
>> >> "gray." If a licensed amateur is employed at a Domino's Pizza, answers
>> >> the phone, and it's a ham radio friend of his on the autopatch ordering
>> >> a pizza, then the only relationship that exists is the normal merchant/
>> >> customer relationship.
>> >>
>> >
>> >How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and his
>> >buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
>> >Larry?
>>
>> Simple. If the individuals involved do not make a point of mentioning the
>name
>> or location of the pizza shop any more than necessary, they are not
>> advertising.
>
>But even the FCC didn't place such a narrow restriction
>on the pizza order scenario. Clearly when the pizza
>shop answers the phone, they will likly state something
>akin to: Hello, Joey's Pizza Shop, how can I help you?

That's what I mean by "any more than necessary". If the autopatchers
keep mentioning the name of the shop, how good the pizza is, etc., it could
reach a point where they are doing a pizza shop commercial rather than actually
ordering a pizza.
>
>Frankly, Kim's personal interpretation of what the
>prohibition on using ham radio for pecuniary interests
>means has been taken to ridiculous extremes.

Agreed 100%.

> What
>seems totally amazing is that Kim even ignores the

>FCC rulings that have already addressed several of
>the specific scenarios she claims are violations.

Seems to me that Kim wants to whittle away at amateur radio
until it is destroyed. Kim thinks it's OK to cuss on the air and
make fun of other hams having legal conversations, but it's
not OK in her book to discuss the weather or the traffic or
order a pizza. Even though the FCC has repeatedly said
exactly the opposite.

It's not code tests or lack thereof that will drive amateur radio to
extinction. It's addytoods like Kim's.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1715. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:07:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418000732.13688.00000738@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 40934

In article <20020415231243.20665.00000606@mb-mq.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3cbb65ba_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
>>I can absolutely assure you that there are no smooth operations here during
>>our several hours of rush.

>>> Kim, you have chosen to live a long way from where you work, in a city
>>with
>>> inadequate roads and all-but-nonexistent transit. Your choice has pretty
>>> much guaranteed you a long, frustrating, energy-inefficient, air-polluting
>>> commute. Perhaps it bothers you that other hams in other places (like
>>Larry)
>>> have made different choices and don't have to got through that sort of
>>commute
>>> every working day.
>>>
>>> In short, jealousy.
>
>Jim:
>
>If that's the case, let Kim be jealous of this: My "commute" to work
>is 3.5 miles one way, usually takes from 10 - 12 minutes, and I have
>free, dedicated parking. I fill the gas tank on my '01 Toyota Corolla LE
>every three weeks, and it usually takes 9 gallons. This includes my
>weekly commuting and all other incidental driving during days off, etc.

COOL!

But ya gotta beat this:

My commute to work is about 1.5 miles one way - so close that I can go home for lunch on some days. Free, safe dedicated parking a few steps from the office door.

And most days I carpool with two beautiful young women who are very appreciative of my driving skills.

The only thing I can't match is your gas mileage. The Odyssey uses a bit more fuel than a Corolla.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1716. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:07:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418000733.13688.00000740@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 40933

In article <ubn6qli88bu52a@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Passed the General Written tonight using primarily the
>QRZ site to prepare, due to lack of time.

Congratulations, Val!

>Hope to take
>the code and Extra exam a month from now, after a lot
>of CW practice with a home-made keyer that will work
>with a 2m transceiver.

GREAT!

How's the code practice coming? Lots of free software out there that will run
on your PC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1717. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:07:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418000733.13688.00000739@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 40935

In article <3cbb988b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur station
>shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably be
>furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to me
>that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be furnished
>alternatively through other radio services" category...

Nope. Not any other radio service I know of. And the rule only prohibits such
communications if its done on a regular basis.

>97.113 (again):
>(e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
>any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
>propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
>general public and originated from United States Government stations and
>communications, including incidental music, originating on United States
>Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth
>stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
>from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
>retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
>Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
>conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
>normal amateur radio communications.
>
>I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention to
>"*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than* an
>amateur station..."

The prohibition is against retransmitting the program or signal, not the
information.

If KYW says it's 75 degrees at Philadelphia International airport, or that Alan
Greenspan decided to leave the prime interest rate alone, I can legally repeat
that information on the ham bands. What is not legal is retransmitting the
actual KYW program, either in real time or time delayed.

Phil Kane's railroad radio example is a bit different because, unlike BC
services, railroad radio communications are not usually meant for the general
public. Indeed, the general public won't understand much of it anyway. ("He's
stopped at the dwarf - what can you do to get that hogger a highball?" or "The
glad hands parted and he pulled a knuckle" don't mean much to most people.)

Your interpretations of these rules are simply not correct, Kim. The rules are
not nearly so restrictive as you think.

Time for me to pull the pin.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1718. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:08:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CBE46CE.17CD1C8B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 40937

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020417065434.09489.00000575@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > In article <20020416081740.01968.00003582@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI)
> > writes:
> >
> >
> > >
> > (Kim wrote:)
> > >>>then I'll answer with: I don't
> > >>> know.
> > >
> > (N2EY wrote:)
> > >>OK, then. Simple question, simple answer.
> > >
> > >Well, it really isn't that simple.
> > >
> > >Kim, I am curious too... you said that the mode you used on 30 meters was
> > >neither CW nor digital. Then what mode was it?
> >
> > You're forgetting something, Ed. When Kim wrote that she "worked all bands
> > lots of times" (in the context of HF amateur bands"), her definition of
> "all
> > bands" does not include 30 meters.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY.
> >
> >
>
> Jim, what a Dick you're becoming.

Kim, what a Kim you've remained. Another of your statements blows up in
your face and you blame those who call you on it.

Dave K8MN

1719. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:26:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9lhuf$1jr$1@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 40938

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> >Unless you have an assignment as the singular HQ poster here to RRAP
> >> >(the very occasional presence of Jon Bloom teh exception) your presence
> >> >here helps to confirm that.
>
> >> And this is confirmed in your mind by the fact that I keep telling you that
> >>my presence here is personal.
>
> > Sure it is, Ed. And as you said, your boss knows you'd never say
> >anything that would work against League policy.
>
> That is a far cry from "assignement as singular poster," Dick. Did you twist it
> on purpose, or are you really that confused?

I changed nothing, nor did I say you have an "Assignment". I said
"unless you have an assignment..." Seems you are the confused.

1720. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:29:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9li2i$1jr$2@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 40939

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> >
> > You guys don't consider a board member/Vice President and another BOD
> > member, a division director, as "HQ folks"? I sure do. I didn't say
> > staff member.
> >
>
> I served two terms as Dakota Division vice director. I always considered
> myself a field representative, not an HQ guy.
>

Probably right but unless I have been badly misinformed, the BOD makes
the policy decisions (though at whose behest is often open to question).
If it's not done at HQ it sure is done under the HQ umbrella.

1721. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:33:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9liak$37p$0@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 40940

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Do you really believe that all other readers here fail to note your
> >dishonesty in deliberatly changing the wordings and meanings of my
> >posts? I sure don't.
>
> I bet lots more of them note that you often don't say what you mean.

Ah. So you read my posts and automatically know that I don't mean what
I'm saying. Neat. How do you manage to divine just what it is that I
mean?

> "Assignment by ARRL as the rrap poster" vs "You have said that you will not use
> your posts to undermine ARRL policy sort of things."
>
> Talk about chaning meaning...
>

"Again, you deliberately obfuscate. "Unless you have an assignment..."
does not mean "You have an assignment..." And should we read your post
that said "...my bosses know I'd never say anything that would undermine
league policy" as meaning something else?
YOU change meanings, yet again

1722. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:35:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9lien$37p$1@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 40941

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <oppv8.4180$S%1.75586856@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >The point is that FISTS is not soley a morse/cw use society. FISTS advocate
> >changes to the rules much as do other organizations that get a lot of heat
> >for it. Just more of the old PCTA double standard.
>
> Brian:
>
> What "changes to the rules" does FISTS advocate? From the time
> I first joined FISTS, the concept that FISTS is a "non-political"
> organization has been driven home many times. The only thing FISTS
> "advocates" is the continued use of the Morse/CW mode on-the-air,
> by providing operating events and awards programs geared exclusively
> to the CW mode. They "advocate" absolutely nothing as far as political
> action to influence the FCC to change the amateur radio service rules
> and regulations with regard to code testing, although they do support
> the notion of individual members taking their own initiative to do so.
> You are not demonstrating a very thorough knowledge of how the
> FISTS organization operates.

Briabn has yet to demonstrate a thorough knowledge of anything.

1723. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:36:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9ligo$37p$2@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 40942

CJ wrote:
>
> I looked at my license renewal/approval etc, and I have had my
> Tech license since 1989 (then renewed in 1992 with a new address)
> and my license had said TECH PLUS.
>
> NOW it says PREV license class TECH PLUS, and new license class TECH
>
> how will this differentiate me from other TECHS w/o Tech plus privlidges?
> DO I still have TECH plus privledges? I had to take 5wpm code back in 1989
> to get my license.
>
> HOW do I prove this.. cj

Keep your old license(s) for proof.

1724. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:38:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418003859.09449.00004292@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 40943

>Subject: Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 04/18/02 00:07 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020418000733.13688.00000740@mb-da.aol.com>

>
>In article <ubn6qli88bu52a@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
><vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
>>Passed the General Written tonight using primarily the
>>QRZ site to prepare, due to lack of time.
>
>Congratulations, Val!

Dittos on the congrats, Val. My XYL did the same thing as a "surprise"
when we went to Huntsville last August. (W5AMY)

NOW....That 5WPM thing! I promised her I'd buy me....I mean HER...a new
2M rig and buy a steak dinner if she'd do it in 60 days. No go, so far...

>How's the code practice coming? Lots of free software out there that will run
>on your PC.

Sure wish I'd saved the 33 1/3 RPM album I used for practice. My dad
taught me code but this thing was great for practice. I could play it for her
on a hand-cranked player and drive you-know-who NUTS withe the "old technology"
stuff!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1725. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 04:53:45 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a9m7mh310p6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40947

Jeesh.... now you are gonna have me do a whole series of tapes!!!!! :) :) :) I agree about the grounding issue, as that could apply to many different aspects of a non-hams life. Especially when dealing with RFI from their computers, home stereo's etc....

I will be "polling the masses" both here and elsewhere as to their suggestions of what should be covered when I get closer to the time to make these videos. At least that way, if I forget something, I should have most all of the bases covered.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

>
> Man, that sounds like a blast. You know, it may be a little controversial,
> but you could even do a "show" with interviews of hams who stormspotting,
> DXpeditions, build gear, etc. How 'bout one called "Hamming ISN'T all
> Radio." Why? Because there's topics that some (LOL) hams know a lot about,
> like grounding for example. A show on grounding could interest nearly
> anyone, and could end up getting them interested in ham radio...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1726. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 05:05:08 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a9m7mi410p6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 40946

Don't get me wrong..... I can cuss with the best of them.... After a particularly bad medical run I went on, where the only survivor in the victims car was a young boy, (parents didnt make it) that was hit by a drunk driver, I and many others vented back at the station, as to the uselessnes of these deaths.

I was mainly getting to the point of just because we *can* say, does that mean we should say it over the air? Most the hams here seem to be more along the line of anal-rentive introverts being in a town with as many P.h.D.'s we have here thanks to Dow. There are some exceptions to this though.... me! Who else would be crazy enough to run in a perfectly good burning building?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

>
> Yep, I think so. I think getting hung up on language is secondary to some
> of the real crap that goes on over the air, and we've had lots of fun on
our
> own repeater...when we "forget" where we are.
>
> At any rate, you wouldn't want to be at one of our dinners, then, because
we
> let loose in person... ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1727. Re: From the Ham X-files.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 07:03:17 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <Vcuv8.4754$xx3.2892440778@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 40944

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:u5rv8.14972$3z3.1417143@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote
>
> >
> > I'm hoping that someone can provide some helpful insight.
> >
>
> Go the the nearest Home Depot hardware outlet and obtain a large metal
> funnel. Wear it over your head to filter out the offending signals. Use
> grade 0000 steel wool for padding around any openings.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
Ahhhh Hans, excellent concept, but unfortunately a faraday cage type
"helmet" would be limited by the size of the openings in it. Although tissue
offers resistance, RF will travel through it. At 224 MHz, a faraday cage
would be functional providing the largest aperature, or physical opening, in
it was approx 8cm or less, so I suppose a funnel could offer relief as long
as it was a conducting material. These particular devices however are more
difficult to contend with because each seperate device is individually
addressable, and this allows device stimulus parameters, as well as
addressing to be transmitted to an implanted unit elswhere (say, in the
foot) and the data can then be "daisy chained" via RF or magnetic coupling
and "relay", through the tissue, to other devices and then to the correct
device address. This would circumvent the effects of a "helmet". Now an
entire "tent size" faraday cage could be considered.... LARS

1728. Re: Dear ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 07:36:46 UTC
From: Wolfie <wolf@redridinghood.com>
Message-ID: <ubsv11ji5nhmf4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 40945
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dear Mr. Voobmer,
I don't suppose it has occured to you that many ham operators go to that
cb newsgroup because..they still own citizen band transceivers and enjoy it.
Further, most everyone (with the exception of you of course..) knowing
this bit of trivia; these same ham operators may be interested in this
equipment.
Just as many in radio-phono newsgroup do not have ham license but are
interested in ham receivers.
In short Mr. Voobner.....get a life..

"Aaron H. Voobner" <voobner@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:fbc7a2.0204161210.adffcd1@posting.google.com...
> Dear ARRL,
>
> I don't know if this fellow (see below) is a member of your
> organization or not, but he is certainly making a nuisance of himself
> in the rec.radio.cb newsgroup by continually advertising his "10 meter
> amps" to CBers.
>
> I thought hams were supposed to police themselves? If so, someone
> should take this disgrace to amateur radio aside and let him know what
> harm he's doing to the citizens band.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Aaron H. Voobner
>
> ==
> Subject: HF AMPLIFIERS
> From: NI4L ni4l@charter.net
> Date: Tue, Apr 16, 2002 6:34 PM
> Message-id: <3CBC6E9A.7199795C@charter.net>
>
> FS TRANSEL NITRO 300A 10 meter amp. looks and works great.
> its pretty heavy. 250.00 + shipping
>
> FOR SALE PALOMAR 300A AMP
> Works good, Looks good, 10-40 meters, seprate power supply.
> 250.00 + shipping.
> have pics of amps
>
> --
>

> NI4L CUSTOM RESONANT DIPOLE
> LEGAL LIMIT ++ CUSTOM MADE CENTER FED DIPOLE
> Made with the same components used by our military forces today
> Custom made to YOUR FREQUENCY of operation
> Let me take the hassle out of making a RESONANT DIPOLE for you.
> Click here for more info... http://www.angelfire.com/nb/ni4l/
> ==========

1729. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 12:07:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418080717.19000.00000953@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40949

In article <3cbcdaf8$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020415231243.20665.00000606@mb-mq.aol.com...
>> In article <3cbb65ba_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
>> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>>
>> >I can absolutely assure you that there are no smooth operations here
>during
>> >our several hours of rush.
>> >
>> >>
>> >> Kim, you have chosen to live a long way from where you work, in a city
>> >with
>> >> inadequate roads and all-but-nonexistent transit. Your choice has
>pretty
>> >> much guaranteed you a long, frustrating, energy-inefficient,
>air-polluting
>> >> commute. Perhaps it bothers you that other hams in other places (like
>> >Larry)
>> >> have made different choices and don't have to got through that sort of
>> >commute
>> >> every working day.
>> >>
>> >> In short, jealousy.
>>
>> Jim:
>>
>> If that's the case, let Kim be jealous of this: My "commute" to work
>> is 3.5 miles one way, usually takes from 10 - 12 minutes, and I have
>> free, dedicated parking. I fill the gas tank on my '01 Toyota Corolla LE
>> every three weeks, and it usually takes 9 gallons. This includes my
>> weekly commuting and all other incidental driving during days off, etc.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Let me assure you that Jim is quite wrong.

I may be mistaken, but not wrong.

>I was raised in the country and
>am country through and through.

Which means what, exactly?

Definitions of "country" vary all over the place. To some people it's clothes, to others it's furnishings, to still others it's driving a pickup truck as a commute vehicle or an SUV that spends 99% of its existence on pavement. Etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. Let's not even go into the oxymoron of "country music".

You choose to work in the big city and have a long commute.

>As development encroaches upon this area,
>my husband and I have even toyed with the idea of moving about 20-25 miles
>further east.

Burn more imported oil commuting and pollute the air more.
>
>Nope, it's ideal to drive from the heart of downtown Dallas to the cattle in
>the country and I wouldn't trade it for the world. Traffic jams are my
>haven in the morning and evenings...they don't bother me at all.

Ah - now I understand. You like sitting in traffic, and don't want hams use of radio to reduce that. Thus the "chiding" "teasing" and "busting".

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
>

1730. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 12:07:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418080718.19000.00000954@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40950

In article <Lmpv8.4179$fY1.75417902@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0204171043.6259a073@posting.google.com...
>> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
>news:<TR2v8.2029$7d4.322998386@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>...
>> > I knew I read this on the FISTS site. Brian
>> > ----------
>> >
>> > http://www.fists.org/declare.html
>> > The North American contingent of FISTS, the International Morse
>Preservation
>> > Society, in formal balloting of its membership approved the following
>> > declaration of purpose and policy by a 95 to 5 percent margin. FISTS is
>the
>> > first grass-roots organization worldwide to formally support, and call
>for,
>> > a restoring of exam standards of any kind.
>>
>> Tell the rest of the story, then, and the context.
>>
>> The issue was the use if multiple choice code tests. And the date was
>1992,
>> when FISTS had less than 1000 members, about 350 of them in the USA.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Is FISTS soley interested in promoting the use of Morse/CW,

Yes. The declaration you quoted is a recommendation that is a decade old. The elimination of multiple-choice code tests came about long after that recommendation was made. Many hams supported the end of multiple-choice code tests.

>or is it also
>interested in the regulating of Amateur Radio?

There is NO regulatory policy directly promoted by FISTS. It is not a political organization.

Did FISTS file proposals or coments with the FCC? No. Ex-parte presentations? Nope. Does FISTS membership require support of code testing? No, and it never has.

The purpose of FISTS is to promote the USE of Morse code, and its preservation.

Testing is a whole other issue.

And code testing is a nonissue in the USA and most other countries today. FCC and many other regulatory agencies have reduced the test to the bare minimum that meets the treaty. FCC has made it clear that the treaty is the one and only reason the 5 wpm code test exists at all. Any reasonable reading of the R&O for the recent restructuring indicates that the FCC will end code testing as soon as treaty provisions allow it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1731. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 12:07:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418080719.19000.00000956@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 40948

In article <e66d27d2.0204171821.1e01896c@posting.google.com>,
ceejaay1@yahoo.com (CJ) writes:

>I looked at my license renewal/approval etc, and I have had my
>Tech license since 1989 (then renewed in 1992 with a new address)
>and my license had said TECH PLUS.

Yup.
>
>NOW it says PREV license class TECH PLUS, and new license class TECH

FCC has been doing that since April 15, 2002. All Tech Pluses who renew get
licenses that say Tech. Eventually there will be no more Tech Pluses.
>
>how will this differentiate me from other TECHS w/o Tech plus privlidges?

You have to retain documents that say you have passed the code test. Your old
license that says Tech Plus is one proof, and your current license that says
"previous class Tech Plus" is another proof.

>DO I still have TECH plus privledges?

YES.

For the long term, your best bet is to upgrade to General or Extra. All you
need to do for General is to pass a 35 question multiple-choice written test at
a VE session. Sample tests are available at many sites.

http://www.qrz.com

has online sample tests.

Good luck!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1732. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 12:07:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418080719.19000.00000955@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 41001

In article <3CBE0FAF.30C09829@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Depending on your personality, it could have been a big help to you too.
>It might be nice to have the chance to warm up some.

I don't see how, Mike. It was presented as the real 20 wpm test. The way they
gave tests in those days was straightforward: No warmups, no second tries, no
going back after the code stopped and correcting your copy. You got the
straight 5 minutes and that was it.

73 de Jim, N2EY-
>
>N2EY wrote:
>
>> However, I would not put it past ol' Joe Squelch to do something like
>> that just so there'd be no doubt that a kid with an Extra knew his/her
>> stuff cold.
>

1733. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 13:02:29 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ubtfssnfc4bt39@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41002

N2EY wrote, about my passing the written test for General:

>Congratulations, Val!

Thanks! I promised my ham neighbor, who has been Elmering
me from time to time, that I would take a test a month until I was
out of tests to take! I was not able to fully prepare for the Gen-
eral test but did better than I thought I would. Looking at this
Extra book, well, that's going to be a bit more of a challenge for
me to do in 30 days!

>How's the code practice coming? Lots of free software out
>there that will run on your PC.

Yes, I have some of that and have been learning the alpahbet.
But the real goal was to make these keyers and do CW on 2m
with the radio actually being keyed by the switch. That is, we
could use the code-practice thingees and just open the mike
but, hey, actually keying the H/T would be so much more
like, er, COOL! Also, we could make these available through
the club to other new Technicians, encouraging them to get on
the air with us, on 2m, with CW! It's a simple circuit and the
whole thing costs about $10.00 but it's been a long time since
I've done this stuff . . . and I've yet to get one to work right. But,
it won't be long providing my soldering technique improves!

Val
KC0MUB

1734. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 13:17:03 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ubtgo6pjglq8b5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41003

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote

> Dittos on the congrats, Val.

Thanks!

>My XYL did the same thing as a "surprise"
>when we went to Huntsville last August. (W5AMY)

Congratulations to both her and you! My wife
could probably not be coached in this direction!

>NOW....That 5WPM thing! I promised her I'd buy
>me....I mean HER...a new 2M rig and buy a steak
>dinner if she'd do it in 60 days. No go, so far...

Gotta up the ante, I bet! Maybe TWO dinners!

>Sure wish I'd saved the 33 1/3 RPM album I used
>for practice. My dad taught me code but this thing
>was great for practice. I could play it for her on a
>hand-cranked player and drive you-know-who NUTS
>with the "old technology" stuff!

Hey, I've got LOTS of Black Vinyl here, and a TT that
will spin those 33s! Hm!

Val

1735. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 13:30:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9mhuqaod1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41004

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020418000731.13688.00000737@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <a9eo70$82i$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020415080705.19000.00000862@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >> In article <3cba4ba3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> (K3LT wrote):
> >> >> As usual, you are totally incorrect. Neither example is even
remotely
> >> >> "gray." If a licensed amateur is employed at a Domino's Pizza,
answers
> >> >> the phone, and it's a ham radio friend of his on the autopatch
ordering
> >> >> a pizza, then the only relationship that exists is the normal
merchant/
> >> >> customer relationship.
> >> >
> >> >How could it be proven that the ham who works at the pizza shop, and
his
> >> >buddy making the calls, is not doing so to "advertise" the pizza shop,
> >> >Larry?
> >>
> >> Simple. If the individuals involved do not make a point of mentioning
> >> the name or location of the pizza shop any more than necessary,
> >> they are not advertising.
> >
> >But even the FCC didn't place such a narrow restriction
> >on the pizza order scenario. Clearly when the pizza
> >shop answers the phone, they will likly state something
> >akin to: Hello, Joey's Pizza Shop, how can I help you?
>
> That's what I mean by "any more than necessary". If the autopatchers
> keep mentioning the name of the shop, how good the pizza is, etc., it
> could reach a point where they are doing a pizza shop commercial
> rather than actually ordering a pizza.

Agreed, but since most other hams would agree
that the user was abusing the autopatch by tying it up
for such an extended time for no reason...the liklihood of

the advertising scenario ever happening isn't too
high at all.

> >Frankly, Kim's personal interpretation of what the
> >prohibition on using ham radio for pecuniary interests
> >means has been taken to ridiculous extremes.
>
> Agreed 100%.
>
> > What
> >seems totally amazing is that Kim even ignores the
> >FCC rulings that have already addressed several of
> >the specific scenarios she claims are violations.
>
> Seems to me that Kim wants to whittle away at amateur radio
> until it is destroyed. Kim thinks it's OK to cuss on the air and
> make fun of other hams having legal conversations, but it's
> not OK in her book to discuss the weather or the traffic or
> order a pizza. Even though the FCC has repeatedly said
> exactly the opposite.
>
> It's not code tests or lack thereof that will drive amateur radio to
> extinction. It's addytoods like Kim's.

I'm not convinced that Kim wants an end to ham radio.
I'd rather believe it is just a lack of clear thinking as
to the laglities of the rules and their actual application...
especially where there is clear FCC direction in some cases
or a long history of accepted practice (i.e. the FCC hasn't seen
fit to say something's wrong) for some of the things that Kim
wants us to believe is/are illegal.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1736. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 13:40:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9mihbatb1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41005

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020418000732.13688.00000738@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <20020415231243.20665.00000606@mb-mq.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
....
> >If that's the case, let Kim be jealous of this: My "commute" to work
> >is 3.5 miles one way, usually takes from 10 - 12 minutes, and I have
> >free, dedicated parking. I fill the gas tank on my '01 Toyota Corolla LE
> >every three weeks, and it usually takes 9 gallons. This includes my
> >weekly commuting and all other incidental driving during days off, etc.
>
> COOL!
>
> But ya gotta beat this:
>
> My commute to work is about 1.5 miles one way - so close that I can go
home for
> lunch on some days. Free, safe dedicated parking a few steps from the
office
> door.
>
> And most days I carpool with two beautiful young women who are very
> appreciative of my driving skills.
>
> The only thing I can't match is your gas mileage. The Odyssey uses a bit
more
> fuel than a Corolla.

I can't beat that every day, BUT with the
advent of higher speed modems and extensive
conference calling capabilities....I can usually
telecommute one or two days a week from my
home which is a 0 mileage commute. I spent
three hours yesterday enjoying the incredible 90
degree afternoon weather on my deck while
on a conference call and logged into my
corporate internet system. Days like that don't
happen much in April in NJ.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1737. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 13:48:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9mj0h$1vg$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41006

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9li2i$1jr$2@208.206.142.75...
>
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> > > You guys don't consider a board member/Vice
> > > President and another BOD
> > > member, a division director, as "HQ folks"? I sure do.
> > > I didn't say staff member.
> >
> > I served two terms as Dakota Division vice director.
> > I always considered
> > myself a field representative, not an HQ guy.
>
> Probably right but unless I have been badly misinformed, the BOD makes
> the policy decisions (though at whose behest is often open to question).
> If it's not done at HQ it sure is done under the HQ umbrella.

I agree.
My understanding is that ALL policy decisions are via the
elected directors. HQ may suggest a policy change, but the BOD
still must approve. That's very similar to many organizations.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1738. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 13:59:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9mjlpmlk1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41007

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ubtfssnfc4bt39@corp.supernews.com...
>
> N2EY wrote, about my passing the written test for General:
> >Congratulations, Val!
>
> Thanks! I promised my ham neighbor, who has been Elmering
> me from time to time, that I would take a test a month until I was
> out of tests to take! I was not able to fully prepare for the Gen-
> eral test but did better than I thought I would.

The only thing that counts is that you passed. You
get no bonus for passing with a higher score than any other
person that passed.

> Looking at this
> Extra book, well, that's going to be a bit more of a challenge for
> me to do in 30 days!

You mentioned the QRZ site. That is an excellent self
testing process. The great thing about QRZ.com is
that you can grab a few minutes and run through a
test anytime. I would do two or three tests each
day at lunch, one or two during the day as a break, etc.
A good deal of the pre 4/2000 test was pure memorization
about space communication rules, VE rules, etc.

Congrats on the General theory. My suggestion is to do the
code next. The CSCE for the General written is only good for 365
days. That's plenty of time, but others have lost credits by
not actually getting the license within the time frame.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1739. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 14:06:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBED2EF.9AB1F95@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41008

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > I bet lots more of them note that you often don't say what you mean.
>
> Ah. So you read my posts and automatically know that I don't mean what
> I'm saying.

The problem is, Dick, that you deny meaning what you say. If you don't
mean what you say then don't say it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1740. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 14:07:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBED32C.C9BF6CE0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41009

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Briabn has yet to demonstrate a thorough knowledge of anything.

Who is Briabn?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1741. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 14:10:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9mkbs$b23$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41010

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020418080719.19000.00000956@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <e66d27d2.0204171821.1e01896c@posting.google.com>,
> ceejaay1@yahoo.com (CJ) writes:
>
> >I looked at my license renewal/approval etc, and I have had my
> >Tech license since 1989 (then renewed in 1992 with a new address)
> >and my license had said TECH PLUS.
>
> Yup.
> >
> >NOW it says PREV license class TECH PLUS, and new license class TECH
>
> FCC has been doing that since April 15, 2002. All Tech Pluses who renew
get
> licenses that say Tech. Eventually there will be no more Tech Pluses.

Didn't you mean to say: "since April 15, 2000"

> >how will this differentiate me from other TECHS w/o Tech plus privlidges?
>
> You have to retain documents that say you have passed the code test. Your
old
> license that says Tech Plus is one proof, and your current license that
says
> "previous class Tech Plus" is another proof.
>
> >DO I still have TECH plus privledges?
>
> YES.
>
> For the long term, your best bet is to upgrade to General or Extra. All
you
> need to do for General is to pass a 35 question multiple-choice written
test at
> a VE session. Sample tests are available at many sites.
>
> http://www.qrz.com
>
> has online sample tests.

I strongly recommend going the upgrade route also. As Jim N2EY
suggests, the qrz.com web site is a great place to self test
yourself. Do a couple of tests a day at lunch and again in the
evening and you'll be up to speed passing the online tests

in the 90% or better range in a few weeks.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1742. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 14:49:46 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <8mhtbuolsc54cc7p4rob6uall5fgd5ib3j@4ax.com>
Source record: 41011

On Wed, 17 Apr 2002 18:52:26 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>> >Kim W5TIT
>> >
>>
>> Well, in 1997 I bought a Swan 350 for $165. In 1998 I sold it for
>> $200 and bought a Kenwood TS-520. After buying an external VFO-520
>> for $75, I turned around and sold THAT combination for $300 and bought
>> myself an IC-720A. So actually, yes... we CAN sell our equipment at
>> a profit - provided we bought it for a bargain to begin with...
>>
>>
>>
>> Raymond Sirois AB2HR

>
>Good grief, I need you to negotiate a few deals for me...LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

heh heh heh.... Yeah, I did pretty good with it... Guess it's a
matter of being in the right place at the right time - AND buying a
radio that you won't mind operating until the right deal happens to
come along... I'm working my way up to a TS-2000. Eventually...

73!

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1743. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 14:49:46 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <3khtbuo67bm6uf8licn40g6uvphr0t0lep@4ax.com>
Source record: 41012

On 13 Apr 2002 03:11:03 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Bob:
>
>When it's done on a wide-area coverage repeater, occurs on a daily
>basis, and goes on for hours on end, it definitely becomes a "gray" area --
>from a standpoint of "good amateur practice." I have monitored such
>long-winded health-related diatribes among old-timers, who don't know
>the difference between a repeater and their nightly 75-meter roundtable,
>while other stations have tried desperately to break-in for a chance to
>make a call of a more urgent nature. The Geezer Factor in ham radio
>is something that must be reckoned with, particularly in larger urban
>areas with a dense population of hams.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Or simply any geographic area with a larger population of dense
hams...
Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1744. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 15:09:07 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ubtnaj7kucr963@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41013

Bill Sohl wrote:

>The only thing that counts is that you passed. You
>get no bonus for passing with a higher score than
>any other person that passed.

This is, of course, true, but I really did want to do
WELL on that test. It's just me.

>You mentioned the QRZ site. That is an excellent self
>testing process. The great thing about QRZ.com is
>that you can grab a few minutes and run through a
>test anytime.

Yes, it's fantastic. I probalby took that Technician
test 40 or even 50 times over several weeks. When
I was going through it in just four or five minutes, and
getting 100 nearly every time, well, I knew I was ready.

>I would do two or three tests each day at lunch, one
>or two during the day as a break, etc.

What seems to work for me is to take ten in a row,
in the evening, and note mistakes. I have the book
with me and refer to it as I go along. It's slow at first
but all the sudden things start really moving and you
remember the material. The book plus the computer
seems very powerful to me. And yes, you can "look
in" at any time and take a text on that site. Very nice.

>A good deal of the pre 4/2000 test was pure mem-
>orization about space communication rules, VE rules,
>etc.

I'm sure that was true. It's the modern world and
a certain amount of memorization HAS to be done!
Schools today are NOT really teaching kids to simply
KNOW their multiplication tables, COLD, or so it
seems. They're teaching "concepts" about math, to
NINE-YEAR-OLDS, or so it seems. I told my little
girl, who is nine, that she WILL know her multiplication
tables, by the end of fourth grade, up to 15X15, COLD,
or we will know the reason why! And she's just about
got it. Her teacher says she's using "a short cut" but
has not otherwise complained! Can you IMAGINE!

> Congrats on the General theory.

Thanks!

>My suggestion is to do the code next. The CSCE for
>the General written is only good for 365 days. That's
>plenty of time, but others have lost credits by not actually
>getting the license within the time frame.

My goal is to take both the Extra written and the code
next month. I would have already done the code but
for this keyer, which was going to allow me to "train"
with another new Technician in what I am viewing as a
pilot program for our local club. I'd like to be able to
offer, free, a keyer to each new Technician, and then
describe what amounts to a 2m CW "net" that we could
put up from time to time, for training and what-not.
The plan was to use myself as a guinea pig BUT the
keyer has to WORK first! So, I'm behind.

Val
KC0MUB

1745. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 15:22:08 UTC
From: Black Silver <Black_Silver@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <AwBv8.18195$L1.1442975@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41014

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> I strongly recommend going the upgrade route also. As Jim N2EY
> suggests, the qrz.com web site is a great place to self test
> yourself. Do a couple of tests a day at lunch and again in the
> evening and you'll be up to speed passing the online tests
> in the 90% or better range in a few weeks.
>

Ah, Yes! The old "keep mindlessly taking the test until you memorize it"
trick!

Spoken like a true loser.

Here's a concept. Study and learn the MATERIAL. Naw, that would be much
too hard!

Loser!

73, Blackie

1746. Today is World Amateur Radio Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 15:29:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204180729.6c24b39b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41015

See:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/04/17/102/?nc=1

73 de Jim, N2EY

1747. Re: Today is World Amateur Radio Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 15:38:22 UTC
From: Black Silver <Black_Silver@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <OLBv8.18234$L1.1444774@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41016

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

The World Amateur Radio Day Award--issued by PZK (Polish Amateur Radio Union) and QTC magazine--is available for making at least 50 contacts on HF or 10 QSOs on VHF-UHF on April 18, 2002 (UTC). Applicants send name, call sign, address, a list of QSOs and $3 (5 IRCs or 5 Euro) before May 31, 2002, to Redakcja MK QTC, ul. Wielmo|y 5b, 82-337 Suchacz-Zamek, POLAND. The award is also available to SWLs.

1748. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 16:11:40 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.ORG>
Message-ID: <0fCv8.18296$L1.1448820@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41017

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9li2i$1jr$2@208.206.142.75...
>
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > You guys don't consider a board member/Vice President and another BOD
> > > member, a division director, as "HQ folks"? I sure do. I didn't say
> > > staff member.
> > >
> >
> > I served two terms as Dakota Division vice director. I always
considered
> > myself a field representative, not an HQ guy.
> >

>
> Probably right but unless I have been badly misinformed, the BOD makes
> the policy decisions (though at whose behest is often open to question).
> If it's not done at HQ it sure is done under the HQ umbrella.
>

The hired help at HQ may suggest policies, new programs, changes in old
policies or programs, etc., but no policy decisions are made at HQ or under
the umbrella of HQ. The decision making, including approval/disapproval of
HQ suggestions, is made by the field representatives (Division Directors).
No one at HQ sets ARRL policy.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1749. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 17:25:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBF019D.7DBD99A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41018

Black Silver wrote:
> Spoken like a true loser.
> Here's a concept. Study and learn the MATERIAL.

The material requires memorization. How can you know the band edges
without memorizing them? How can you learn Morse code characters
without memorizing them? Do you develop Morse code from first
principles every time you use it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1750. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 17:55:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204180955.1ca958f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41019

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a9mkbs$b23$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020418080719.19000.00000956@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > In article <e66d27d2.0204171821.1e01896c@posting.google.com>,
> > ceejaay1@yahoo.com (CJ) writes:
> >
> > >I looked at my license renewal/approval etc, and I have had my
> > >Tech license since 1989 (then renewed in 1992 with a new address)
> > >and my license had said TECH PLUS.
> >
> > Yup.
> > >
> > >NOW it says PREV license class TECH PLUS, and new license class TECH
> >
> > FCC has been doing that since April 15, 2002. All Tech Pluses who renew
> get
> > licenses that say Tech. Eventually there will be no more Tech Pluses.
>
> Didn't you mean to say: "since April 15, 2000"

DOH!!!

Yep - tnx Bill. April 15, 2000.

Historical tidbit: When the FCC proposed removing the code test from
the Technician class (1990), part of their idea was that those Techs
who had passed 5 wpm would simply keep documents showing that
information. IOW there would have not been a formal Tech Plus license
class at all. But the protest against it was so unanimous that FCC
added a new class of license. Yet as late as mid-1994 some pre-1991
Techs were getting their licenses renewed as Technician, not Tech
Plus.

Now we have the system FCC wanted more than a decade ago. Between
renewals and upgrades, Tech Plus will simply disappear in a few years
even if no other changes occur.
> > For the long term, your best bet is to upgrade to General or Extra. All
> you
> > need to do for General is to pass a 35 question multiple-choice written
> test at
> > a VE session. Sample tests are available at many sites.
> >
> > http://www.qrz.com
> >

> > has online sample tests.
>
> I strongly recommend going the upgrade route also. As Jim N2EY
> suggests, the qrz.com web site is a great place to self test
> yourself. Do a couple of tests a day at lunch and again in the
> evening and you'll be up to speed passing the online tests
> in the 90% or better range in a few weeks.

Same goes for the Extra written, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1751. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 19:00:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204181100.53b64a38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41020

"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:<3cbe0acc_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020417065433.09489.00000574@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > In article <3cbc1213_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> > >news:bhsnbu0jcp7n8bsvkim9t4dil6kicjfoac@4ax.com...
> > >> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:28:30 -0500, "Kim"
> > >> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
> > >>
> > >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >> >news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > >> >> In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> > >> >> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
> >
> > >Oh, not at all am I complaining. I really don't care what "kind of
> > >language" people use on the air. I have a tuning knob and an on/off
> button.
> >
> > Then why don't you practice what you preach, Kim?
> >
> > Your radio sets have a tuning knob and a power switch. But when someone
> > shows up on the repeater you frequent and talks about traffic conditions,
> you
> > "chide", "tease" "make fun of them" "bust their ....", etc. rather than
> tuning
> > away
> > or turning off. You've told us you do these things, so your saying "do as
> I
> > say, not as I do".
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> Uh, Jim...in a word: get over it.

Get over what, Kim?

> I *choose* to have fun with folks who
> think all there is to talk about is traffic, or think all QSOs have to be
> made up of traffic and weather.

You've told us that you "have fun" on the air by chiding, teasing,
busting on and making fun of other hams who *choose* to talk about

traffic, weather, etc.
Even though such conversations are perfectly legal. What if your "fun"
isn't "fun" for those on the receiving end?

What is wrong with live and let live?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1752. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 19:30:23 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CBF1ED0.C94CD9DD@psu.edu>
Source record: 41022

Performance anxiety is what I'm thinking about, Jim.

Many people will tend to start out poorly, then gather momentum and poise as they go. This happens a lot with public speaking. I think it has a lot to do with why I flunked the code test the first time. I had traveled quite a way, had drank a good bit of coffee, and even though I tried to convince myself otherwise, when I took element 1, I freaked for a while. Didn't settle down until near the end of the test.

The second time around, 'twas a lot easier. But as I said, it depends on your personality.

- Mike KB3EIA

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CBE0FAF.30C09829@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >Depending on your personality, it could have been a big help to you too.
> >It might be nice to have the chance to warm up some.
>
> I don't see how, Mike. It was presented as the real 20 wpm test. The way they
> gave tests in those days was straightforward: No warmups, no second tries, no
> going back after the code stopped and correcting your copy. You got the
> straight 5 minutes and that was it.

1753. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 19:34:29 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CBF1FC6.AE86C082@psu.edu>
Source record: 41021

Briabn is the Nordic God of hemmoroids.

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Briabn has yet to demonstrate a thorough knowledge of anything.
>
> Who is Briabn?

1754. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 19:39:41 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204181939030.21694-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41023

On 17 Apr 2002, CJ wrote:
>I looked at my license renewal/approval etc, and I have had my
>Tech license since 1989 (then renewed in 1992 with a new address)
>and my license had said TECH PLUS.
>
>NOW it says PREV license class TECH PLUS, and new license class TECH
>
>how will this differentiate me from other TECHS w/o Tech plus privlidges?
>DO I still have TECH plus privledges? I had to take 5wpm code back in 1989
>to get my license.
>
>HOW do I prove this.. cj

You have to keep your expired license as proof.

This problem initiated one of the technical corrections that was denied.

You still have the code privilege.

1755. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 20:18:35 UTC
From: hikezilla@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <662db5ea.0204181218.6a71c665@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41024

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a9mjlpmlk1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...

> You mentioned the QRZ site. That is an excellent self
> testing process. The great thing about QRZ.com is
> that you can grab a few minutes and run through a
> test anytime. I would do two or three tests each
> day at lunch, one or two during the day as a break, etc.
> A good deal of the pre 4/2000 test was pure memorization
> about space communication rules, VE rules, etc.

Check out http://www.aa9pw.com too, that's where I've been doing my
studying, that and the Gordon West audio tapes for Extra class. I
take my Extra on the 27th, and looks like I should be able to pass.

Then I'll be a top bander like the big boys!

73 de KB9BVN/QRP

1756. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 20:25:27 UTC
From: hikezilla@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <662db5ea.0204181225.4fd2b71b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41025

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<a8vllg$36d$1@208.207.71.173>...

> Going 'way back there, it would take a book. I don't have time to write
> it and you don't have time to read it.

So Dick...what you are saying is that you are full of hot air?

You pointed the finger, you made the accusations, now back it up or shut up.

73 de KB9BVN/QRP

1757. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 20:27:25 UTC
From: hikezilla@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <662db5ea.0204181227.33220ad6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41026

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<a91hmp$29v$0@208.206.142.90>...

> So it *has* to be a conspiricy if you know of internal ARRL
> malfeasances but don't wish to acknowledge it. Right. And if you don't
> know of any, that means you don't pay much attention.

You mean, the ARRL isn't PERFECT???

HOW LONG HAS THIS BEEN GOING ON???

Dick...hams like you force me to fund the ARRL more each and every
year. Thanks and keep up the good work.

1758. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 20:35:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204181235.5640156a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41027

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3CBCE2C4.E1AC1917@adelphia.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> You were definitely motivated to get your licenses the way you did.

Ya don't know the half of it.....
>
> I think we all had some defining moment that we decided this was
> something interesting to do.

For me it was as soon as I heard about ham radio.

But many kids and adults don't even know ham radio exists. Or if they
do know, their image of it is very inaccurate.

Consider the recent movie "Frequency" - according to that movie, ham
radio was something people did 30 years ago, not today (even though
there are more than twice as many US hams today).

Or the beginning of the film "Contact" - great opening, but the words
"amateur radio" or "ham radio" are never mentioned at all. And again,
there is no mention of ham radio as being something done today.

> Most of us wish we had started sooner. But
> I don't think we should be too hopeful of our displays at malls to
> attract kids to the hobby. I suspect the potential hams will find their
> way there whether we do that or not.

I think the main point of displays and literature should be to let
nonhams know what ham radio is and what we do. Those who are
interested will follow up. But if people don't even know ham radio
exists, or have a distorted image of it ("What's your handle?") the
ARS is not served well.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> > In article <3CBC799C.9E3491DD@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> > >We need to get kids to be Hams!
> > >
> > > I always thought the ARS was more of an adult thing. Kids can
> > >participate, and can make excellent hams, but most definitely, most kids
> > >are not cut out for this. I think that the kids who want to become hams
> > >seek the ARS out, not the other way around.
> >
> > Depends on what you mean by "kid"..
> >

> > I got my Novice at age 13, Tech and Advanced at age 14 and Extra at age 16.
> > Would
> > have done it earlier but for lack of information and resources. Amateur radio
> > led me
> > to a career and many wonderful friendships, accomplishments and experiences. It
> > has
> > always been a service for all ages, and should remain so. But kids will only
> > know about
> > it if we tell them.

1759. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 21:22:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9ndj0$5gj$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41028

"Black Silver" <Black_Silver@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:AwBv8.18195$L1.1442975@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> >
> > I strongly recommend going the upgrade route also. As Jim N2EY
> > suggests, the qrz.com web site is a great place to self test
> > yourself. Do a couple of tests a day at lunch and again in the
> > evening and you'll be up to speed passing the online tests
> > in the 90% or better range in a few weeks.
> >
>
> Ah, Yes! The old "keep mindlessly taking the test until you memorize it"
> trick!
>
> Spoken like a true loser.
>
> Here's a concept. Study and learn the MATERIAL. Naw, that would be much
> too hard!

Hey pal, an associate degree in electronics and 30+
years in industry. The only thing I needed was to
pass the test. When was the last time any ham had
to regurgitate the rules for establishing a space station,
VE credentials, testing procedures.
The rest of the test that did involve theory was a no brainer.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1760. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 21:37:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cbf3cbb_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41029

"CJ" <ceejaay1@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:e66d27d2.0204171821.1e01896c@posting.google.com...
> I looked at my license renewal/approval etc, and I have had my
> Tech license since 1989 (then renewed in 1992 with a new address)
> and my license had said TECH PLUS.
>
> NOW it says PREV license class TECH PLUS, and new license class TECH
>
> how will this differentiate me from other TECHS w/o Tech plus privlidges?
> DO I still have TECH plus privledges? I had to take 5wpm code back in 1989
> to get my license.
>
> HOW do I prove this.. cj

CJ,

All Tech+ are being renewed as Tech ... but the FCC knows that you
have credit for 5 wpm.

You still have your Tech+ privs.

I would keep a copy of your most recent Tech + license document, just
to be sure ... and you will need to produce it in the future if you go to
upgrade, in order to claim your lifetime credit for the 5 wpm Morse test.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
<mailto:wk3c@fast/net> (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
<mailto:wk3c-shack@fast.net> (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wk3c>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

1761. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 22:04:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418180442.06890.00004110@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41030

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>:) I agree about the grounding issue, as that could apply to many different
>aspects of a non-hams life. Especially when dealing with RFI from their
>computers, home stereo's etc....

If I could find someone to handle the video end of things, I do a pretty good
1-hour presentation on RFI. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1762. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 22:07:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418180719.06890.00004111@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41031

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> You guys don't consider a board member/Vice President and another BOD
>member, a division director, as "HQ folks"? I sure do

Even though they spend less than 1% of their lives at ARRL HQ?

In ARRL parlance, HQ folks means the paid staff at ARRL HQ. "Board" or "official family" means the unpaid ARRL Board of Director or other volunteer officers.

73.
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1763. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 22:10:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418181022.06890.00004113@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41032

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Probably right but unless I have been badly misinformed, the BOD makes
>the policy decisions (though at whose behest is often open to question).
>If it's not done at HQ it sure is done under the HQ umbrella.

Dick, it is the other way around; the HQ staff operate under the ARRL Board policy umbrella. I can only occasionally get away with telling the Board what to do. :-)

The ARRL Board meetings are not held at ARRL HQ, although a few of the smaller committee meetings may be. The Board usually meets twice a year, in cities of their choosing. In past years, most of the July Board meetings have been at a hotel facility in a hotel near Newington, perhaps as much as a 45-minute drive away. The January meetings are usually held someplace warmer.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1764. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-18 22:12:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418181208.06890.00004114@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41033

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Ah. So you read my posts and automatically know that I don't mean what
>I'm saying. Neat. How do you manage to divine just what it is that I
>mean?

My secret is that when I react to what you actually said, you start bellyaching
that you didn't say it. Gives it away every time.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1765. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 00:02:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418200235.20548.00002977@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 41034

From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
>>Ah. So you read my posts and automatically know that I don't mean what
>>I'm saying. Neat. How do you manage to divine just what it is that I
>>mean?

I thought about it some more, Dick, and I decided you are right. It is not possible to tell what you mean from what you say in your posts. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1766. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 00:05:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020418200516.20548.00002978@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 41035

Black Silver" <Black_Silver@earthlink.net> wrote:

> Ah, Yes! The old "keep mindlessly taking the test until you memorize it"
> trick!
>
> Spoken like a true loser.
>
> Here's a concept. Study and learn the MATERIAL. Naw, that would be much
> too hard!

That sounds a lot easier than trying t memorize all that stuff without understanding. Why would you want to try to convince aspiring hams that learning is the "hard" way?

Actually, I am one of those who passed his test with a combination of learning, memorizing and lucky guessing.

Do you think that I am a loser?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1767. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 00:45:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kMJv8.5219$PJ4.112653598@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41036

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CBF019D.7DBD99A3@IEEE.org...
> Black Silver wrote:
> > Spoken like a true loser.
> > Here's a concept. Study and learn the MATERIAL.
>
> The material requires memorization. How can you know the band edges
> without memorizing them?

You could always memorize all the other service's band edges, then operate
outside them.

How can you learn Morse code characters
> without memorizing them? Do you develop Morse code from first
> principles every time you use it?

You can't. The FCC doesn't provide the 1st principle to develop from. Yes,
yes, its an old argument. I suggest just making up your own code code like
the VEC did.

1768. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 00:46:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kNJv8.5220$e25.113337607@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41037

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020418200516.20548.00002978@mb-mn.aol.com...
> Black Silver" <Black_Silver@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
> > Ah, Yes! The old "keep mindlessly taking the test until you memorize
it"
> > trick!
> >
> > Spoken like a true loser.
> >
> > Here's a concept. Study and learn the MATERIAL. Naw, that would be
much
> > too hard!
>
> That sounds a lot easier than trying t memorize all that stuff without
> understanding. Why would you want to try to convince aspiring hams that
> learning is the "hard" way?
>
> Actually, I am one of those who passed his test with a combination of
learning,
> memorizing and lucky guessing.
>
> Do you think that I am a loser?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I think Tarnished Silver is a jerk.

1769. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 00:49:19 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.ORG>
Message-ID: <jQJv8.19511$L1.1528371@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41038

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> Do you think that I am a loser?
>

Did you use the old "keep mindlessly taking the test until you
memorize it" trick?

73, Blackie

1770. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 00:49:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <OQJv8.5225$L45.113428882@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41039

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204180955.1ca958f2@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a9mkbs$b23$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020418080719.19000.00000956@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > > In article <e66d27d2.0204171821.1e01896c@posting.google.com>,
> > > ceejaay1@yahoo.com (CJ) writes:
> > >
> > > >I looked at my license renewal/approval etc, and I have had my
> > > >Tech license since 1989 (then renewed in 1992 with a new address)
> > > >and my license had said TECH PLUS.
> > >
> > > Yup.
> > > >
> > > >NOW it says PREV license class TECH PLUS, and new license class TECH
> > >
> > > FCC has been doing that since April 15, 2002. All Tech Pluses who
renew
> > get
> > > licenses that say Tech. Eventually there will be no more Tech Pluses.
> >
> > Didn't you mean to say: "since April 15, 2000"
>
> DOH!!!
>
> Yep - tnx Bill. April 15, 2000.
>
> Historical tidbit: When the FCC proposed removing the code test from
> the Technician class (1990), part of their idea was that those Techs
> who had passed 5 wpm would simply keep documents showing that
> information. IOW there would have not been a formal Tech Plus license
> class at all. But the protest against it was so unanimous that FCC
> added a new class of license. Yet as late as mid-1994 some pre-1991
> Techs were getting their licenses renewed as Technician, not Tech
> Plus.

Welp, when I moved back to America in 92, my address change got me an extra
10 years, the license said Tech not Plus, and the rudeness started.

Looks like Blackeye carries on the tradition.

1771. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 00:53:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <nUJv8.5226$3a5.113626553@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41040

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020417224651.10628.00001928@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <Lmpv8.4179$fY1.75417902@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Is FISTS soley interested in promoting the use of Morse/CW, or is it also
> >interested in the regulating of Amateur Radio?
>
> Brian:
>
> The former, and definitely not the latter.

Then you score 20% on reading comprehension.

1772. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:01:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <j%Jv8.5229$wa5.113641707@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41041

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020418080718.19000.00000954@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <Lmpv8.4179$fY1.75417902@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:9f4bfe89.0204171043.6259a073@posting.google.com...
> >> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> >news:<TR2v8.2029$7d4.322998386@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> > I knew I read this on the FISTS site. Brian
> >> > ----------
> >> >
> >> > http://www.fists.org/declare.html
> >> > The North American contingent of FISTS, the International Morse
> >Preservation
> >> > Society, in formal balloting of its membership approved the following
> >> > declaration of purpose and policy by a 95 to 5 percent margin. FISTS
is
> >the
> >> > first grass-roots organization worldwide to formally support, and
call
> >for,
> >> > a restoring of exam standards of any kind.
> >>
> >> Tell the rest of the story, then, and the context.
> >>
> >> The issue was the use if multiple choice code tests. And the date was
> >1992,
> >> when FISTS had less than 1000 members, about 350 of them in the USA.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Is FISTS soley interested in promoting the use of Morse/CW,
>
> Yes. The declaration you quoted is a recommendation that is a decade old.
The
> elimination of multiple-choice code tests came about long after that
> recommendation was made. Many hams supported the end of multiple-choice
code
> tests.

That's not the point. The point is that FISTS supported the end of
multiple-choice code tests.

> >or is it also
> >interested in the regulating of Amateur Radio?
>
> There is NO regulatory policy directly promoted by FISTS. It is not a
political
> organization.

Wrong-O. It may be inactive as a political organization, but the history is
there.

> Did FISTS file proposals or coments with the FCC? No. Ex-parte
presentations?
> Nope. Does FISTS membership require support of code testing? No, and it
never
> has.
>
> The purpose of FISTS is to promote the USE of Morse code, and its
preservation.

And promoted the change in amateur license examinations.

> Testing is a whole other issue.
>
> And code testing is a nonissue in the USA and most other countries today.

Who declared that?

FCC
> and many other regulatory agencies have reduced the test to the bare
minimum
> that meets the treaty.

I could probably come up with something, such as a look-up table, and still
satisfy the treaty.

> FCC has made it clear that the treaty is the one and
> only reason the 5 wpm code test exists at all. Any reasonable reading of
the
> R&O for the recent restructuring indicates that the FCC will end code
testing
> as soon as treaty provisions allow it.

Meanwhile the ARRL VEC could jack up the letter elements to 22 wpm and the
intercharacter and interword spacing to something lower.................

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Brian

1773. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:01:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbf6f17_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41045

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9leba$i0o$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> Phil Kane posted a part 47 rule. It applies to any
> telling of what is heard. The reality, however, is that
> thousands of people (especially reporters, ambulance chasers,
> lawyers, tow truck operators, etc. listen, act and repeat
> what they hear all the time.)
>

Well, Bill, for goodness sake. The "debate" is not whether people break
rules or not. The debate was on the rule.

Kim W5TIT

1774. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:04:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <T2Kv8.5233$cZ4.113164411@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41042

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020417224652.10628.00001929@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <oppv8.4180$S%1.75586856@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >The point is that FISTS is not soley a morse/cw use society. FISTS
advocate
> >changes to the rules much as do other organizations that get a lot of
heat
> >for it. Just more of the old PCTA double standard.
>
> Brian:
>
> What "changes to the rules" does FISTS advocate? From the time
> I first joined FISTS, the concept that FISTS is a "non-political"
> organization has been driven home many times. The only thing FISTS
> "advocates" is the continued use of the Morse/CW mode on-the-air,
> by providing operating events and awards programs geared exclusively
> to the CW mode. They "advocate" absolutely nothing as far as political
> action to influence the FCC to change the amateur radio service rules
> and regulations with regard to code testing, although they do support
> the notion of individual members taking their own initiative to do so.
> You are not demonstrating a very thorough knowledge of how the
> FISTS organization operates.

Then they need to remove the page advocating, in their own words, the
removal of multiple choice questions on the code exam, and erase my memory.
It appears that yours has been erased. Probably just selective memory.

1775. Re: FISTS supports Morse Exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:05:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <r3Kv8.5234$ah5.113868839@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41043

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a9lien$37p$1@208.206.142.75...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <oppv8.4180$S%1.75586856@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> > Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >
> > >The point is that FISTS is not soley a morse/cw use society. FISTS
advocate
> > >changes to the rules much as do other organizations that get a lot of
heat
> > >for it. Just more of the old PCTA double standard.
> >
> > Brian:
> >
> > What "changes to the rules" does FISTS advocate? From the time
> > I first joined FISTS, the concept that FISTS is a "non-political"
> > organization has been driven home many times. The only thing FISTS
> > "advocates" is the continued use of the Morse/CW mode on-the-air,
> > by providing operating events and awards programs geared exclusively
> > to the CW mode. They "advocate" absolutely nothing as far as political
> > action to influence the FCC to change the amateur radio service rules
> > and regulations with regard to code testing, although they do support
> > the notion of individual members taking their own initiative to do so.
> > You are not demonstrating a very thorough knowledge of how the
> > FISTS organization operates.
>
>
> Briabn has yet to demonstrate a thorough knowledge of anything.

I've got CB Dick figured out.

1776. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:07:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbf70a2$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41047

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CBE46CE.17CD1C8B@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020417065434.09489.00000575@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > > In article <20020416081740.01968.00003582@mb-df.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com
> > (W1RFI)
> > > writes:
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > > (Kim wrote:)
> > > >>>then I'll answer with: I don't
> > > >>> know.
> > > >
> > > (N2EY wrote:)
> > > >>OK, then. Simple question, simple answer.
> > > >
> > > >Well, it really isn't that simple.
> > > >
> > > >Kim, I am curious too... you said that the mode you used on 30 meters
was
> > > >neither CW nor digital. Then what mode was it?
> > >
> > > You're forgetting something, Ed. When Kim wrote that she "worked all
bands
> > > lots of times" (in the context of HF amateur bands"), her definition
of
> > "all
> > > bands" does not include 30 meters.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Jim, what a Dick you're becoming.
>
> Kim, what a Kim you've remained. Another of your statements blows up in
> your face and you blame those who call you on it.
>
> Dave K8MN

Maybe you can explain to me how it blew up in my face? Or, when I say I've travelled a lot, you'd expect me to meet your definition of "travel" and "a lot." Right? Just as Jim wants me to meet his definition of "all" in all bands. Like I said, my all is different from his all. Wonder why he didn't choose any of the Ghz stuff (I've never been there, either), and there's probably lots of other bands I've never been on.

You keep clinging to your semantics, you and Jim. It's your dislike of someone that determines your attitude...not the content of their material.

Kim W5TIT

1777. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:10:35 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <f8Kv8.5237$Cq5.114222320@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41044

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020417224653.10628.00001930@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <bypv8.4186$r_1.75518185@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> The Coast Guard called it a decision based on the cost involved
> >> in recruiting, training, and providing pay and benefits for code-
> >> trained radio operators. The ARS doesn't have that problem, unless
> >> they're going to start paying us to participate in a voluntary hobbyist
> >> activity.
> >
> >When they force an -amateur- to develop an unnecessary skill in a mode
that
> >all other services have previously paid for professionally and then
> >abandoned, I think its reasonable that they should compensate at at least
> >the GS-7 or 9 technician level.
> >
> >73, Brian
>
> Brian:
>
> Well, in that case, it's a good thing that hams are not "forced"
> to learn the Morse code! If they were, the FCC would have a
> greatly expanded payroll!

Yeh, no kidding. So when the other services abandoned code use, did the FCC
still require them to pass a Morse Code EXAM to get on HF?

> BTW -- would I be able to "double dip" and receive my GS-7/9
> payments in addition to my military retirement?

Yep, enlisted retired pay is so low that even that added to GS-7 pay is
pretty pathetic.

1778. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:11:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbf7170_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41049

Someone once privately changed my mind about you, Jim. They convinced me
that you weren't the jerk I thought you were. But you are...

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020418080717.19000.00000953@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3cbcdaf8$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20020415231243.20665.00000606@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >> In article <3cbb65ba_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
> >> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >I can absolutely assure you that there are no smooth operations here
> >during
> >> >our several hours of rush.
> >> >
> >>
> >> Kim, you have chosen to live a long way from where you work, in a
city
> >> >with
> >> inadequate roads and all-but-nonexistent transit. Your choice has
> >pretty
> >> much guaranteed you a long, frustrating, energy-inefficient,
> >air-polluting
> >> commute. Perhaps it bothers you that other hams in other places
(like
> >> >Larry)
> >> have made different choices and don't have to got through that sort
of
> >> >commute
> >> every working day.
> >>
> >> In short, jealousy.
> >>
> >> Jim:
> >>
> >> If that's the case, let Kim be jealous of this: My "commute" to work
> >> is 3.5 miles one way, usually takes from 10 - 12 minutes, and I have
> >> free, dedicated parking. I fill the gas tank on my '01 Toyota Corolla
LE
> >> every three weeks, and it usually takes 9 gallons. This includes my

> >> weekly commuting and all other incidental driving during days off, etc.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Let me assure you that Jim is quite wrong.
>
> I may be mistaken, but not wrong.
>
> >I was raised in the country and
> >am country through and through.
>
> Which means what, exactly?
>
> Definitions of "country" vary all over the place. To some people it's
clothes,
> to others it's furnishings, to still others it's driving a pickup truck as
a
> commute vehicle or an SUV that spends 99% of its existence on pavement.
> Etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. Let's not even go into the oxymoron of
"country
> music".
>
> You choose to work in the big city and have a long commute.
>
> >As development encroaches upon this area,
> >my husband and I have even toyed with the idea of moving about 20-25
miles
> >further east.
>
> Burn more imported oil commuting and pollute the air more.
> >
> >Nope, it's ideal to drive from the heart of downtown Dallas to the cattle
in
> >the country and I wouldn't trade it for the world. Traffic jams are my
> >haven in the morning and evenings...they don't bother me at all.
>
> Ah - now I understand. You like sitting in traffic, and don't want hams
use of
> radio to reduce that. Thus the "chiding" "teasing" and "busting".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

1779. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:15:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbf726c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41052

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020418000733.13688.00000740@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <ubn6qli88bu52a@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >Passed the General Written tonight using primarily the
> >QRZ site to prepare, due to lack of time.
>
> Congratulations, Val!
>

What? No definition of "passed?!"

> >
> >Hope to take
> >the code and Extra exam a month from now, after a lot
> >of CW practice with a home-made keyer that will work
> >with a 2m transceiver.
>
> GREAT!
>

How great?

>
> How's the code practice coming? Lots of free software out there that will
run
> on your PC.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Define "coming." That is a verb, meaning to move, right? Or at least a
word that implies motion toward something. How can code practice come or
have motion?

"Free?" "Lots?" Free in terms of money, jail, or politically free? Lots
in terms of tracts of land, or... Could you be more specific, please? "Out
there." Would that be out there where you are, or further than that?

Kim W5TIT

1780. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:16:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2eKv8.5242$az5.114560327@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41046

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.ORG> wrote in message
news:jQJv8.19511$L1.1528371@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Do you think that I am a loser?
> >
>
> Did you use the old "keep mindlessly taking the test until you
> memorize it" trick?
>
> 73, Blackie

Who'se Blackie?

1781. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:18:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbf7326_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41054

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020418180442.06890.00004110@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >:) I agree about the grounding issue, as that could apply to many
different
> >aspects of a non-hams life. Especially when dealing with RFI from their
> >computers, home stereo's etc....
>
> If I could find someone to handle the video end of things, I do a pretty
good
> 1-hour presentation on RFI. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ed!!! Now, *that* would be terrific. An ARRL person doing the
presentation! Yep, that would be really, really neat.

Ryan, wish we lived in the same area. I wonder if I could drag myself up
enough energy to undertake some of this around here. Hmmmmmm

Kim W5TIT

1782. Re: Promoting Amateur Radio -- Part One

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:21:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5iKv8.5243$6D5.114728361@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41048

"Phranqueopinion2" <phranqueopinion2@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020416091432.00480.00004041@mb-mj.aol.com...
> If you want to promote ham radio, try operating a kids day station at a
mall.
> Our club did that last year, we set up in the center of an outdoor mall,
we ran
> HF, Two Meters and PSK 31 on 20 meters. We also spent some money on a both
that
> people could no miss (around $400,00)

Phew! That's a lot of repeater dues.

1783. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:21:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbf73ea_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41055

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204181100.53b64a38@posting.google.com...
>
> You've told us that you "have fun" on the air by chiding, teasing,
> busting on and making fun of other hams who *choose* to talk about
> traffic, weather, etc.
> Even though such conversations are perfectly legal. What if your "fun"
> isn't "fun" for those on the receiving end?
>
> What is wrong with live and let live?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Most people aren't so easily offended as you, Jim. Most people end up laughing right along with all of us on the repeater. So take your wounded ego off to someone who might care...

Kim W5TIT

1784. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:24:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbf747b$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41056

"AB2HR" <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:8mhtbuolsc54cc7p4rob6uall5fgd5ib3j@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 17 Apr 2002 18:52:26 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >> >Kim W5TIT
> >> >
> >>
> >> Well, in 1997 I bought a Swan 350 for $165. In 1998 I sold it for
> >> $200 and bought a Kenwood TS-520. After buying an external VFO-520
> >> for $75, I turned around and sold THAT combination for $300 and bought
> >> myself an IC-720A. So actually, yes... we CAN sell our equipment at
> >> a profit - provided we bought it for a bargain to begin with...
> >>
> >> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> >
> > >
> > >Good grief, I need you to negotiate a few deals for me...LOL
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> > >
> >
> >
> > heh heh heh.... Yeah, I did pretty good with it... Guess it's a
> > matter of being in the right place at the right time - AND buying a
> > radio that you won't mind operating until the right deal happens to
> > come along... I'm working my way up to a TS-2000. Eventually...
> >
> > 73!
> >
> > Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> > SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> > 607-733-5745
> > telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

Gosh, Raymond. What a breath of fresh air! Someone who can actually have a round, have a debate, have a different point of view and end up laughing! Good stuff... It must be that senses of humor are much harder to come by these days.

And good luck, 73 to you...

Kim W5TIT

1785. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:26:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <knKv8.5244$4K5.114989295@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41050

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020416085741.07506.00003516@mb-cc.aol.com...
> For those who like to moan and whine about Amateur Radio's death
throes, I
> can't help but wonder how they rationalize thier rants when NASA, the most
> conservative of any technology based agency in the world, see's fit to
> incorporate it into it's multi-billion dollar pet.
>
> Also...for those (or "the one") who always whine about how little
Amateur
> radio get's any media exposure, here's another prick in the balloon.

Steve, relax, the ARS isn't going away any time soon. It'll take another
decade for the actuarial table to do any real damage. The first boomer
turns 65 in 2010.

1786. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:27:31 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7oKv8.5245$aL5.115032404@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41051

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020416175519.00480.00004147@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
> >From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >Date: 04/16/02 15:00 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3CBC74DA.E6A5273D@psu.edu>
>
> >There are a few things about the
> >ARS that aren't so good.
>
> Sure there is, Mike, but at the end of the day, which outweighs the
other
> by a long way?
>
> >It says a lot about a person in what they focus upon.
>
> I'm focusing upon the fact that NASA has Ham Radio on board an
orbiting
> space station and they're bragging about it...and I bet there ain't a
cellphone
> within 300 miles of it!~
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What's the orbit altitude of the ISS?

1787. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:31:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020418213111.16785.00000726@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 41053

In article <20020418000732.13688.00000738@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>Jim:
>>
>>If that's the case, let Kim be jealous of this: My "commute" to work
>>is 3.5 miles one way, usually takes from 10 - 12 minutes, and I have
>>free, dedicated parking. I fill the gas tank on my '01 Toyota Corolla LE
>>every three weeks, and it usually takes 9 gallons. This includes my
>>weekly commuting and all other incidental driving during days off, etc.
>
>COOL!
>
>But ya gotta beat this:
>
>My commute to work is about 1.5 miles one way - so close that I can go home
>for
>lunch on some days. Free, safe dedicated parking a few steps from the office
>door.
>
>And most days I carpool with two beautiful young women who are very
>appreciative of my driving skills.
>
>The only thing I can't match is your gas mileage. The Odyssey uses a bit more
>fuel than a Corolla.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Oh, I forgot to mention...when I *get* to work, I then proceed to start
up a big, fuel-guzzling, smoky (sometimes, like in the ride I had today)
diesel engine, and gleefully dump the hydrocarbon by-products of up
to 20 gal. of diesel fuel into the atmosphere! Oh well, with one hand I
giveth, with the other, I taketh away!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1788. Re: Recreation [was Onomatopoeia]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:53:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <IMKv8.5257$fg6.116426930@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41057

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHOTELBRAVO@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:GL7v8.12786$3z3.1228384@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Those minds abhor anyone "enjoying" a hobby. Everything has
> > to be selfless devotion to duty in the "service." They must
> > continue to wear a "uniform" complete with rows of service
> > ribbons, insignia, march in ranks to martial music on a parade
> > ground, and fight the imaginary wars which threaten their
> > perceived status as some "5th military service branch" of the US.
> >
>
> Damn, how'd I miss all that? I've been licensed since the early 60's and
> never heard of uniforms, marching, or any of that. My Mom, who was first
> licensed in 1930 never told me about those things either.
>
> I guess Leonard is telling tall stories again! Crank that organ, old Sir.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Welp Hans, early in my rrap career, I was told that I needed to learn code because the "Chicoms were overrunning" someones position and, by extension, if I learned code (which I already had) I might not suffer the same fate. Sounds a lot like the military to me. This mentor used a variety of screen names, but GrayJL and Xray are easily searched. He's most famous for Know Code = Know Ham Radio, and No Code = CB Radio. He was pretty limited in cognitive processes; I think the Chicoms actually got to him. Apparently knowing the code didn't save him.

1789. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 01:59:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <fSKv8.5260$Wm6.116695088@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41058

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CB84692.B144C290@IEEE.org...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > I agree and kind of disagree. The golden agedness of any time period
> > exists in peoples minds. It is a very fluid thing, moving forwards and
> > backwards with the observers own prejudices.
>
> The golden age of ham radio was when we could watch the VR-150's
> pulsate to the sound of our voices. :-)

Is that anything like those antennas with the little light bulbs in the tip
that they sell in the truck stops?

1790. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 02:05:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3YKv8.5265$At6.116932027@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41059

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020412231103.02551.00001667@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3CB66ECC.8252C699@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >The gall bladder ailments QSOs and such are just the old timers
exchanging
> >physcologal support with each other. Seems as valid use of radio as say
> >contests and such. Sure it's boring to listen to if you're
> >young, but they're not "broadcasting" to you. There's other QSOs going
on
> >to listen to, or call CQ and start a topic with someone.
>
> Bob:
>
> When it's done on a wide-area coverage repeater, occurs on a daily
> basis, and goes on for hours on end, it definitely becomes a "gray"
area --
> from a standpoint of "good amateur practice." I have monitored such
> long-winded health-related diatribes among old-timers, who don't know
> the difference between a repeater and their nightly 75-meter roundtable,

At least on a repeater, its probably confined to America, whereas on 75M its
damaging international goodwill. Good thing we got a riff-raff filter to
keep that from happening.

> while other stations have tried desperately to break-in for a chance to
> make a call of a more urgent nature. The Geezer Factor in ham radio
> is something that must be reckoned with, particularly in larger urban
> areas with a dense population of hams.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

And the beat goes on...

1791. Re: I give up! I've changed my mind completely!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 02:11:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <J1Lv8.5271$Zy6.117132352@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41060

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:ub6gg2eg8ntl70@corp.supernews.com...
> Sort of reminds me of the story that the favorite sport of the technicians
> was basketball, the engineers liked tennis, the managers played handball,
> and the executives played golf.
>
> Proving, of course, that the higher you rise in an organization, the
smaller
> your balls.
>
> {;-)
>
> Jim

I really hate to admit this here, but as a senior NCO a few years back, I
was tagged to be a "pee" monitor for the USAF random urinalysis program.
Not exactly within my specialty, but ... Quality Force/Zero Tolerance and
all.

Anyway, your observation is correct.

1792. Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 02:31:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cbf844c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41061

Noting the recent exchange on interpreting FCC R&R, note the following:

PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents
Subpart E--Providing Emergency Communications
Sec. 97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service.
(a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a civil defense organization as registered with that organization, or it is an FCC-licensed RACES station. No person may be the control operator of a RACES station, or may be the control operator of an amateur station transmitting in RACES unless that person holds a FCC-issued amateur operator license and is certified by a civil defense organization as enrolled in that organization.

and:

(c) A RACES station may only communicate with:
(1) Another RACES station;
(2) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization;
(3) A United States Government station authorized by the responsible agency to communicate with RACES stations;
(4) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such communication is authorized by the FCC.
(d) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization may only communicate with:
(1) A RACES station licensed to the civil defense organization with which the amateur station is registered;
(2) The following stations upon authorization of the responsible civil defense official for the organization with which the amateur station is registered:
(i) A RACES station licensed to another civil defense organization;
(ii) An amateur station registered with the same or another civil defense organization;
(iii) A United States Government station authorized by the responsible agency to communicate with RACES stations; and
(iv) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such communication is authorized by the FCC.

Regarding (a), what do you all think? Can a RACES organization make its rules on whom may and may not transmit during their RACES nets? I have heard this debated all over the place and have RACES organizations here that allow "just anyone" to enter their nets; and those who allow no one but their own organization's participants. By "their own" I mean, literally, *only* those RACES stations who are authorized by the city in which they live/work.

Regarding (c)(2) and (4), does this mean that any amateur who with a civil defense organization--regardless of their affiliation with the particular RACES organization--can communicate/transmit on any RACES net? And, (4) pretty much covers any amateur at a station of the Red Cross, etc., right? So, what would be "legal" about a RACES net control saying to that person that they cannot enter the net because they are not recognized by that particular RACES organization.

Overall, if the R&R are to be followed, to the letter, is it OK for a RACES organization to allow anyone onto their nets?

Kim W5TIT

1793. Re: Dear ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 03:18:01 UTC
From: Mike <mlaw3825@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <J%Lv8.17177$3z3.1597248@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41062
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I can't believe that you think us ham's are a causing a disgrace to the
"citizens" band by posting an ad selling something. Do you want to see
disgrace? Take a listen at the 10 meter band on a HAM radio and listen to
all the "hash and trash" that's being transmitted illegaly by the "citizens
band" Lets get even simpler. I can go a whole day, or a whole month without
hearing one swear word on my local repeater, or one slander towards anybody.
But, oh no, god forbid i say "damn" on the citizens band!
FCC should make it so everybody has to have a license to use CB's.
73's!
Mike

--
From the desk of KC2JGA
"Wolfie" <wolf@redridinghood.com> wrote in message
news:ubsv11ji5nhmf4@corp.supernews.com...
> Dear Mr. Voobmer,
> I don't suppose it has occured to you that many ham operators go to that
> cb newsgroup because..they still own citizen band transceivers and enjoy
it.
> Further, most everyone (with the exception of you of course..) knowing
> this bit of trivia; these same ham operators may be interested in this
> equipment.
> Just as many in radio-phono newsgroup do not have ham license but are
> interested in ham receivers.
> In short Mr. Voobner.....get a life..
>
> "Aaron H. Voobner" <voobner@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:fbc7a2.0204161210.adffcd1@posting.google.com...
> > Dear ARRL,
> >
> > I don't know if this fellow (see below) is a member of your
> > organization or not, but he is certainly making a nuisance of himself
> > in the rec.radio.cb newsgroup by continually advertising his "10 meter
> > amps" to CBers.
> >
> > I thought hams were supposed to police themselves? If so, someone
> > should take this disgrace to amateur radio aside and let him know what
> > harm he's doing to the citizens band.
> >
> > Sincerely,
> >
> > Aaron H. Voobner
> >

> > ==
> > Subject: HF AMPLIFIERS
> > From: NI4L ni4l@charter.net
> > Date: Tue, Apr 16, 2002 6:34 PM
> > Message-id: <3CBC6E9A.7199795C@charter.net>
> >
> > FS TRANSEL NITRO 300A 10 meter amp. looks and works great.
> > its pretty heavy. 250.00 + shipping
> >
> > FOR SALE PALOMAR 300A AMP
> > Works good, Looks good, 10-40 meters, seprate power supply.
> > 250.00 + shipping.
> > have pics of amps
> >
> > --
> >
> > NI4L CUSTOM RESONANT DIPOLE
> > LEGAL LIMIT ++ CUSTOM MADE CENTER FED DIPOLE
> > Made with the same components used by our military forces today
> > Custom made to YOUR FREQUENCY of operation
> > Let me take the hassle out of making a RESONANT DIPOLE for you.
> > Click here for more info... http://www.angelfire.com/nb/ni4l/
> > ==========================
>
>
>

1794. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 03:27:36 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <c33vbusb01rvkjnb2du0lvk6g6fpldaq79@4ax.com>
Source record: 41063

```
On Wed, 17 Apr 2002 18:50:39 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020417065433.09489.00000574@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <3cbc1213_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>> >news:bhsnbu0jcp7n8bsvkim9t4dil6kicjfoac@4ax.com...
>> >> On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:28:30 -0500, "Kim"
>> >> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:20020415080704.19000.00000861@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> >> >> In article <3CBA41F4.47A61DDA@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> >> >> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Oh, not at all am I complaining. I really don't care what "kind of
>> >> >language" people use on the air. I have a tuning knob and an on/off
>button.
>> >>
>> >> Then why don't you practice what you preach, Kim?
>> >>
>> >> Your radio sets have a tuning knob and a power switch. But when someone
>> >> shows up on the repeater you frequent and talks about traffic conditions,
>you
>> >> "chide", "tease" "make fun of them" "bust their ....", etc. rather than
>tuning
>> >> away
>> >> or turning off. You've told us you do these things, so your saying "do as
>I
>> >> say, not as I do".
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >Uh, Jim...in a word: get over it. I *choose* to have fun with folks who
>> >think all there is to talk about is traffic, or think all QSOs have to be
>> >made up of traffic and weather. I *choose* WHEN to use my knobs...you
>> >*choose* when to yours.

I choose to have fun with people who think that all that they have to
talk about is the quality of other people's radio conversations. If
it's not illegal, it's ok with me. If I'm not interested, I'm not
```

required to listen. There are some who think that freedom of speech is great so long as people only talk about things that they want them to talk about.

Be careful how you use the term "knobs." With a call sign of "TIT" there could be some kind of an innuendo in there somewhere.

I'm back to lurking, but you are really very funny. With a little work you could become a comedian.

1795. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 03:33:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBF901E.F6B746F4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41064

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > The golden age of ham radio was when we could watch the VR-150's
> > pulsate to the sound of our voices. :-)
>
> Is that anything like those antennas with the little light bulbs in the tip
> that they sell in the truck stops?

I was once stopped on the coastal highway at night by a CA patrolman who
accused me of having a red light on top of my antenna. The salt air was
causing an orange corona when I transmitted. He said the glow was illegal
because it was visible to oncoming traffic.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1796. Re: Dear ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 03:36:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CBF90CC.5A28D144@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41065
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Mike wrote:
> FCC should make it so everybody has to have a license to use CB's.

They did. Didn't work.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1797. Re: Dear ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 04:03:58 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0204182003.5756466c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Wolfie" <wolf@redridinghood.com> wrote in message
news:<ubsv11ji5nhmf4@corp.supernews.com>...
> Dear Mr. Voobmer,
> I don't suppose it has occured to you that many ham operators go to that
> cb newsgroup because..they still own citizen band transceivers and enjoy it.

Call them "HF amps", "10 meter amps", "Broadband amps", whatever you
like. We both know they're meant to sell to CBers and be used
illegally, so why continue the charade?

> Further, most everyone (with the exception of you of course..) knowing
> this bit of trivia; these same ham operators may be interested in this
> equipment.

Oh I get it. These ads for CB AMPLIFIERS in a CB NEWSGROUP are meant
for HAMS to see. Ohhhhhh. Silly me.

> Just as many in radio-phono newsgroup do not have ham license but are
> interested in ham receivers.

That takes the prize for The World's Dumbest Comparative Analogy.
Don't ever go into law, you'll lose your shirt.

> In short Mr. Voobner.....get a life..

And get another expression, that one's worn out.

-A

>
> "Aaron H. Voobner" <voobner@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:fbc7a2.0204161210.adffcd1@posting.google.com...
> > Dear ARRL,
> >
> > I don't know if this fellow (see below) is a member of your
> > organization or not, but he is certainly making a nuisance of himself
> > in the rec.radio.cb newsgroup by continually advertising his "10 meter
> > amps" to CBers.
> >
> > I thought hams were supposed to police themselves? If so, someone
> > should take this disgrace to amateur radio aside and let him know what
> > harm he's doing to the citizens band.
> >
> > Sincerely,
> >
> > Aaron H. Voobner

> >
> > ==
> > Subject: HF AMPLIFIERS
> > From: NI4L ni4l@charter.net
> > Date: Tue, Apr 16, 2002 6:34 PM
> > Message-id: <3CBC6E9A.7199795C@charter.net>
> >
> > FS TRANSEL NITRO 300A 10 meter amp. looks and works great.
> > its pretty heavy. 250.00 + shipping
> >
> > FOR SALE PALOMAR 300A AMP
> > Works good, Looks good, 10-40 meters, seprate power supply.
> > 250.00 + shipping.
> > have pics of amps
> >
> > --
> >
> > NI4L CUSTOM RESONANT DIPOLE
> > LEGAL LIMIT ++ CUSTOM MADE CENTER FED DIPOLE
> > Made with the same components used by our military forces today
> > Custom made to YOUR FREQUENCY of operation
> > Let me take the hassle out of making a RESONANT DIPOLE for you.
> > Click here for more info... http://www.angelfire.com/nb/ni4l/
> > ==========

1798. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 04:10:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9o5bc$2mq$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 41067

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a9li2i$1jr$2@208.206.142.75...
> >
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > > You guys don't consider a board member/Vice President and another BOD
> > > > member, a division director, as "HQ folks"? I sure do. I didn't say
> > > > staff member.
> > > >
> > >
> > > I served two terms as Dakota Division vice director. I always
> considered
> > > myself a field representative, not an HQ guy.
> > >
>
> >
> > Probably right but unless I have been badly misinformed, the BOD makes
> > the policy decisions (though at whose behest is often open to question).
> > If it's not done at HQ it sure is done under the HQ umbrella.
> >
>
> The hired help at HQ may suggest policies, new programs, changes in old
> policies or programs, etc., but no policy decisions are made at HQ or under
> the umbrella of HQ. The decision making, including approval/disapproval of
> HQ suggestions, is made by the field representatives (Division Directors).
> No one at HQ sets ARRL policy.

Fpr some obscure reason you're tryingto suggest that the Board of
Directors is not in charge of the ARRL. Strange.

1799. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 04:13:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9o5i1$2mq$1@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 41068

Bill wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<a8vllg$36d$1@208.207.71.173>...
>
> > Going 'way back there, it would take a book. I don't have time to write
> > it and you don't have time to read it.
>
> So Dick...what you are saying is that you are full of hot air?

Even that would be better than a vacuum, as you.

>
> You pointed the finger, you made the accusations, now back it up or shut up.

Read your own history. You might learn *something*.

1800. Re: Get it right, Val (Was - Re:Code Test Fiasco: Upon.....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 04:14:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9o5ju$2mq$2@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 41069

Bill wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<a91hmp$29v$0@208.206.142.90>...
>
> > So it *has* to be a conspiricy if you know of internal ARRL
> > malfeasances but don't wish to acknowledge it. Right. And if you don't
> > know of any, that means you don't pay much attention.
>
> You mean, the ARRL isn't PERFECT???
>
> HOW LONG HAS THIS BEEN GOING ON???
>
> Dick...hams like you force me to fund the ARRL more each and every
> year. Thanks and keep up the good work.

Good. Eventually there will be a majority of dipshit members.

1801. Re: Dear ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 04:18:18 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3cbf99fd.8526831@news.cet.com>
Source record: 41070
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <fbc7a2.0204182003.5756466c@posting.google.com>, voobner@yahoo.com
(Aaron H. Voobner) wrote:

<snip>
>> Just as many in radio-phono newsgroup do not have ham license but are
>> interested in ham receivers.
>
>That takes the prize for The World's Dumbest Comparative Analogy.

Kinda like, "I'm selling my car in a drapery shop because carpenters
frequently drink beer." Makes perfect sense to me...

1802. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 04:19:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9o5rn$2mq$3@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 41071

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > Probably right but unless I have been badly misinformed, the BOD makes
> >the policy decisions (though at whose behest is often open to question).
> >If it's not done at HQ it sure is done under the HQ umbrella.
>
> Dick, it is the other way around; the HQ staff operate under the ARRL Board
> policy umbrella. I can only occasionally get away with telling the Board what
> to do. :-)
>

Did you even read what I said???

> The ARRL Board meetings are not held at ARRL HQ, although a few of the smaller
> committee meetings may be. The Board usually meets twice a year, in cities of
> their choosing. In past years, most of the July Board meetings have been at a
> hotel facility in a hotel near Newington, perhaps as much as a 45-minute drive
> away. The January meetings are usually held someplace warmer.
>

Why do you keep insisting that the BOD doean't run the ARRL? Maybe
because it's true?

1803. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 04:20:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a9o5u9$2mq$4@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 41072

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> >>Ah. So you read my posts and automatically know that I don't mean what
> >>I'm saying. Neat. How do you manage to divine just what it is that I
> >>mean?
>
> I thought about it some more, Dick, and I decided you are right. It is not
> possible to tell what you mean from what you say in your posts. :-)

You have proved yourself incapable of reading plaing language English.

1804. Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 05:07:19 UTC
From: Black Silver <Black_Silver@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bCNv8.20117$L1.1579457@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41073

The FCC has assigned a "RM" (RM-10413) to the ARRL Novice Sub-band refarming petition. Interested parties can comment to FCC at their web site (http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi) or by mail.

Below are my comments.

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10413
Amateur Service Rules Governing)
Operating Privileges)
)

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments are in response to the ARRL proposal for "refarming" the existing HF "Novice sub-bands".

I. Discussion:

The ARRL petition does not address the implementation of new technologies as repeatedly requested by the Commission in WT Docket 98-143. It simply proposes to eliminate the Novice segments and reshuffle that spectrum among existing legacy modes. Rather than gain consensus, the ARRL polling method produced a popularity poll among several non-responsive (to 98-143) choices.

Rather than just "more of the same old stuff", I propose that the Commission take this opportunity to provide the Amateur Radio service with a new incentive to concentrate on paragraph 97.1(b) of the Commission's Rules.

97.1(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art.

While I agree that the declining Novice license population no longer justifies several significant chunks of spectrum as a "reservation" for improving their Morse skills, and that these "reservations" have outlived their regulatory purpose, I propose that we retain these 50-year old "reservations" and

convert them to a new purpose which will ensure the future Amateur Radio service continues our "proven ability to contribute to the advancement".

II Proposal:

A. To "de-populate" the current Novice segments, I propose that all Novice (and Technician with code credit) licensees be authorized to use Morse code in the same band segments now authorized for General class licensees.

B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be set aside as a new "Experimental Reservation" for non-traditional and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized image, and other "forward looking" communications methods.

C. I propose that the current power output level of 200W be retained for those segments, and additionally propose that transmitters in those segments must be equipped with auto-adaptive circuitry to reduce output to the lowest level consistent with reliable communications.

D. I recommend that the Commission grant broad discretion to amateurs operating in this "experimental reservation" as to innovative modulation schemes and non-traditional technologies.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
1610 Weston Lane
Plymouth, MN 55447-2855

1805. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 09:23:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CBFE20E.70864BB2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 41074

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CBE46CE.17CD1C8B@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20020417065434.09489.00000575@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > > > In article <20020416081740.01968.00003582@mb-df.aol.com>,
> w1rfi@aol.com
> > > (W1RFI)
> > > > writes:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > (Kim wrote:)
> > > > >>>then I'll answer with: I don't
> > > > >>> know.
> > > > >
> > > > (N2EY wrote:)
> > > > >>OK, then. Simple question, simple answer.
> > > > >
> > > > >Well, it really isn't that simple.
> > > > >
> > > > >Kim, I am curious too... you said that the mode you used on 30 meters
> was
> > > > >neither CW nor digital. Then what mode was it?
> > > >
> > > > You're forgetting something, Ed. When Kim wrote that she "worked all
> bands
> > > > lots of times" (in the context of HF amateur bands"), her definition
> of
> > > "all
> > > > bands" does not include 30 meters.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY.
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > Jim, what a Dick you're becoming.
> >
> > Kim, what a Kim you've remained. Another of your statements blows up in
> > your face and you blame those who call you on it.
> >

> > Dave K8MN
>
> *Maybe* you can explain to me how it blew up in my face? Or, when I say
> I've travelled a lot, you'd expect me to meet your definition of "travel"
> and "a lot." Right? Just as Jim wants me to meet his definition of "all"
> in all bands. Like I said, my all is different from his all. Wonder why he
> didn't choose any of the Ghz stuff (I've never been there, either), and
> there's probably lots of other bands I've never been on.

Jim hasn't set the definition of the term "all HF bands". The phrase
can only mean one thing. If you are the only person who feels that she
can leave out a band or two and still claimed to have been active on
"all HF bands", you are the one with the problem of definition. Let's
take your travel analogy: If you claimed to have visited every state
and it happened to come out later that you meant that you'd been to all
of 'em except Missouri, Alaska and Hawaii, your statement would have
blown up in your face. When you state that you've operated on "all HF
bands" but you mean "most HF bands", your statement has blown up in your
face. I trust my explanation is sufficient.

> You keep clinging to your semantics, you and Jim. It's your dislike of
> someone that determines your attitude...not the content of their material.

I don't know about clinging to semantics, Kim but semantics are
important and can't be simply tossed aside. You could make an effort to
make your statements factual to begin with. That would have made it
possible to avoid the game of dodge ball you played when questioned
about what mode you used on 30 meters.

Dave K8MN

1806. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 10:22:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419062233.13688.00000798@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 41075

In article <a9mhuqaod1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

(N2EY wrote):

>> That's what I mean by "any more than necessary". If the autopatchers
>> keep mentioning the name of the shop, how good the pizza is, etc., it
>> could reach a point where they are doing a pizza shop commercial
>> rather than actually ordering a pizza.
>
>Agreed, but since most other hams would agree
>that the user was abusing the autopatch by tying it up
>for such an extended time for no reason...the liklihood of
>the advertising scenario ever happening isn't too
>high at all.

Exactly. Point is, to violate the rule requires a pretty outlandish situation.
>
>> >Frankly, Kim's personal interpretation of what the
>> >prohibition on using ham radio for pecuniary interests
>> >means has been taken to ridiculous extremes.
>>
>> Agreed 100%.
>>
>> > What
>> >seems totally amazing is that Kim even ignores the
>> >FCC rulings that have already addressed several of
>> >the specific scenarios she claims are violations.
>>
>> Seems to me that Kim wants to whittle away at amateur radio
>> until it is destroyed. Kim thinks it's OK to cuss on the air and
>> make fun of other hams having legal conversations, but it's
>> not OK in her book to discuss the weather or the traffic or
>> order a pizza. Even though the FCC has repeatedly said
>> exactly the opposite.
>>
>> It's not code tests or lack thereof that will drive amateur radio to
>> extinction. It's addytoods like Kim's.
>
>I'm not convinced that Kim wants an end to ham radio.

Perhaps not.

>I'd rather believe it is just a lack of clear thinking as
>to the laglities of the rules and their actual application...
>especially where there is clear FCC direction in some cases

>or a long history of accepted practice (i.e. the FCC hasn't seen
>fit to say something's wrong) for some of the things that Kim
>wants us to believe is/are illegal.

Agreed. But some of the attitudes and opinions Kim professes are
not good for the future and health of the ARS. For example - imagine
an amateur radio service where cussing on the air is tolerated but
discussions of traffic and weather are not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1807. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 10:25:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419062533.08056.00004453@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 41076

From: "Black Silver" Black_Silver@earthlink.net

>B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be set aside
> as a new "Experimental Reservation" for non-traditional
> and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized
> image, and other "forward looking" communications methods.

If this is implemented by the FCC, I would hope that it is done without the current data rate limitations that apply to the rest of HF. This would be an ideal place to allow higher-speed (translate: generally greater bandwidth) HF digital operation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1808. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 10:30:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419063014.08056.00004454@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 41077

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Yeh, no kidding. So when the other services abandoned code use, did the FCC
>still require them to pass a Morse Code EXAM to get on HF?

The FCC did not require a Morse code test for commercial HF access *before* the
other services abandoned code use.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1809. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 10:33:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419063305.08056.00004457@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 41078

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.ORG:

>Did you use the old "keep mindlessly taking the test until you
>memorize it" trick?

I don't know anyone who has.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1810. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 10:36:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419063616.08056.00004458@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 41079

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>K0HB wrote:

>> The hired help at HQ may suggest policies, new programs, changes in old
>> policies or programs, etc., but no policy decisions are made at HQ or under
>> the umbrella of HQ. The decision making, including approval/disapproval of
>> HQ suggestions, is made by the field representatives (Division Directors).
>> No one at HQ sets ARRL policy.
>
>
> Fpr some obscure reason you're tryingto suggest that the Board of
>Directors is not in charge of the ARRL. Strange.

How could you possibly get that from Hans' saying that policy decisions are
made by the Division Directors?

Strange, indeed. Is this another one of those "what you said -- what you
really meant" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1811. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 10:39:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419063934.08056.00004459@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 41080

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> > Probably right but unless I have been badly misinformed, the BOD makes
>> >the policy decisions (though at whose behest is often open to question).
>> >If it's not done at HQ it sure is done under the HQ umbrella.

>> Dick, it is the other way around; the HQ staff operate under the ARRL Board
>> policy umbrella. I can only occasionally get away with telling the Board
>what
>> to do. :-)

> Did you even read what I said???

Yes, I did. You said that the Board makes policy decisions, but then implied
that it is at the behest of some unknown persons, and then said that you
thought those policy decisions were made under an ARRL HQ umbrella.

Only the first statement is correct. The "behest" is very well known; the Board
members are elected by the direct vote of the members in their Divisions. The
Board does not meet an ARRL HQ and the ARRL staff do not dictate policy to the
ARRL Board, your consoiracy theory notwithstanding.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>
>> The ARRL Board meetings are not held at ARRL HQ, although a few of the
>smaller
>> committee meetings may be. The Board usually meets twice a year, in cities
>of
>> their choosing. In past years, most of the July Board meetings have been
>at a
>> hotel facility in a hotel near Newington, perhaps as much as a 45-minute
>drive
>> away. The January meetings are usually held someplace warmer.
>>
>
> Why do you keep insisting that the BOD doean't run the ARRL? Maybe
>because it's true?
>
>
>
>
>
>

1812. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 11:17:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419071752.08742.00000450@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41081

In article <3cbf73ea_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0204181100.53b64a38@posting.google.com...
>>
>> You've told us that you "have fun" on the air by chiding, teasing,
>> busting on and making fun of other hams who *choose* to talk about
>> traffic, weather, etc.
>> Even though such conversations are perfectly legal. What if your "fun"
>> isn't "fun" for those on the receiving end?
>>
>> What is wrong with live and let live?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Most people aren't so easily offended as you, Jim.

How do you know, Kim? Who are "most people"?

>Most people end up
>laughing right along with all of us on the repeater.

Ah - so the ones who are offended don't matter. Now I understand.

>So take your wounded
>ego off to someone who might care...
>
My ego's not "wounded" at all.

Most people aren't offended by what I write here. However, you seem to
get really upset over having the bright lights of logic, reason, fact and
experience shown on your words here. Thus the ad hominem attacks
on the one who shines the light.

Perhaps you should take your own advice and "get over it".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1813. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 11:17:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419071752.08742.00000449@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41083

In article <3cbf70a2$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Kim, what a Kim you've remained. Another of your statements blows up in
>> your face and you blame those who call you on it.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>*Maybe* you can explain to me how it blew up in my face?

As I have written before:

The conversation was about the HF amateur bands. You claimed to have " been on
all bands, lots of times".

> Or, when I say
>I've travelled a lot, you'd expect me to meet your definition of "travel"
>and "a lot." Right?

Just the generally-agreed upon ones. "Traveled a lot" is pretty vague. "All HF
amateur bands" is well-defined. It means 80, 40, 30, 20, 17, 15, 12, and 10
meters. Some people even include 160, but 160 is actually an MF band.

>Just as Jim wants me to meet his definition of "all"
>in all bands.

Not my definition. The generally accepted definition. "All" as in "each and
every, no exceptions"

> Like I said, my all is different from his all.

And different from everyone else's "all"

>Wonder why he
>didn't choose any of the Ghz stuff (I've never been there, either), and
>there's probably lots of other bands I've never been on.

Because the context was HF amateur bands.
>
>You keep clinging to your semantics, you and Jim.

That's a good thing.

>It's your dislike of
>someone that determines your attitude...not the content of their material.

Just the opposite. It's the content of your material that determines our
attitude.

You post things that appear to be incorrect. When questioned on the details you get angry at the questioner for even daring to point out that you might have made a mistake, or written something that doesn't make sense.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1814. Re: Small-Scale Ham Testing Continues!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 11:17:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419071753.08742.00000451@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41082

In article <3cbf726c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020418000733.13688.00000740@mb-da.aol.com...
>> In article <ubn6qli88bu52a@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
>> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>>
>> >Passed the General Written tonight using primarily the
>> >QRZ site to prepare, due to lack of time.
>>
>> Congratulations, Val!
>
>What? No definition of "passed?!"

Just the universal, obvious one. FCC actually defines
what it takes to pass each element. Go look it up in Part 97..

>> >Hope to take
>> >the code and Extra exam a month from now, after a lot
>> >of CW practice with a home-made keyer that will work
>> >with a 2m transceiver.

>> GREAT!

>How great?

Excellently great, wonderfully great, encouragingly great.

>> How's the code practice coming? Lots of free software out there that will
>run
>> on your PC.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Define "coming." That is a verb, meaning to move, right? Or at least a
>word that implies motion toward something.

It means progress towards a goal. I'm not surprised you don't know that
meaning, Kim ;-)

>How can code practice
>have motion?

See above.
>
>"Free?"

Yes - as in no need to spend money.

http://www.ah0a.org

is one source that comes to mind. "Free for the download".

> "Lots?"

Yup.

> Free in terms of money, jail, or politically free?

All of those.

>Lots
>in terms of tracts of land, or... Could you be more specific, please?

Lots in terms of great quantities. Huge masses. More than an adequate supply.

< "Out
>there." Would that be out there where you are, or further than that?

I'm not "out there", Kim. ;-)

How about defining your meaning of "all" for us, Kim? Or maybe "country"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1815. What's It Like To Be THAT bitter, Lennie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 12:09:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419080943.13156.00004773@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 41085

>Subject: Space Ham
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/17/02 17:53 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020417175320.06459.00000641@mb-mo.aol.com>

>That seems to be the intent. It has no other purpose than being
>PR and a form of recreation for ISS crew members.

NASA and ARISS report on more of the "PR" and "recreation" accomplished by the crew of the International Space Station.

QUOTE:

ARISS Logs Two More Successful School Contacts (Apr 18, 2002) -- Dan Bursch, KD5PNU, aboard the International Space Station this week took time out of a busier-than-usual schedule to answer questions via ham radio from an enthusiastic throng of elementary schoolers. The April 16 contact with Quogue School on New York's Long Island gave 10 youngsters a chance to pose 17 questions to Bursch. On April 11, astronaut Carl Walz, KC5TIE, was interviewed via ham radio by youngsters at Caribbean Preparatory School in Puerto Rico. Both contacts with NA1SS were arranged through the Amateur Radio on the International Space Station--or ARISS--program.

UNQUOTE

Yeah...Just a "publicity stunt" with a multi-billion dollar toy.....

Rrrrrrrrrriiiiiiiiggggggghhhhhhttttttt Lennie.......

Putz.

1816. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 12:11:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204190411.d19c561@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41084

"Black Silver" <Black_Silver@earthlink.net> wrote:
> II Proposal:
>
> A. To "de-populate" the current Novice segments, I propose
> that all Novice (and Technician with code credit) licensees
> be authorized to use Morse code in the same band segments
> now authorized for General class licensees.

Does this mean on all HF/MF maateur bands, or just 80/40/15/10? (I
favor the former).
>
> B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be set aside
> as a new "Experimental Reservation" for non-traditional
> and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized
> image, and other "forward looking" communications methods.

COOL!!!
>
> C. I propose that the current power output level of 200W
> be retained for those segments, and additionally propose
> that transmitters in those segments must be equipped with
> auto-adaptive circuitry to reduce output to the lowest
> level consistent with reliable communications.

More type-acceptance. Limits the ability to experiment. Very uncool.
>
> D. I recommend that the Commission grant broad discretion
> to amateurs operating in this "experimental reservation"
> as to innovative modulation schemes and non-traditional
> technologies.

DOUBLE COOL!!

Would CW still be allowed in those segments?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1817. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 12:59:34 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <qt40cukbknvo9vt90an4k29iplmhgr5g5e@4ax.com>
Source record: 41086

On Thu, 18 Apr 2002 20:24:19 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>> >> myself an IC-720A. So actually, yes... we CAN sell our equipment at
>> >> a profit - provided we bought it for a bargain to begin with...
>> >>
>> >> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
>>
>> >
>> >Good grief, I need you to negotiate a few deals for me...LOL
>> >
>> >Kim W5TIT
>> >
>>
>>
>> heh heh heh.... Yeah, I did pretty good with it... Guess it's a
>> matter of being in the right place at the right time - AND buying a
>> radio that you won't mind operating until the right deal happens to
>> come along... I'm working my way up to a TS-2000. Eventually...
>>
>> 73!
>>
>> Raymond Sirois AB2HR

>Gosh, Raymond. What a breath of fresh air! Someone who can actually have a
>round, have a debate, have a different point of view and end up laughing!
>Good stuff... It must be that senses of humor are much harder to come by
>these days.
>
>And good luck, 73 to you...
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Well Kim, In my 16 years of corresponding online (starting with early
dial-up BBS's in the 80's), I've been known to get involved in some
very contentious exchanges of opposing points of view. I very seldom,
if ever, took it seriously (I tend to be a "fecal disturber" and like
to see what happens when the fertilizer gets agitated), and at one
point or another an agreement was reached - even if it was "well,
we'll never agree so let's drop it" I never took it personally - but
some do... Those that can't learn to disagree in a civilized manner
are simply.... uncivilized... That's also not to say that I
haven't, on occasion, taken some people to task for their attitudes -
as I certainly have. Even if I agree with their argument, abusing

people is NOT a way to make a point...

Anyway, the sense of humor here is fully intact, and just because
people thing differently is no means not to be pleasant about it...
Anyway, 73 to you!

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1818. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 14:24:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC0289A.CA5424FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41087

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > I thought about it some more, Dick, and I decided you are right. It is not
> > possible to tell what you mean from what you say in your posts. :-)
>
> You have proved yourself incapable of reading plaing language English.

My advice to you, Dick, is to avoid 'plaing English' from now on.
Where the heck did you learn 'plaing English' anyway?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

1819. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 14:59:12 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <4hWv8.20993$L1.1644033@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41088

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Does this mean on all HF/MF maateur bands, or just 80/40/15/10? (I
> favor the former).
>

All HF/MF bands.

>
> More type-acceptance. Limits the ability to experiment. Very uncool.
>

No type-acceptance involved.

>
> Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
>

No.

1820. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 15:10:06 UTC
From: "Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.com>
Message-ID: <3CC0334E.9000405@dioxine.com>
Source record: 41089

K0HB wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>>Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
>>
>>
>
> No.

Why not?

Dana K6JQ
dana@dioxine.com

1821. Re: Applicable to r.r.a.p?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 16:02:27 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ncXv8.21118$L1.1652376@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41090

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A14454-2002Apr19.html

Did someone call you a chicken butt?

73, Hans

1822. Re: Applicable to r.r.a.p?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 16:15:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC042BE.C1F0C174@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41091

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A14454-2002Apr19.html
>
> Did someone call you a chicken butt?

Probably. :-)

1823. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 16:54:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419125432.12019.00000664@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 41092

In article <4hWv8.20993$L1.1644033@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>> Does this mean on all HF/MF maateur bands, or just 80/40/15/10? (I
>> favor the former).

>All HF/MF bands.

I agree 100%. Many hams are stymied in their attempts to get on HF by antenna, rig and/or time-of-day problems.

>> More type-acceptance. Limits the ability to experiment. Very uncool.

>No type-acceptance involved.

If a rig must have certain features, such as automatic power control, in order to be used in those subbands, how is that feature to be guaranteed without type acceptance?

>> Would CW still be allowed in those segments?

>No.

Why not?

Having a "no CW" subband on HF/MF sets a very bad precedent and complicates the rules unnecessarily.

Better to simply set up those subbands as "digital" and say that casual CW use is against the bandplan, same as the 'phone subbands. How much actual CW use do you hear on the HF phone subbands?

Overall, a great idea that needs a few minor tweaks. Much better than simply widening the 'phone subbands, squeezing the digital and CW folks still more, and continuing to restrict digital data rates.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1824. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 17:46:19 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <LJYv8.18458$3z3.1699579@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41093

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> >No type-acceptance involved.
>
> If a rig must have certain features, such as automatic power control, in
order
> to be used in those subbands, how is that feature to be guaranteed without
type
> acceptance?
>

In those same sub-bands we now have a 200W power limitation. There is
no type acceptance to "guarantee" that feature. In fact, there is only one
"type accpetance" currently in effect in amateur radio, and that is the
shackle
placed on HF amplifiers because of CB outlaws.

Why in the world should we suddenly apply the concept of "type
acceptance" to amateur radio equipment, especially if we are trying
to promote experimentation?

> >> Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
>
> >No.
>
> Why not?
>

Because I envision these sub-bands to be a reservation for
experimenters. I'd like them to gain the reputation of "come
here to tinker with your new idea", to arouse the curiosity
of "tuners by", and to be a place where we can proudly point
when regulators ask "what are you hams doing to advance
the art". I don't want any legacy modes in sight.

73, Hans, K0HB

1825. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 18:03:56 UTC
From: hikezilla@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <662db5ea.0204191003.2415948a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41094

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<4hWv8.20993$L1.1644033@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...

> >
> > Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
> >
>
> No.

I liked your idea up to this point. CW should be always allowed
anywhere in the Amateur bands....in my humble opinion. It's a great
emergency, last ditch effort, mode...at worst.

72 de KB9BVN

1826. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 18:09:22 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204191807060.22184-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41095

On Thu, 18 Apr 2002, W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>Noting the recent exchange on interpreting FCC R&R, note the following:
>
>PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents
>Subpart E--Providing Emergency Communications
>Sec. 97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service.
> (a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed
>primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a ...

Why bother?

RACES is one of the things REMOVED by the April 15, 2000 changes. In 8 years (maximum), there will be no RACES stations because all their licenses will have expired out.

1827. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 18:29:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gutjnd1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41096

On Thu, 18 Apr 2002 21:31:32 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>Regarding (a), what do you all think? Can a RACES organization make its
>rules on whom may and may not transmit during their RACES nets?

Yes, as long as those rules are not in conflict with the FCC's
Rules.

>Regarding (c)(2) and (4), does this mean that any amateur who with a civil
>defense organization--regardless of their affiliation with the particular
>RACES organization--can communicate/transmit on any RACES net?

Replace "can" with "is eligible to be allowed to, at the
discretion of the RACES officials or Net Control"....

>And, (4)
>pretty much covers any amateur at a station of the Red Cross, etc., right?
>So, what would be "legal" about a RACES net control saying to that person
>that they cannot enter the net because they are not recognized by that
>particular RACES organization.

Just because one is "registered" does not mean that one can force
their way one to the Net against the direction of Net Control.

The question of which licensed and registered operators the
RACES director is allowing to participate is a spitting contest
of how the RACES organization is run and has to be resolved by
the professional Emergency Management official of the local
government unit under which RACES operates, not the FCC Rules.

>Overall, if the R&R are to be followed, to the letter, is it
>OK for a RACES >organization to allow anyone onto their nets?

Yes, as long as the operator is licensed by the FCC and
registered with RACES, s/he can be allowed onto the Net.

"Can be", not "must be".

Didn't we kick this around a while back?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
ARES/EACES member and compliance advisor

1828. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 18:42:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gutnht0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41097

On Fri, 19 Apr 2002 18:09:22 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>RACES is one of the things REMOVED by the April 15, 2000 changes.

RACES was not removed, onmly separately-identigied RACES stations
licensed to the Emergency Management agencies

>In 8 years (maximum), there will be no RACES stations because all their
>licenses will have expired out.

And the RACES operations and "stations" will be remain but will be
licensed to participating amateur radio operators rather than to the
RACES entity.

Just a different coat of paint.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1829. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 19:47:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9psglnqj1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41099

"Bill" <hikezilla@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:662db5ea.0204191003.2415948a@posting.google.com...
> "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<4hWv8.20993$L1.1644033@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> > > Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
> >
> > No.
>
> I liked your idea up to this point. CW should be always allowed
> anywhere in the Amateur bands....in my humble opinion. It's a great
> emergency, last ditch effort, mode...at worst.

If there was a TRUE emergency...any mode is still allowed.

Depends on how you define emergency.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1830. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 19:47:16 UTC
From: "Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.com>
Message-ID: <3CC07442.4020500@dioxine.com>
Source record: 41098

K0HB wrote:

>>>>Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
>>>>
>>>No.
>>>
>>Why not?
>>
>>
>
> Because I envision these sub-bands to be a reservation for
> experimenters. I'd like them to gain the reputation of "come
> here to tinker with your new idea", to arouse the curiosity
> of "tuners by", and to be a place where we can proudly point
> when regulators ask "what are you hams doing to advance
> the art". I don't want any legacy modes in sight.

Experimentation is not just working with new modes, it
may also involve experimentation with new twists on old
modes or even operating procedures. I see no value
at all in prohibiting the use of OOK Morse or any other
variation of an AM mode in an experimental sub-band.

Experimenters should have as many options as possible
open to them.

Dana K6JQ
dana@dioxine.com

1831. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 20:02:07 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <3J_v8.18662$3z3.1710679@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41100

"Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.com> wrote

> I see no value at all in prohibiting the use of OOK
> Morse or any other variation of an AM mode in
> an experimental sub-band.

We disagree, but hey, submit your own proposal if
mine isn't acceptable to you.

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi

73, de Hans, K0HB

1832. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 20:40:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC080DB.F0797097@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41151

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.com> wrote
>
> > I see no value at all in prohibiting the use of OOK
> > Morse or any other variation of an AM mode in
> > an experimental sub-band.
>
> We disagree, but hey, submit your own proposal if
> mine isn't acceptable to you.

Would you object to hams experimenting with coherent CW?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1833. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 20:51:52 UTC
From: "Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.com>
Message-ID: <3CC08368.2090805@dioxine.com>
Source record: 41152

CAM wrote:

> K0HB wrote:
>
>>"Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>I see no value at all in prohibiting the use of OOK
>>>Morse or any other variation of an AM mode in
>>>an experimental sub-band.
>>>
>>We disagree, but hey, submit your own proposal if
>>mine isn't acceptable to you.
>>
>
> Would you object to hams experimenting with coherent CW?

... which is one of the modes I was thinking of.

As Hans points out, we're welcome to submit our own comments
to the FCC, though.

Dana K6JQ
dana@dioxine.com

1834. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 20:53:31 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ft%v8.18770$3z3.1725376@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41153

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
> Would you object to hams experimenting with coherent CW?
>

I'd have no objection as long as they didn't do it in a band segment
reserved for new technologies.

73, Hans, K0HB

1835. Re: Applicable to r.r.a.p?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 21:19:26 UTC
From: "Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.com>
Message-ID: <3CC089DF.6040303@dioxine.com>
Source record: 41154

CAM wrote:

> K0HB wrote:
>
>>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>>
>>
>>>http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A14454-2002Apr19.html
>>>
>>Did someone call you a chicken butt?
>>
>
> Probably. :-)

Even more probably, someone *thought* about calling you a
chicken butt.

Heh-heh.

Dana K6JQ
dana@dioxine.com

1836. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 23:50:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc0ad4d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41155

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020419125432.12019.00000664@mb-fl.aol.com...
> In article <4hWv8.20993$L1.1644033@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >> Does this mean on all HF/MF maateur bands, or just 80/40/15/10? (I
> >> favor the former).
>
> >All HF/MF bands.
>
> I agree 100%. Many hams are stymied in their attempts to get on HF by
antenna,
> rig and/or time-of-day problems.
>
> >> More type-acceptance. Limits the ability to experiment. Very uncool.
>
> >No type-acceptance involved.
>
> If a rig must have certain features, such as automatic power control, in
order
> to be used in those subbands, how is that feature to be guaranteed without
type
> acceptance?

The SS rules require APC above 1W, IIRC, but there is no type
acceptance requirement ... same deal here ...

> >> Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
>
> >No.
>
> Why not?
>
> Having a "no CW" subband on HF/MF sets a very bad precedent and
complicates the
> rules unnecessarily.

Hans said it NOT me ... remember that ...

> Better to simply set up those subbands as "digital" and say that casual CW
use
> is against the bandplan, same as the 'phone subbands. How much actual CW

use do
> you hear on the HF phone subbands?
>
> Overall, a great idea that needs a few minor tweaks. Much better than
simply
> widening the 'phone subbands, squeezing the digital and CW folks still
more,
> and continuing to restrict digital data rates.

I think the idea is to NOT artificially restrict digital data rates ... why
the
heck would you want to do that???

Carl - wk3c

1837. Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-19 23:58:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc0af28_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41156

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:LJYv8.18458$3z3.1699579@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>[snip]
>
> > >> Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
> > >
> > > >No.
> > >
> > > Why not?
> > >
>
> Because I envision these sub-bands to be a reservation for
> experimenters. I'd like them to gain the reputation of "come
> here to tinker with your new idea", to arouse the curiosity
> of "tuners by", and to be a place where we can proudly point
> when regulators ask "what are you hams doing to advance
> the art". I don't want any legacy modes in sight.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

I assume from his comments that Hans would prohibit ALL
"legacy" modes from these small segments of spectrum, not
just Morse, but (conventional) RTTY, SSTV, SSB, AM, et al ...

From a philosophical point of view, that would seem fair, but
I have a problem with it ... I made a pledge that I would not
seek to, nor support a move to, restrict Morse usage ... and
I will stick to that pledge.

I can support ALMOST all of Hans' proposal (it's certainly
MUCH better than the ARRL's proposal for the use of those
slivers of spectrum), but I can't support the "no Morse allowed"
part ... I gave my word.

However, I would hope that the Morse folks would "give new
things a chance" and honor a gentleman's agreement, as Jim proposed ...

Carl - wk3c

1838. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:14:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419201445.06885.00004549@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41157

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>If a rig must have certain features, such as automatic power control, in
>order
>to be used in those subbands, how is that feature to be guaranteed without
>type
>acceptance?

I don't believe that any equipment is still type accepted today. Most intentional emitters are certificated. The exception to that is most ham equipment. Of the amateur transmitting equipment, only HF/6M amplifiers must be certificated.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1839. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:17:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419201752.06885.00004552@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41158

From: "Dana H. Myers" dana@dioxine.com

>K0HB wrote:

> I don't want any legacy modes in sight.

>
>
>K0HB wrote:
>
>
>>>>>Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
>>>>>
>>>>No.
>>>>
>>>Why not?
>>>
>>>
>>
>> Because I envision these sub-bands to be a reservation for
>> experimenters. I'd like them to gain the reputation of "come
>> here to tinker with your new idea", to arouse the curiosity
>> of "tuners by", and to be a place where we can proudly point
>> when regulators ask "what are you hams doing to advance
>> the art". I don't want any legacy modes in sight.

>Experimentation is not just working with new modes, it
>may also involve experimentation with new twists on old
>modes or even operating procedures. I see no value
>at all in prohibiting the use of OOK Morse or any other
>variation of an AM mode in an experimental sub-band.

IMHO, those doing QRSS OOK CW or coherent OOK CW are expermenting. And there
are technical advances to be made in both of the above.

My only fear in seeing this recommendation be adopted by the FCC is that the
experminters sub-band might be even quieter than the present use.

One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams can use
all of the bands for such experimentation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1840. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:18:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc0b66f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41161

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:c33vbusb01rvkjnb2du0lvk6g6fpldaq79@4ax.com...
>
> I choose to have fun with people who think that all that they have to
> talk about is the quality of other people's radio conversations. If
> it's not illegal, it's ok with me. If I'm not interested, I'm not
> required to listen. There are some who think that freedom of speech
> is great so long as people only talk about things that they want them
> to talk about.
>

Yeah, there are *those* kind of people.

>
> Be careful how you use the term "knobs." With a call sign of "TIT"
> there could be some kind of an innuendo in there somewhere.
>

If there is for you...well...

>
> I'm back to lurking, but you are really very funny. With a little
> work you could become a comedian.
>

Being a comedian is much harder than that.

Kim W5TIT

1841. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:19:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419201958.06885.00004553@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41159

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3c@fast.net

>I assume from his comments that Hans would prohibit ALL
>"legacy" modes from these small segments of spectrum, not
>just Morse, but (conventional) RTTY, SSTV, SSB, AM, et al ...

The MFSK and Hellschreiber modes are also decades old.

Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1842. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:23:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020419202314.06885.00004554@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41160

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> You have proved yourself incapable of reading plaing language English.

>My advice to you, Dick, is to avoid 'plaing English' from now on.
>Where the heck did you learn 'plaing English' anyway?

Isn't going after what is pretty clearly a fumble-finger typo pretty petty?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1843. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:24:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc0b7e3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41162

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CBFE20E.70864BB2@earthlink.net...
>
> Jim hasn't set the definition of the term "all HF bands". The phrase
> can only mean one thing. If you are the only person who feels that she
> can leave out a band or two and still claimed to have been active on
> "all HF bands", you are the one with the problem of definition. Let's
> take your travel analogy: If you claimed to have visited every state
> and it happened to come out later that you meant that you'd been to all
> of 'em except Missouri, Alaska and Hawaii, your statement would have
> blown up in your face. When you state that you've operated on "all HF
> bands" but you mean "most HF bands", your statement has blown up in your
> face. I trust my explanation is sufficient.
>

Ah, OK, back to the matter of semantics again. Maybe you've got the time to be that analytical, Dave...and maybe Jim does, too. However, I think most of us would be able to ascertain that, when someone says they have worked all bands or been on all bands, they're probably either bored as hell or they probably mean *most.* I'll try to remember that you and a couple of others are so anal that you've got to have your things inside the box...

> >
> > You keep clinging to your semantics, you and Jim. It's your dislike of
> > someone that determines your attitude...not the content of their
material.
>
> I don't know about clinging to semantics, Kim but semantics are
> important and can't be simply tossed aside. You could make an effort to
> make your statements factual to begin with. That would have made it
> possible to avoid the game of dodge ball you played when questioned
> about what mode you used on 30 meters.
>
> Dave K8MN

Don't flatter yourself, Dave. Why in the world would someone be concerned about dodging a question about 30M? The only thing I can tell you about that band is that I *think* it is an all digital band. So, when the question arose, I knew I had not been on that band--as I know I've never done any digital work. Here, while we're at it, I'll even mention that the only VHF/UHF bands I've been on are 2M and 70cm. So, get your little ink pen out and figure out what anal comments you can make now...

Kim W5TIT

1844. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:33:29 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc0ba05_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41163

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020419071752.08742.00000449@mb-mj.aol.com...
>
> As I have written before:
>
> The conversation was about the HF amateur bands. You claimed to have "
been on
> all bands, lots of times".
>

Is that a direct quote, Jim?

>
> Just the generally-agreed upon ones. "Traveled a lot" is pretty vague.
"All HF
> amateur bands" is well-defined. It means 80, 40, 30, 20, 17, 15, 12, and
10
> meters. Some people even include 160, but 160 is actually an MF band.
>

The reason I asked if it was a direct quote is because on one hand you say "
been on all bands, lots of times," yet the next paragraph--the one right
above--you state "All HF amateur bands," so which is it?

> >
> >Just as Jim wants me to meet his definition of "all"
> >in all bands.
>
> Not my definition. The generally accepted definition. "All" as in "each
and
> every, no exceptions"
>

I think, as usual Jim, you are having a nut over semantics.

> >
> > Like I said, my all is different from his all.
>
> And different from everyone else's "all"
>
> >Wonder why he
> >didn't choose any of the Ghz stuff (I've never been there, either), and
> >there's probably lots of other bands I've never been on.
>
> Because the context was HF amateur bands.

I don't know, Jim, you seem pretty confused above. See...there is an advantage to being vague and unprecise. At least I don't become confused about what I said. You obviously have.

> >
> >You keep clinging to your semantics, you and Jim.
>
> That's a good thing.
>
> >It's your dislike of
> >someone that determines your attitude...not the content of their material.
>
> Just the opposite. It's the content of your material that determines our
> attitude.
>
> You post things that appear to be incorrect. When questioned on the details you
> get angry at the questioner for even daring to point out that you might have
> made a mistake, or written something that doesn't make sense.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
>

Uh, Jim. Before you start saying things like "you post things that appear to be incorrect" and "when questioned on the details," you need to be able to figger things out first, K?

As to being angry? Do you really think my life is *that* simple?

Kim W5TIT

1845. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:44:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc0bc87_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41166

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gutjnd1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Thu, 18 Apr 2002 21:31:32 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >Regarding (a), what do you all think? Can a RACES organization make its
> >rules on whom may and may not transmit during their RACES nets?
>
> Yes, as long as those rules are not in conflict with the FCC's
> Rules.
>
> >Regarding (c)(2) and (4), does this mean that any amateur who with a
civil
> >defense organization--regardless of their affiliation with the particular
> >RACES organization--can communicate/transmit on any RACES net?
>
> Replace "can" with "is eligible to be allowed to, at the
> discretion of the RACES officials or Net Control"....
>
> >And, (4)
> >pretty much covers any amateur at a station of the Red Cross, etc.,
right?
> >So, what would be "legal" about a RACES net control saying to that person
> >that they cannot enter the net because they are not recognized by that
> >particular RACES organization.
>
> Just because one is "registered" does not mean that one can force
> their way one to the Net against the direction of Net Control.
>
> The question of which licensed and registered operators the
> RACES director is allowing to participate is a spitting contest
> of how the RACES organization is run and has to be resolved by
> the professional Emergency Management official of the local
> government unit under which RACES operates, not the FCC Rules.
>
> >Overall, if the R&R are to be followed, to the letter, is it
> >OK for a RACES >organization to allow anyone onto their nets?
>
> Yes, as long as the operator is licensed by the FCC and
> registered with RACES, s/he can be allowed onto the Net.
>
> "Can be", not "must be".
>
> Didn't we kick this around a while back?
>

> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
> ARES/EACES member and compliance advisor
>
>

I am so, so glad you made the last point, Phil. YES!!! You and I kicked this around via private emails between each other. And, I've cusses and discussed this time and time again on the repeaters in our area. Do you know that the same thing happens with this topic of R&R as happened with the traffic discussion we just had (still going) on this newsgroup!!??

There are people who tell me I am absolutely wrong when I tell them that restricting people from a RACES net should not be attributed to FCC Regulations, but to the discretion of that particular RACES organization. *Their* interpretation--and they maintain it no matter what--is that the FCC absolutely mandates that no one but a RACES person is allowed on a RACES net.

So, I was hoping that you would respond, completely unprovoked by my mentioning any prior history between you and I, and I am also curious to see what others' responses to the post will be.

It just points up the fact that we *all* (yeah, Jim/N2EY, *ALL* meaning majority/most) interpret the rules differently and that is our own personal decisions as to how we interpret them--*until* we are in front of the FCC.

Kim W5TIT

1846. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:53:11 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <2603584f2e35f8543cdb0b8bf7378600.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 41164

Ed, I hadn't even given that a thought. It makes a LOT of sense. I remember the ice storm in the North East a few years back ... I do recall there was a need for HF mobil amateur operators as power and telephone were out for hundreds of miles. FM on VHF/UHF makes sense for local operations, but there is nothing like digital to pass messages without error. A higher data rate would make a lot of sense. Sure, multiple hop long haul would not likely fare well, but on 80 meters over a distance of a couple of hundred miles, I would guess that signals would be reasonably stable and not as subject to phase shifting. It would be a heck of an opportunity to see just what COULD be done and certainly give a big edge when a relatively large disaster hits (such as 9/11). Great thought!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020419062533.08056.00004453@mb-cr.aol.com...

> From: "Black Silver" Black_Silver@earthlink.net
>
> >B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be set aside
> > as a new "Experimental Reservation" for non-traditional
> > and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized
> > image, and other "forward looking" communications methods.
>
> If this is implemented by the FCC, I would hope that it is done without the
> current data rate limitations that apply to the rest of HF. This would be an
> ideal place to allow higher-speed (translate: generally greater bandwidth) HF
> digital operation.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1847. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 00:56:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <R03w8.2416$X61.121825424@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41165

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:ft%v8.18770$3z3.1725376@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> >
> > Would you object to hams experimenting with coherent CW?
> >
>
> I'd have no objection as long as they didn't do it in a band segment
> reserved for new technologies.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Shees, Hans. Even Jesus lets whores in church.

Brian

1848. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 01:04:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <w83w8.2420$NG.120519750@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41167

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CBF901E.F6B746F4@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > The golden age of ham radio was when we could watch the VR-150's
> > > pulsate to the sound of our voices. :-)
> >
> > Is that anything like those antennas with the little light bulbs in the
tip
> > that they sell in the truck stops?
>
> I was once stopped on the coastal highway at night by a CA patrolman who
> accused me of having a red light on top of my antenna. The salt air was
> causing an orange corona when I transmitted. He said the glow was illegal
> because it was visible to oncoming traffic.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Any spoiled grape juice involved?

1849. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 01:05:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <V93w8.2422$yd1.122083694@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41168

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020419063014.08056.00004454@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Yeh, no kidding. So when the other services abandoned code use, did the
FCC
> >still require them to pass a Morse Code EXAM to get on HF?
>
> The FCC did not require a Morse code test for commercial HF access
before the
> other services abandoned code use.

This is even richer. Why not?

1850. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 01:10:34 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1ba652daa9caf3eb7182533c49c3686c.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 41169

Excellent, Hans. Some original thinking; a great idea.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1851. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 01:20:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Kn3w8.2435$Fh1.122237120@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41170

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3cbb33eb$1_1@news7.fast.net...
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CBAD059.37FF7718@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > "S. Hanrahan" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Yes, the ex-AA8DP.
> > > >
> > > > I knew him going back to early 1993, when I started checking into
the
> > > > 3905 Century Club WAS Net when I was still licensed as KB7PKE.
> > > >
> > > > He wasn't as radical then, but things started going downhill around
> > > > 1995. He didn't check in as often, and was often heard up the band
> > > > between 3930 and 3950.
> > >
> > > So what's he wanted for?
> > >
> > A host of weapons charges including emptying a 30 round magazine from
> > an automatic rifle into a highway patrol vehicle with the officer
> > hiding behind it. (attempted murder of a police officer)
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> Sure glad he's not a radical PCTA :-)
>
> Carl - wk3c

Should never have happened. He was code tested, after all. It screens out
stuff like this.

1852. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 02:04:13 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <x04w8.471$PX2.46521@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41171

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams can
use
> all of the bands for such experimentation.
>

The current rules (97.305(b)) contain the restriction that such
experimentation be only "brief periods". Would you design and
implement a new modulation scheme if you were restricted to
"brief periods" of test emission?

I wouldn't either, but I sure would be a lot more inclined to do the
design if I knew there was a small segment of the spectrum
where I and other tinkerers could meet for extended test, debug,
and prove-in of our ideas.

Or we could take the politically easy ARRL approach and just
shuffle some legacy-mode boundaries around while ignoring the
FCC plea (in WT Docket 98-143) regarding "implementation
of modern technologies into the amateur service.....before a
comprehensive restructuring of the amateur service operating
privileges and frequencies is undertaken".

Note carefully those FCC words ... "modern technologies" ...
"comprehensive restructuring" ... I think they were carefully
and deliberately chosen phrases. It shocks me that the ARRL
re-farming petition scarcely give lip service to the advancement
of technology, but whined pathetically about "critical overcrowding"
in the HF allocations.

73, Hans, K0HB

1853. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 03:23:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020419232344.10062.00001124@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 41173

In article <3cc0bc87_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>There are people who tell me I am absolutely wrong when I tell them that
>restricting people from a RACES net should not be attributed to FCC
>Regulations, but to the discretion of that particular RACES organization.
>*Their* interpretation--and they maintain it no matter what--is that the FCC
>absolutely mandates that no one but a RACES person is allowed on a RACES
>net.

Kim:

Which happens to be the truth. You yourself quoted the chapter(s)
of Part 97 that spell this out. Here it is again:

>Sec. 97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service.
> (a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed
>primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a
>civil defense organization as registered with that organization, or it
>is an FCC-licensed RACES station.

>So, I was hoping that you would respond, completely unprovoked by my
>mentioning any prior history between you and I, and I am also curious to see
>what others' responses to the post will be.

I didn't see Phil say anything that validated your position.

>It just points up the fact that we *all* (yeah, Jim/N2EY, *ALL* meaning
>majority/most) interpret the rules differently and that is our own personal
>decisions as to how we interpret them--*until* we are in front of the FCC.

In this case, the rules are so clear that there is really only one
interpretation. A RACES station is what the FCC says it is, and the local
civil defense officials who control RACES nets in any given area have
the FCC-mandated authority to limit participation in their nets only to
the local amateurs who are certified members of their organization.
This is crystal clear, not the least bit "gray," and is solidly enforceable.
The only people who would conceivably have a problem with this is
someone who can't break into the local RACES organization for one
reason or another, and is thus being denied another patch on their
official International Orange Ham Hero™ uniform jumpsuit.

Why would you want to be involved in RACES anyway? If you are
truly interested in local ham radio emergency communications service,
ARES is where the action should be.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1854. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 03:23:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020419232345.10062.00001125@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 41174

In article <3cbf844c_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

[My apologies for the lengthy quote.]

>PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents
>Subpart E--Providing Emergency Communications
>Sec. 97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service.
> (a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed
>primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a
>civil defense organization as registered with that organization, or it
>is an FCC-licensed RACES station. No person may be the control operator
>of a RACES station, or may be the control operator of an amateur station
>transmitting in RACES unless that person holds a FCC-issued amateur
>operator license and is certified by a civil defense organization as
>enrolled in that organization.
>
>and:
>
>(c) A RACES station may only communicate with:
> (1) Another RACES station;
> (2) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization;
> (3) A United States Government station authorized by the responsible
>agency to communicate with RACES stations;
> (4) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such
>communication is authorized by the FCC.
> (d) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization
>may only communicate with:
> (1) A RACES station licensed to the civil defense organization with
>which the amateur station is registered;
> (2) The following stations upon authorization of the responsible
>civil defense official for the organization with which the amateur
>station is registered:
> (i) A RACES station licensed to another civil defense organization;
> (ii) An amateur station registered with the same or another civil
>defense organization;
> (iii) A United States Government station authorized by the
>responsible agency to communicate with RACES stations; and
> (iv) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such
>communication is authorized by the FCC.
>
>Regarding (a), what do you all think? Can a RACES organization make its
>rules on whom may and may not transmit during their RACES nets?

Kim:

No, the FCC made the rule. You just quoted it. What a RACES
organization can do is to determine *which* stations may participate
in their nets, as a result of being duly authorized members of the
civil defense organization operating under the RACES rules.

> I have
>heard this debated all over the place and have RACES organizations here that
>allow "just anyone" to enter their nets; and those who allow no one but
>their own organization's participants. By "their own" I mean, literally,
>*only* those RACES stations who are authorized by the city in which they
>live/work.

That would seem to be a reasonable limitation. Remember, RACES is a
specialized adjunct to the Amateur Radio Service, and is dedicated solely
to emergency communications. RACES exists in order to permit State
and Federal civil defense agencies to intercommunicate with amateur
radio stations that are duly authorized members of their *local* civil
defense organization(s). It is a small, very unique, and highly
specialized aspect of the overall amateur radio emergency communications
capability. The majority of amateur radio emergency communications
falls under the ARES banner. RACES organizations have, by authority
of the FCC, the ability to limit participation in their local nets to only
locally
certified amateur radio operators, in addition to other authorized stations.

>Regarding (c)(2) and (4), does this mean that any amateur who with a civil
>defense organization--regardless of their affiliation with the particular
>RACES organization--can communicate/transmit on any RACES net?

Not the way I read it. A ham who is a certified RACES member in Buffalo, NY
would not be able to just join in on an ongoing RACES net operation in
Baltimore, MD just because he is a RACES member *somewhere* in the U.S.

>And, (4)
>pretty much covers any amateur at a station of the Red Cross, etc., right?

Only if that Red Cross amateur station is certified with the civil defense
organization with which it intends to communicate *as* a RACES station.

>So, what would be "legal" about a RACES net control saying to that person
>that they cannot enter the net because they are not recognized by that
>particular RACES organization.

The fact that the FCC specifically permits this limitation.

>Overall, if the R&R are to be followed, to the letter, is it OK for a RACES
>organization to allow anyone onto their nets?

No. They would only allow stations who are certified at their own local
level.

You seem to be looking for some kind of loophole through which to
drive your station into a RACES net, without actually *being* a certified
RACES station. I would suggest that it would be better for you to simply
operate within the rules. If you want to be a RACES station, then join

the local civil defense organization that runs RACES in your area, and go through their certification process. I would think that anyone with the extensive amateur radio emergency communications training that you claim to have should instinctively know this.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1855. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 03:23:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020419232346.10062.00001126@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 41172

In article <f8Kv8.5237$Cq5.114222320@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>Yeh, no kidding. So when the other services abandoned code use, did the FCC
>still require them to pass a Morse Code EXAM to get on HF?
>
>> BTW -- would I be able to "double dip" and receive my GS-7/9
>> payments in addition to my military retirement?
>
>Yep, enlisted retired pay is so low that even that added to GS-7 pay is
>pretty pathetic.

Brian:

Well, you ought to know all about that!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1856. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 03:52:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC0E5F3.D47E31EE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41175

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> You have proved yourself incapable of reading plaing language English.
>
> >My advice to you, Dick, is to avoid 'plaing English' from now on.
> >Where the heck did you learn 'plaing English' anyway?
>
> Isn't going after what is pretty clearly a fumble-finger typo pretty petty?

Remember that Dick has recently said he means exactly what he says,
no more and no less.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1857. Re: Birthplace of NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 03:56:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC0E6DA.47BE4B52@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41176

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > I was once stopped on the coastal highway at night by a CA patrolman who
> > accused me of having a red light on top of my antenna. The salt air was
> > causing an orange corona when I transmitted. He said the glow was illegal
> > because it was visible to oncoming traffic.
>
> Any spoiled grape juice involved?

Nope, I had been SCUBA diving.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1858. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 04:39:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420003915.19503.00000843@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 41177

In article <20020419063014.08056.00004454@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>Yeh, no kidding. So when the other services abandoned code use, did the FCC
>>still require them to pass a Morse Code EXAM to get on HF?
>
>The FCC did not require a Morse code test for commercial HF access *before*
>the other services abandoned code use.

Ed, some commercial HF-access radio services did require
morse code test license exams. That depended on the kind of
commercial radio service. Maritime radio is an example.

1859. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 05:20:27 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <uiu1cukmhq8q02hnv9lob86rtmcb91gvb6@4ax.com>
Source record: 41178

On Fri, 19 Apr 2002 19:18:03 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:c33vbusb01rvkjnb2du0lvk6g6fpldaq79@4ax.com...
>>
>> I choose to have fun with people who think that all that they have to
>> talk about is the quality of other people's radio conversations. If
>> it's not illegal, it's ok with me. If I'm not interested, I'm not
>> required to listen. There are some who think that freedom of speech
>> is great so long as people only talk about things that they want them
>> to talk about.
>>
>
>Yeah, there are *those* kind of people.

Sounds like you should know.
>
>>
>> Be careful how you use the term "knobs." With a call sign of "TIT"
>> there could be some kind of an innuendo in there somewhere.
>>
>
>If there is for you...well...

There must be for you too.
>
>>
>> I'm back to lurking, but you are really very funny. With a little
>> work you could become a comedian.
>>
>
>Being a comedian is much harder than that.
>
>Kim W5TIT

See, there you go with innuendos again.

1860. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 05:44:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CC10020.25CE2A38@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41179

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
>
>

Only if operated mobile from a paratransit bus by
the busdriver..... :-)

1861. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 05:48:22 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CC10126.310D335D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41180

W1RFI wrote:

>
>
> Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)
>

There's some sub-bands reserved for radio astronomy, where
no one is allowed to transmit. So no interference to astronomers
observing natural radio emissions from deep space.

1862. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 06:45:40 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204200641040.22489-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41181

On Fri, 19 Apr 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Fri, 19 Apr 2002 18:09:22 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>>RACES is one of the things REMOVED by the April 15, 2000 changes.
>
> RACES was not removed, onmly separately-identigied RACES stations
> licensed to the Emergency Management agencies
>
>>In 8 years (maximum), there will be no RACES stations because all their
>>licenses will have expired out.
>
> And the RACES operations and "stations" will be remain but will be
> licensed to participating amateur radio operators rather than to the
> RACES entity.
>
> Just a different coat of paint.

The fact that they won't have their own license anymore is more than "a different coat of paint." It's non-existance.

There will be little difference between a former races organization and ANY radio club which volunteers in disasters - except that the radio club may have its OWN license while the races organization can't.

Without a license, it's a disavowed entity type.

It would be like our recent restructuring but not allowing novice licensees to renew: The HF subbands would still be there, but (ignoring Tech+HF for the moment) there would be no one for which those rules would apply to.

1863. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 06:55:15 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204200649540.22489-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41182

On 20 Apr 2002, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>There are people who tell me I am absolutely wrong when I tell them that
>>restricting people from a RACES net should not be attributed to FCC
>>Regulations, but to the discretion of that particular RACES organization.
>>*Their* interpretation--and they maintain it no matter what--is that the FCC
>>absolutely mandates that no one but a RACES person is allowed on a RACES
>>net.
>
>Which happens to be the truth. You yourself quoted the chapter(s)
>of Part 97 that spell this out. Here it is again:
>
>>Sec. 97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service.
>> (a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed
>>primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a
>>civil defense organization as registered with that organization, or it
>>is an FCC-licensed RACES station.
>
>>So, I was hoping that you would respond, completely unprovoked by my
>>mentioning any prior history between you and I, and I am also curious to see
>>what others' responses to the post will be.
>
>I didn't see Phil say anything that validated your position.
>
>>It just points up the fact that we *all* (yeah, Jim/N2EY, *ALL* meaning
>>majority/most) interpret the rules differently and that is our own personal
>>decisions as to how we interpret them--*until* we are in front of the FCC.
>
>In this case, the rules are so clear that there is really only one
>interpretation. A RACES station is what the FCC says it is, and the local
>civil defense officials who control RACES nets in any given area have
>the FCC-mandated authority to limit participation in their nets only to
>the local amateurs who are certified members of their organization.
>This is crystal clear, not the least bit "gray," and is solidly enforceable.
>The only people who would conceivably have a problem with this is
>someone who can't break into the local RACES organization for one
>reason or another, and is thus being denied another patch on their
>official International Orange Ham Hero™ uniform jumpsuit.
>
>Why would you want to be involved in RACES anyway? If you are
>truly interested in local ham radio emergency communications service,
>ARES is where the action should be.

ARES is the ARRL's delusion that they are doing something helpful. There is no
guarentee that anyone in ARES has contact to any emergency organization.

RACES was organized directly by the local governments, presumedly directly under the agencies which would be providing emergency assistance. Direct oversight guarenteed contact with government (or other aid organizations).

1864. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 09:18:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420051855.22569.00000950@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 41184

In article <3cc0af28_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
>news:LJYv8.18458$3z3.1699579@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>[snip]
>>
>> > >> Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
>> >
>> > >No.
>> >
>> > Why not?
>> >
>>
>> Because I envision these sub-bands to be a reservation for
>> experimenters. I'd like them to gain the reputation of "come
>> here to tinker with your new idea", to arouse the curiosity
>> of "tuners by", and to be a place where we can proudly point
>> when regulators ask "what are you hams doing to advance
>> the art". I don't want any legacy modes in sight.
>>
>> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
>I assume from his comments that Hans would prohibit ALL
>"legacy" modes from these small segments of spectrum, not
>just Morse, but (conventional) RTTY, SSTV, SSB, AM, et al ...

That's how I read it too. Not only those modes - PSK31, coherent CW,
MFSK, Hellschrieber, PACTOR I and II all qualify as "legacy" modes under
Hans' proposal. None of them would be allowed in those subbands.
>
>From a philosophical point of view, that would seem fair, but
>I have a problem with it ... I made a pledge that I would not
>seek to, nor support a move to, restrict Morse usage ... and
>I will stick to that pledge.
>
Glad to hear it.

>I can support ALMOST all of Hans' proposal (it's certainly
>MUCH better than the ARRL's proposal for the use of those
>slivers of spectrum), but I can't support the "no Morse allowed"
>part ... I gave my word.

BRAVO!

>However, I would hope that the Morse folks would "give new
>things a chance" and honor a gentleman's agreement, as Jim proposed ...

At least as well as on the 'phone subbands.

There are also practical angles to all of this.

Suppose we wish to try out a new mode - say, some sort of PSK-based digital voice. (Let's not bog down in the new mode's details). I can imagine all sorts of situations where it would be useful to first establish contact on, say, PSK31, then switch over to the new mode on the same frequency using the same rig/antenna setup. With SDRs this would be a natural way to do things. Direct A/B comparisons between modulation and encoding schemes could be very useful - but only if they could be used in the digital subbands. Ruling out all but "new" modes from the subbands would hamper such things. Not good. Requiring auto-power-control would effectively prohibit almost all of the existing common amateur digital modes (like PSK31) from the subbands. Again, not good.

FCC is looking to simplify the rules, not complicate them. So how about this:

1) Phone bands stay as they are.
2) Existing Novices and Tech Pluses get access to all the non-phone non-Extra HF/MF amateur spectrum with the same power as today (nobody loses)
3) The 80, 40 and 15 meter "Novice" bands become the "digital" subbands. All modes allowed except analog voice and image. The current bandwidth/data rate/symbol rate regs do not apply in those subbands. Want to develop "PSK10" or "Pactor 3" or digital voice? Have at it!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1865. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 09:18:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420051857.22569.00000951@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 41183

In article <3cc0ad4d_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>"K0HB" wrote:

>> >"N2EY" wrote
>>
>> >> Does this mean on all HF/MF maateur bands, or just 80/40/15/10? (I
>> >> favor the former).

>> >All HF/MF bands.

>> I agree 100%. Many hams are stymied in their attempts to get on HF by
>antenna,
>> rig and/or time-of-day problems.

>> >> Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
>>
>> >No.
>>
>> Why not?
>>
>> Having a "no CW" subband on HF/MF sets a very bad precedent and
>complicates the
>> rules unnecessarily.
>
>Hans said it NOT me ... remember that ...

Frankly, I was shocked at this part of the idea.
>
>> Better to simply set up those subbands as "digital" and say that casual CW
>use
>> is against the bandplan, same as the 'phone subbands. How much actual CW
>use do
>> you hear on the HF phone subbands?

I hear almost none. But CW can be used on the 'phone bands in the occasional
situation where it is needed.

>> Overall, a great idea that needs a few minor tweaks.

>>Much better than simply
>> widening the 'phone subbands, squeezing the digital and CW folks still
>> more, and continuing to restrict digital data rates.
>
>I think the idea is to NOT artificially restrict digital data rates ... why

>the
>heck would you want to do that???

I don't want to limit digital mode data rate in the proposed digital subbands.
Sorry if it wasn't clear.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1866. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 11:02:26 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.20.07.02.25.925806.26664@arrl.org>
Source record: 41185

On Fri, 19 Apr 2002 22:04:13 -0400, K0HB wrote:

> The current rules (97.305(b)) contain the restriction that such
> experimentation be only "brief periods". Would you design and implement
> a new modulation scheme if you were restricted to "brief periods" of
> test emission?

I wouldn't, but the "test" emissions the FCC's talking about in 97.305(b) are defined in 97.3(c)(9) as "emissions containing no information having the designators with N as the third symbol." Hard to see how the 97.305(b) restriction on such emissions would actually keep anyone from desigining and implementing a new modulation scheme.

> I wouldn't either, but I sure would be a lot more inclined to do the
> design if I knew there was a small segment of the spectrum where I and
> other tinkerers could meet for extended test, debug, and prove-in of our
> ideas.

There is such a segment of the spectrum. It's called the ham bands. People have been using it for years to meet for extended test, debug, and prove-in of ideas.

If there is insufficient experimentation in ham radio it's not because hams lack a dedicated subband in which to experiement.

Jon, KE3Z

1867. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 12:06:48 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc159c5.6703968@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41186

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 01:48:22 -0400, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>
>
>W1RFI wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)
>>
>
>There's some sub-bands reserved for radio astronomy, where
>no one is allowed to transmit. So no interference to astronomers
>observing natural radio emissions from deep space.

It's called, "The DX Window" :)

AA7YA

1868. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 12:40:59 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc161bc.8743478@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41187

On Tue, 16 Apr 2002 21:15:18 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020416081740.01968.00003582@mb-df.aol.com...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >>then I'll answer with: I don't
>> >> know.
>>
>> >OK, then. Simple question, simple answer.
>>
>> Well, it really isn't that simple.
>>
>> Kim, I am curious too... you said that the mode you used on 30 meters was
>> neither CW nor digital. Then what mode was it?
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>
>That was actually a snied comment. I actually have no idea if I've ever
>been on 30...I don't think I have, since 30 meters is strictly digital, is
>it not? I haven't done any digital.
>

OK, so you don't log contacts either.

>Kim W5TIT

1869. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 12:41:45 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc161e5.8784487@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41188

On 17 Apr 2002 10:34:02 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>From: "W5TIT - Kim"
>
>>I don't think I have, since 30 meters is strictly digital, is
>>it not? I haven't done any digital.
>
>You could have said that about 10 exchanges ago, Kim.

Or she could have said "most" instead of "all" bands.

>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Stacey, AA7YA

1870. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 12:45:17 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc16368$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41189

Oh no...another kid in the sandbox...

Kim W5TIT

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:uiu1cukmhq8q02hnv9lob86rtmcb91gvb6@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 19 Apr 2002 19:18:03 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:c33vbusb01rvkjnb2du0lvk6g6fpldaq79@4ax.com...
> >>
> >> I choose to have fun with people who think that all that they have to
> >> talk about is the quality of other people's radio conversations. If
> >> it's not illegal, it's ok with me. If I'm not interested, I'm not
> >> required to listen. There are some who think that freedom of speech
> >> is great so long as people only talk about things that they want them
> >> to talk about.
> >>
> >
> >Yeah, there are *those* kind of people.
>
> Sounds like you should know.
> >
> >>
> >> Be careful how you use the term "knobs." With a call sign of "TIT"
> >> there could be some kind of an innuendo in there somewhere.
> >>
> >
> >If there is for you...well...
>
> There must be for you too.
> >
> >>
> >> I'm back to lurking, but you are really very funny. With a little
> >> work you could become a comedian.
> >>
> >
> >Being a comedian is much harder than that.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> See, there you go with innuendos again.
>

1871. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 12:51:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc164e1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41190

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020419232344.10062.00001124@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3cc0bc87_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >There are people who tell me I am absolutely wrong when I tell them that
> >restricting people from a RACES net should not be attributed to FCC
> >Regulations, but to the discretion of that particular RACES organization.
> >*Their* interpretation--and they maintain it no matter what--is that the
FCC
> >absolutely mandates that no one but a RACES person is allowed on a RACES
> >net.
>
> Kim:
>
> Which happens to be the truth. You yourself quoted the chapter(s)
> of Part 97 that spell this out. Here it is again:
>
> >Sec. 97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service.
> > (a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed
> >primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a
> >civil defense organization as registered with that organization, or it
> >is an FCC-licensed RACES station.
>
> >So, I was hoping that you would respond, completely unprovoked by my
> >mentioning any prior history between you and I, and I am also curious to
see
> >what others' responses to the post will be.
>
> I didn't see Phil say anything that validated your position.
>
> >It just points up the fact that we *all* (yeah, Jim/N2EY, *ALL* meaning
> >majority/most) interpret the rules differently and that is our own
personal
> >decisions as to how we interpret them--*until* we are in front of the
FCC.
>
> In this case, the rules are so clear that there is really only one
> interpretation. A RACES station is what the FCC says it is, and the local
> civil defense officials who control RACES nets in any given area have
> the FCC-mandated authority to limit participation in their nets only to
> the local amateurs who are certified members of their organization.
> This is crystal clear, not the least bit "gray," and is solidly
enforceable.

> The only people who would conceivably have a problem with this is
> someone who can't break into the local RACES organization for one
> reason or another, and is thus being denied another patch on their
> official International Orange Ham HeroT uniform jumpsuit.
>
> Why would you want to be involved in RACES anyway? If you are
> truly interested in local ham radio emergency communications service,
> ARES is where the action should be.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Larry, you are the mutually exclusive personality here, not me. I don't care what emergency communication group there is. Also, since you didn't get it, there are people who will argue that the FCC R&R are clear that only *RACES* stations may be on a *RACES* net. I think the R&R are quite clear in stating that is not true--that it is up to the individual RACES officials as to how they wish to run their nets.

Kim W5TIT

1872. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 13:08:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc168e0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41194

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020419232345.10062.00001125@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3cbf844c_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Regarding (a), what do you all think? Can a RACES organization make its
> >rules on whom may and may not transmit during their RACES nets?
>
> Kim:
>
> No, the FCC made the rule. You just quoted it. What a RACES
> organization can do is to determine *which* stations may participate
> in their nets, as a result of being duly authorized members of the
> civil defense organization operating under the RACES rules.
>
> > I have
> >heard this debated all over the place and have RACES organizations here
that
> >allow "just anyone" to enter their nets; and those who allow no one but
> >their own organization's participants. By "their own" I mean, literally,
> >*only* those RACES stations who are authorized by the city in which they
> >live/work.
>
> That would seem to be a reasonable limitation. Remember, RACES is a
> specialized adjunct to the Amateur Radio Service, and is dedicated solely
> to emergency communications.
>

You're hilarious, Larry. You say the above, yet you also say in another
post:

"Why would you want to be involved in RACES anyway? If you are
truly interested in local ham radio emergency communications service,
ARES is where the action should be."

>
> The majority of amateur radio emergency communications
> falls under the ARES banner.
>

Maybe in *your* area that is true. In the immediate area of the City of
Dallas/Dallas County, there are no ARES organizations at all. Here in
Kaufman County, we are a RACES County; in Parker County emergency
communication is provided by ARES; Denton County is ARES (I think); Tarrant

County (Ft. Worth) is RACES; Ellis County is RACES. RACES provides the
majority of amateur radio emergency communication here.

>
> RACES organizations have, by authority
> of the FCC, the ability to limit participation in their local nets to only
> locally certified amateur radio operators, in addition to other authorized
> stations.
>

That's what I also believe the R&R to say. However, there are folks who
will argue that RACES organizations have *no* authority to allow "other
authorized stations" onto their nets.

> >
> >Regarding (c)(2) and (4), does this mean that any amateur who with a
civil
> >defense organization--regardless of their affiliation with the particular
> >RACES organization--can communicate/transmit on any RACES net?
>
> Not the way I read it. A ham who is a certified RACES member in Buffalo,
NY
> would not be able to just join in on an ongoing RACES net operation in
> Baltimore, MD just because he is a RACES member *somewhere* in the U.S.
>

And, I am on the other side of that argument, Larry. I believe the FCC R&R
say with implication that a RACES official of any RACES organization can
make the decision to allow, or not, any station identifying themselves as a
RACES station--regardless of affiliation. I believe the FCC R&R go even
further in that a RACES official can make the decision to allow *any* legal
station onto their net.

And, here's the kicker: if you believe as you do, above, then there are
RACES organizations all over the US who are operating illegally during nets.
Our own Hunt County here in Texas will accept any station who identifies
themselves as RACES. If I wish to enter a Hunt County RACES net, I key up
and identify as "W5TIT, Kaufman County RACES." Hunt County also allows
any station onto their RACES nets, although this is less common as not
many people are willing to travel to the "boondocks" for the sake of normal
storm spotting.

>
> >So, what would be "legal" about a RACES net control saying to that person
> >that they cannot enter the net because they are not recognized by that
> >particular RACES organization.
>
> The fact that the FCC specifically permits this limitation.
>

I don't think so. And, I think Phil's post backs that up.

> >
> >Overall, if the R&R are to be followed, to the letter, is it OK for a
RACES
> >organization to allow anyone onto their nets?
>
> No. They would only allow stations who are certified at their own local
> level.
>

Then, as I said, there are RACES organizations all over the US operating
illegally.

>
> You seem to be looking for some kind of loophole through which to
> drive your station into a RACES net, without actually *being* a certified
> RACES station.
>

If you're speaking of me, personally, hardly. I am already a member of two
RACES organizations (Kaufman and Hunt). What my end of the debate stems
from is in being as accurate as we can, as amateurs, when we say stuff on
the air. For an official RACES net control to specifically state that it is
because of FCC R&R that they do not allow other non-RACES stations onto
their net is a bit of stretch to me.

>
> I would suggest that it would be better for you to simply
> operate within the rules. If you want to be a RACES station, then join
> the local civil defense organization that runs RACES in your area, and
> go through their certification process. I would think that anyone with the
> extensive amateur radio emergency communications training that you
> claim to have should instinctively know this.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And, Larry, you instinctively act like an ass every time you post
something...

Kim W5TIT

1873. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 13:18:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420091800.29940.00000544@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 41191

In article <20020419202314.06885.00004554@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Isn't going after what is pretty clearly a fumble-finger typo pretty petty?

You're comparting apples and oranges there, Ed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1874. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 13:18:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420091801.29940.00000545@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 41192

In article <3cc0b7e3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:3CBFE20E.70864BB2@earthlink.net...
>>
>> Jim hasn't set the definition of the term "all HF bands". The phrase
>> can only mean one thing. If you are the only person who feels that she
>> can leave out a band or two and still claimed to have been active on
>> "all HF bands", you are the one with the problem of definition. Let's
>> take your travel analogy: If you claimed to have visited every state
>> and it happened to come out later that you meant that you'd been to all
>> of 'em except Missouri, Alaska and Hawaii, your statement would have
>> blown up in your face. When you state that you've operated on "all HF
>> bands" but you mean "most HF bands", your statement has blown up in your
>> face. I trust my explanation is sufficient.
>
>Ah, OK, back to the matter of semantics again.

Actually, it's a matter of definitions.

> Maybe you've got the time to
>be that analytical, Dave...and maybe Jim does, too.

But you do not? Sure seems odd, given the volume of your postings here, Kim.

>However, I think most
>of us would be able to ascertain that, when someone says they have worked
>all bands or been on all bands, they're probably either bored as

[expletive deleted]

>or they probably mean *most.*

NO. "All" means "each and every" or "the complete set". If even one thing is
left out, "all" does not apply.
That's not just my definition.

I don't know anybody except Kim that would take "all" to mean "most".

>I'll try to remember that you and a couple of
>others are so anal that you've got to have your things inside the box...

How about just using plain English, Kim, like the rest of us?

>> > You keep clinging to your semantics, you and Jim. It's your dislike of
>> > someone that determines your attitude...not the content of their
>material.

>>
>> I don't know about clinging to semantics, Kim but semantics are
>> important and can't be simply tossed aside. You could make an effort to
>> make your statements factual to begin with. That would have made it
>> possible to avoid the game of dodge ball you played when questioned
>> about what mode you used on 30 meters.

>Don't flatter yourself, Dave. Why in the world would someone be concerned
>about dodging a question about 30M?

Then why did you dodge it for about a week?

>The only thing I can tell you about
>that band is that I *think* it is an all digital band. So, when the
>question arose, I knew I had not been on that band--as I know I've never
>done any digital work.

Then why not just say so?

>Here, while we're at it, I'll even mention that the
>only VHF/UHF bands I've been on are 2M and 70cm. So, get your little ink
>pen out and figure out what anal comments you can make now...

Sounds like Kim is angry, Dave.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1875. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 13:18:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420091802.29940.00000546@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 41193

In article <3cc0ba05_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020419071752.08742.00000449@mb-mj.aol.com...
>>
>> As I have written before:
>>
>> The conversation was about the HF amateur bands. You claimed to have "
>been on
>> all bands, lots of times".
>
>Is that a direct quote, Jim?

Here's a direct quote:

BEGIN DIRECT QUOTE:

In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>Anyway, the
>reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is I've
>done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.

END DIRECT QUOTE

>> Just the generally-agreed upon ones. "Traveled a lot" is pretty vague.
>>"All HF
>> amateur bands" is well-defined. It means 80, 40, 30, 20, 17, 15, 12, and
>>10
>> meters. Some people even include 160, but 160 is actually an MF band.

>
>The reason I asked if it was a direct quote is because on one hand you say "
>been on all bands, lots of times," yet the next paragraph--the one right
>above--you state "All HF amateur bands," so which is it?

The context of the conversation was the amateur HF bands. I'm cutting you a
break by not holding you to the literal meaning of all bands.

>> >Just as Jim wants me to meet his definition of "all"
>> >in all bands.

>> Not my definition. The generally accepted definition. "All" as in "each
>>and
>> every, no exceptions"

>I think, as usual Jim, you are having a nut over semantics.

I have no idea what "having a nut" means.

But I do know what the definition of "all" is.

>> > Like I said, my all is different from his all.
>>
>> And different from everyone else's "all"

>> >Wonder why he
>> >didn't choose any of the Ghz stuff (I've never been there, either), and
>> >there's probably lots of other bands I've never been on.

>> Because the context was HF amateur bands.
>
>I don't know, Jim, you seem pretty confused above.

Not me.

> See...there is an
>advantage to being vague and unprecise. At least I don't become confused
>about what I said. You obviously have.

Nope. See the direct quote, above.

>> >You keep clinging to your semantics, you and Jim.

>> That's a good thing.

>> >It's your dislike of
>> >someone that determines your attitude...not the content of their
>material.
>>
>> Just the opposite. It's the content of your material that determines our
>> attitude.
>>
>> You post things that appear to be incorrect. When questioned on the
>details you
>> get angry at the questioner for even daring to point out that you might
>have
>> made a mistake, or written something that doesn't make sense.

>Uh, Jim.

Yes?

> Before you start saying things like "you post things that appear
>to be incorrect" and "when questioned on the details," you need to be able
>to figger things out first, K?

I have no idea what "K" is supposed to mean in that sentence.

But I have figured out that you sometimes sometimes post here without careful
consideration of the meaning of what you write, or of possible mistakes and
contradictions. Then when these things are pointed out, you argue with the

person who pointed them out. It's called "blaming the messenger". Often your attacks degrade into making fun of people's names, age, etc.
>
>As to being angry? Do you really think my life is *that* simple?

Sure seems like it.

You took about a week and several go-arounds to answer a very simple question ("What mode did you use on 30 meters?" - exact quote) rather than simply saying 'I don't remember' or 'I've never been on 30 meters'.

I could also mention that back on January 3 of this year you wrote that you had never been on any amateur band below 25 MHz, but that's old stuff.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1876. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 13:18:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc16b24_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41195

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0204200641040.22489-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >
> > And the RACES operations and "stations" will be remain but will be
> > licensed to participating amateur radio operators rather than to the
> > RACES entity.
> >
> > Just a different coat of paint.
>
> The fact that they won't have their own license anymore is more than "a
> different coat of paint." It's non-existance.
>

No, that is not true. The only thing that has changed is that there will no more RACES station licenses, and that is it. There will continue to be City, State, and County civil defense organizations who include RACES in their regimen for emergency response operations. There will continue to be RACES organizations and they will continue to operate under the same R&R as always. And, FEMA will continue to be the "mother" organization of RACES.

>
> There will be little difference between a former races organization and
ANY
> radio club which volunteers in disasters - except that the radio club may
have
> its OWN license while the races organization can't.
>

That exists now, thanks to the hard work of many amateurs. There are harline RACES folks and hardline ARES folks, but the truth is that the two organizations have actually been hard to distinguish over the last few years...as emergency communication in amateur radio has begun to take itself more seriously. There are still the folks who love the label "wannabe," but they are also on the fringe of most ham radio organizations anyway.

>
> Without a license, it's a disavowed entity type.
>

THAT is sooooo wrong. You are absolutely wrong in your assessment of this. As stated, the *only* thing that is changing is that the FCC will issue no more RACES station licenses. That's it, nothing more. To say what you said above is to also say that Restructuring was the end of ham radio. Maybe you are one of those people who believes that, but you couldn't be further from the truth.

>
> It would be like our recent restructuring but not allowing novice
licensees to
> renew: The HF subbands would still be there, but (ignoring Tech+HF for
the
> moment) there would be no one for which those rules would apply to.
>

Ya can't "ignore" something that is there just to make your statement true. And refarming of bands isn't quite the same as saying something won't exist any more...hardly so. I challenge you to write to any Emergency Operations officials of your city, state, or county, and ask them if they will be changing a thing about their RACES organization. In fact, I don't care if you write to any or all city, state, or county organizations. You'll get the answer that they will continue as always...either RACES or ARES...whichever the case may be. And, in some really progressive and politically benign areas, both!

Kim W5TIT

1877. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 13:20:54 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc16bbd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41196

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc161bc.8743478@news.montanavision.net...
> On Tue, 16 Apr 2002 21:15:18 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
> >
> >That was actually a snied comment. I actually have no idea if I've ever
> >been on 30...I don't think I have, since 30 meters is strictly digital,
is
> >it not? I haven't done any digital.
> >
>
> OK, so you don't log contacts either.
>
> >Kim W5TIT
>

Nope, never have...except for on Field Day. Don't do QSL cards, either. I
know I "got them" and, for me, that's enough.

Kim W5TIT

1878. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 13:30:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc16df1$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41197

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc161e5.8784487@news.montanavision.net...
> On 17 Apr 2002 10:34:02 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim"
> >
> >>I don't think I have, since 30 meters is strictly digital, is
> >>it not? I haven't done any digital.
> >
> >You could have said that about 10 exchanges ago, Kim.
>
> Or she could have said "most" instead of "all" bands.
>
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Stacey, AA7YA
>
>

Then, you don't know Jim very well. Jim probably has a predetermined percentage that, for him, defines "most." Here's some other alls I've done:

I have worked all my life
I have traveled all my life
I like all stormy weather
I like all animals
I like all people
I like all little babies
I like all nature scents

Like most of us, Stacey, I am sure you are capable of automatically knowing that, when someone says they have "worked all their life," they don't mean even when they were an infant and small child. I am certain that when someone says they have traveled "all their life," you don't take that to mean they've never stopped traveling.

Most of us, Stacey, don't hold each other to the fire whenever we make comments. If you said to me, "I have worked all bands" it would never even cross my mind to even question your definition of that. Unless, as is the case with Jim, you were one of those people I don't like. Don't know how long you've been reading the newsgroup, but you'll see that when all else fails and we just plain don't like someone or what they said, people get their dictionaries, slide rules, and thesauruses out.

Kim W5TIT

1879. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 13:49:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC171D7.3FA20244@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41198

N2EY wrote:
> 1) Phone bands stay as they are.
> 2) Existing Novices and Tech Pluses get access to all the non-phone non-Extra
> HF/MF amateur spectrum with the same power as today (nobody loses)
> 3) The 80, 40 and 15 meter "Novice" bands become the "digital" subbands. All
> modes allowed except analog voice and image. The current bandwidth/data
> rate/symbol rate regs do not apply in those subbands. Want to develop "PSK10"
> or "Pactor 3" or digital voice? Have at it!

Sounds good to me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1880. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 13:58:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC17417.BAB50B90@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41199

N2EY wrote:
> "All" means "each and every" or "the complete set". If even one thing is
> left out, "all" does not apply.

If Kim had said that her high school boyfriend was "all hands",
would you have disagreed with her statement?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1881. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 14:06:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420100621.06600.00001040@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 41200

In article <20020419201445.06885.00004549@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>If a rig must have certain features, such as automatic power control, in
>>order
>>to be used in those subbands, how is that feature to be guaranteed without
>>type
>>acceptance?
>
>I don't believe that any equipment is still type accepted today. Most
>intentional emitters are certificated. The exception to that is most ham
>equipment. Of the amateur transmitting equipment, only HF/6M amplifiers must
>be certificated.

"Type accepted" was not the right choice of words. I apologize for not being
more
clear.

Here's my concern:

Part of Hans' proposal would require automatic power-level control as part of any mode used in the proposed "experimental" subbands. This would effectively ban almost all modes now used by hams on HF/MF. Most of the equipment now used by hams on HF/MF would also be banned from use in those subbands, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1882. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 14:10:15 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc1765d.14024547@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41101

On Fri, 12 Apr 2002 11:04:41 -0400, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:3CB66934.7EA9E7A4@ix.netcom.com...
>>
>>
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >
>> > What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>>
>> CW in a QSO with Larry? :-)
>>
>> I suppose an extra never needs a control op. Unless
>> it's a courtesy to the person whose' station you are a
>> guest at.
>
>Correct. Even a tech, if operating within the confines
>of the tech's permitted frequencies and modes doesn't need
>a control op.

Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.

Stacey, AA7YA

1883. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 14:25:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <WTew8.2926$E62.144202120@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41102

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc159c5.6703968@news.montanavision.net...
> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 01:48:22 -0400, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >W1RFI wrote:
> >
> >>
> >>
> >> Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)
> >>
> >
> >There's some sub-bands reserved for radio astronomy, where
> >no one is allowed to transmit. So no interference to astronomers
> >observing natural radio emissions from deep space.
>
> It's called, "The DX Window" :)
>
> AA7YA

Actually, it would have to be an "atmospheric window" where water vapor and
other constituents of the earth's atmosphere don't attenuate it too much.

1884. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 14:28:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FWew8.2929$uZ1.143804428@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41103

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CC10020.25CE2A38@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Would CW still be allowed in those segments?
> >
> >
>
> Only if operated mobile from a paratransit bus by
> the busdriver..... :-)
>
>
Don't bring Larry into this.

1885. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 14:29:24 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc177b7.14371247@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41104

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 08:30:19 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Then, you don't know Jim very well. Jim probably has a predetermined
>percentage that, for him, defines "most." Here's some other alls I've done:

Shouldn't matter whether I know Jim or not. What matters is, I know
the difference between the meaning of "all" and "most". Most of
-all-, I know what mode(s) are used on 30 meters, you have yet to
demonstrate you have knowledge of that, without dodging the question,
"what mode did you operate on 30 meters?"

>I have worked all my life
>I have traveled all my life
>I like all stormy weather
>I like all animals
>I like all people
>I like all little babies
>I like all nature scents
>
>Like most of us, Stacey, I am sure you are capable of automatically knowing
>that, when someone says they have "worked all their life," they don't mean
>even when they were an infant and small child. I am certain that when
>someone says they have traveled "all their life," you don't take that to
>mean they've never stopped traveling.

Then you should have said "I've operated on most of the HF bands",
instead of saying "all". "All" and "most" don't mean the same thing,
as you've pointed out above.

That's why there's an award called "Worked ALL States Awared", not
"Worked Some Of The States Award" or "Most Of The States".

>
>Most of us, Stacey, don't hold each other to the fire whenever we make
>comments. If you said to me, "I have worked all bands" it would never even
>cross my mind to even question your definition of that. Unless, as is the
>case with Jim, you were one of those people I don't like. Don't know how
>long you've been reading the newsgroup, but you'll see that when all else
>fails and we just plain don't like someone or what they said, people get
>their dictionaries, slide rules, and thesauruses out.

If you can't answer a simple question, be prepared to be held to the
fire.

Since I don't have an antenna for 160 meters, I don't go on ham radio
newsgroups saying I've "worked all bands", and dodge and weave for a

week when asked "What mode did you operate on 30 meters?".

Stacey, AA7YA

1886. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 14:34:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_%ew8.2931$Ba2.144370069@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41105

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020419232346.10062.00001126@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <f8Kv8.5237$Cq5.114222320@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >Yeh, no kidding. So when the other services abandoned code use, did the
FCC
> >still require them to pass a Morse Code EXAM to get on HF?
> >
> >> BTW -- would I be able to "double dip" and receive my GS-7/9
> >> payments in addition to my military retirement?
> >
> >Yep, enlisted retired pay is so low that even that added to GS-7 pay is
> >pretty pathetic.
>
> Brian:
>
> Well, you ought to know all about that!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Welp, that's why I'm no longer with the Corp's of Engineers. You on the
other hand can keep driving your bus to the bank. Verrry lucrative, HA!

1887. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 14:48:42 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <anv2cuo4n15rn80igods6ihm7qcj8l6upl@4ax.com>
Source record: 41106

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 07:45:17 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Oh no...another kid in the sandbox...

Well, you know, if you would stop the innuendos, you wouldn't have
that problem. I hope you don't do the same thing on the radio. That
would be just awful. What if children were listening to daddy's
scanner and overheard you?

Please remember, innuendo is actually created in the mind of the
listener. If you want to lambast someone's radio conversations, try
doing it on what they actually said and not what your own deviant
little mind cooked up or what you wish they had said.

Otherwise, i'll just keep laughing at you.

1888. Re: FCC Requires Positioning Coordinates?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 15:28:10 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc188d1.18749802@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41107

On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 07:57:35 GMT, "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net>
wrote:

>I don't know how many of you go to www.QRZ.com, but when you lookup a
>callsign in their database, it indicates coordinates of the location. Does
>anyone know how they figure what these coordinates are and how accurate.
>I'm wondering if the FCC requires or mandates it, or if QRZ just adds it
>based on the address of the applicant.
>
>Lars
>
>

QRZ adds it based on the address of the applicant. Although, if you
did a search on my callsign, it puts you smack dab in the middle of
the town where my post office box is, and not over the physical QTH.

Stacey, AA7YA

1889. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 15:34:35 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc18a45.19122288@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41108

On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 16:11:46 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>
>"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
>news:WhSs8.2740$Tg.1193133161@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
>> Does anyone know what additional capabilities or privileges a "Tech
>Plus" or
>> "Advanced" license holder has compared to "Technician"?
>>
>> Lars
>>
>>
>
>The Tech PLus itself is no longer issued but you can get the privleges
>simply by passing the code test. It adds CW in four bands and phone at
>28.3-28.5 200 watts.

If one has a Tech Plus license, no reason why they shouldn't just go
for the Extra, since the "dumbing down" of ham radio took place 2
years ago.

1890. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 16:26:55 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC196B1.2327EA0B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41109

Good point. Even SS is decades old--somebody named Hedy
Lamarr back in the 40's???

What would be the value of experimenting with SS in 5KHz
slivers, or does SS imply band hopping too ie.
pseudo-simultaneously transmitting on 80,40,15, and 10
meters?

73,
Clay N4AOX

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3c@fast.net
>
> >I assume from his comments that Hans would prohibit ALL
> >"legacy" modes from these small segments of spectrum, not
> >just Morse, but (conventional) RTTY, SSTV, SSB, AM, et al ...
>
> The MFSK and Hellschreiber modes are also decades old.
>
> Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

1891. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 16:31:25 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC197BF.8D75C9DC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41110

W1RFI wrote:
>
>
>
> My only fear in seeing this recommendation be adopted by the FCC is that the
> experminters sub-band might be even quieter than the present use.
>
>
>

I don't think that will be a problem on 7.100 to 7.150. The
international SW broadcasters will take care of that, at
least at night after the D layer collapses.

73,
Clay N4AOX

1892. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 16:55:32 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC19D66.EF25D2D9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41111

> >W1RFI wrote:
> >
> >>
> >>
> >> Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)
> >>
> >>
>
I think the opposite stance is appropriate. Let
everything be permitted!, at least in the 3675 to 3725,
7100 to 7150, 21100 to 21200, and 28100 to 28500 KHz
subbands. Perhaps there should be some restrictions on max.
power, and using private encoding schemes, but nothing more.

1. This would avoid the contentious and divisive attempts at
defining what is legacy and what is new.

2. This would be a pilot program for complete deregulation
of the HF bands which fits nicely with the FCC policies.

3. This would be a demonstration that the ARS is capable of
policing itself, which fits nicely with the FCC policies.

4. This would provide a proving ground for development of
new modes with little or no restrictions.

73,
Clay N4AOX

1893. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 17:27:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC1A4EC.B24C93E3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41112

"S. Hanrahan" wrote:
>
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> >> I suppose an extra never needs a control op. Unless
> >> it's a courtesy to the person whose' station you are a
> >> guest at.
> >>
> >Correct. Even a tech, if operating within the confines
> >of the tech's permitted frequencies and modes doesn't need
> >a control op.
>
> Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
> radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.
> Stacey, AA7YA

Is he senile or what? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1894. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 17:30:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC1A5A2.51320BC5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41113

"S. Hanrahan" wrote:
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >Then, you don't know Jim very well. Jim probably has a predetermined
> >percentage that, for him, defines "most." Here's some other alls I've done:
>
> Shouldn't matter whether I know Jim or not. What matters is, I know
> the difference between the meaning of "all" and "most".

Perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1895. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 17:32:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC1A641.F0CB6532@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41114

"S. Hanrahan" wrote:
> If one has a Tech Plus license, no reason why they shouldn't just go
> for the Extra, since the "dumbing down" of ham radio took place 2
> years ago.

Maybe some Tech+'s have reasons beyond your comprehension. Why would
a person perfectly satisfied with his/her privileges want to upgrade?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1896. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 17:58:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420135820.14735.00000917@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 41116

In article <Kn3w8.2435$Fh1.122237120@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:3cbb33eb$1_1@news7.fast.net...
>> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>> news:3CBAD059.37FF7718@IEEE.org...
>> > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > >
>> > > "S. Hanrahan" wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > Yes, the ex-AA8DP.
>> > > >
>> > > > I knew him going back to early 1993, when I started checking into the
>> > > > 3905 Century Club WAS Net when I was still licensed as KB7PKE.
>> > > >
>> > > > He wasn't as radical then, but things started going downhill around
>> > > > 1995. He didn't check in as often, and was often heard up the band
>> > > > between 3930 and 3950.
>> > >
>> > > So what's he wanted for?
>> >
>> > A host of weapons charges including emptying a 30 round magazine from
>> > an automatic rifle into a highway patrol vehicle with the officer
>> > hiding behind it. (attempted murder of a police officer)
>> > --
>> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>>
>> Sure glad he's not a radical PCTA :-)
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>
>Should never have happened. He was code tested, after all. It screens out
>stuff like this.

It was probably the usual rage and anger of a PCTA who did
not have a computer to take out his frustrations on NCTAs!
:-)

1897. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 17:58:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420135821.14735.00000918@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 41115

In article <3CC196B1.2327EA0B@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
<wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Good point. Even SS is decades old--somebody named Hedy
>Lamarr back in the 40's???

"Hedvig Markey" is on the patent award...as co-inventor of a
torpedo guidance system, not, repeat NOT, for "inventing
spread spectrum" in any form. Hedy's former husband was a
manufacturer of torpedos in Germany in the 1930s.

The invention was never used but came to public attention through
the IEEE and an article in SPECTRUM, the IEEE membership
magazine (which had a copy of the cover page, invention
description, and a PR photo of Ms. Lamarr).

If that guidance-control system was a precursor to spread
spectrum, then SS is "predated" by nearly every previous patent
on other frequency-multiplexed control systems and the old
long-lines "carrier" equipment. As usual, a reporter who didn't
know merde from boot polish connected one and one and got
five to use an almost buzzphrase of "spread spectrum."

That bastardy of journalism is on par with "filler" news stories
invented to fill word space (journalistic justification for existance)
such as the reputed "morse key in the space shuttle as a last-
resort emergency item tucked away in a remote corner of the
vehicle." Ain't no such morse key on the shuttle, never was, but
PCTAs have to seize such falsities to justify their prides and
egos. Nobody has confirmed the "MV Oak sinking" on New
Year's Eve...another bit of invented word fluff.

>What would be the value of experimenting with SS in 5KHz
>slivers, or does SS imply band hopping too ie.
>pseudo-simultaneously transmitting on 80,40,15, and 10
>meters?

Spread spectrum is not a legacy mode, can never be in the
minds of some amateurs who were brought up on amateur radio
being a bastion of morsemanship as the best that they can be.

Agile frequency-hoppers can easily go HF band-to-band using
some types of spread spectrum. It's already been done but
no one seems to have identified it or understood it. :-)

1898. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 18:07:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420140725.26511.00000362@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41117

In article <3CC17417.BAB50B90@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> "All" means "each and every" or "the complete set". If even one thing is
>> left out, "all" does not apply.
>
>If Kim had said that her high school boyfriend was "all hands",
>would you have disagreed with her statement?

Nope.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1899. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 18:07:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420140726.26511.00000363@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41118

In article <3cc16df1$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:3cc161e5.8784487@news.montanavision.net...
>> On 17 Apr 2002 10:34:02 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>>
>> >From: "Kim"
>> >
>> >>I don't think I have, since 30 meters is strictly digital, is
>> >>it not? I haven't done any digital.
>> >
>> >You could have said that about 10 exchanges ago, Kim.
>>
>> Or she could have said "most" instead of "all" bands.
>>
>> >
>> >73,
>> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>> Stacey, AA7YA

>Then, you don't know Jim very well. Jim probably has a predetermined
>percentage that, for him, defines "most."

I go by the generally accepted definition of "most". Now if someone said they
had worked most of the amateur HF bands but in fact had only been on two or
three of them, I'd say they were mistaken in using the word "most". Wouldn't
you?

>Here's some other alls I've done:
>
Here on rrap? Are all of these direct quotes?

>I have worked all my life
>I have traveled all my life
>I like all stormy weather
>I like all animals
>I like all people
>I like all little babies
>I like all nature scents
>
>Like most of us, Stacey, I am sure you are capable of automatically knowing
>that, when someone says they have "worked all their life," they don't mean
>even when they were an infant and small child. I am certain that when
>someone says they have traveled "all their life," you don't take that to

>mean they've never stopped traveling.

And like most of us, Stacey, I am sure that when someone says they've been on all the amateur HF bands, you don't think they mean some of the bands or most of the bands. You think, like, almost all of us, they mean ALL the amateur HF bands - each and every one.
>
>Most of us, Stacey, don't hold each other to the fire whenever we make
>comments.

>If you said to me, "I have worked all bands" it would never even
>cross my mind to even question your definition of that.

All I did was ask what mode Kim used on 30 meters.

> Unless, as is the
>case with Jim, you were one of those people I don't like.

Yup. Kim doesn't like people who disagree with her and point out possible mistakes and contradictions in her posts.

> Don't know how
>long you've been reading the newsgroup, but you'll see that when all else
>fails and we just plain don't like someone or what they said, people get
>their dictionaries, slide rules, and thesauruses out.

The only person here who does the dictionary quick-draw is in Texas.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1900. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 18:41:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC1B66F.E8F5870C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41119

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> "All" means "each and every" or "the complete set". If even one thing is
> >> left out, "all" does not apply.
> > >
> > >If Kim had said that her high school boyfriend was "all hands",
> > >would you have disagreed with her statement?
> >
> > Nope.

Then perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1901. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 18:44:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC1B709.5D08FBCB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41120

N2EY wrote:
> The only person here who does the dictionary quick-draw is in Texas.

Yep, and why couldn't "I've worked all HF bands" be in the same sense
as "I'm all ears"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1902. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 18:51:27 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1faxpy5.1oi4af91qojqmnN%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 41123

Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020416175519.00480.00004147@mb-mj.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
> > >From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> > >Date: 04/16/02 15:00 Eastern Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <3CBC74DA.E6A5273D@psu.edu>
> >
> > >There are a few things about the
> > >ARS that aren't so good.
> >
> > Sure there is, Mike, but at the end of the day, which outweighs the
> other
> > by a long way?
> >
> > >It says a lot about a person in what they focus upon.
> >
> > I'm focusing upon the fact that NASA has Ham Radio on board an
> orbiting
> > space station and they're bragging about it...and I bet there ain't a
> cellphone
> > within 300 miles of it!~
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> What's the orbit altitude of the ISS?

I'm showing about 396 miles as of this post.

--
If love is blind, why is lingerie so popular?
- George Carlin

1903. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 18:51:41 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <1Niw8.21103$3z3.1907582@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41121

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Here's my concern:
>
> Part of Hans' proposal would require automatic power-level control as part
of
> any mode used in the proposed "experimental" subbands. This would
effectively
> ban almost all modes now used by hams on HF/MF. Most of the equipment now
used
> by hams on HF/MF would also be banned from use in those subbands, too.
>

OK, I'm adaptable.

How about this. Retain the current absolute power limit of 200W in those sub-bands. Further, any transmitter adjusted for more than 50W output must include auto-adaptive devices to hold power to the minimum needed for reliable communications. Then you *could* use your current Yaesu, Icom, Heathkit, or whatever, but you'd need to crank the output down to 50W. The idea is to encourage experimentation with pro-active power reduction to reduce congestion.

73, Hans, K0HB

1904. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 18:51:48 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <8Niw8.21104$3z3.1907582@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41122

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote

>
> If there is insufficient experimentation in ham radio it's not because
> hams lack a dedicated subband in which to experiement.
>

Without the resources of Chris Imlay, most of us out here in the real world don't have the capability to get an STA to try anything really new or novel on the air. It is somewhat disappointing that the two people tossing cold water on my idea here are ARRL HQ guys, W1RFI and KE3Z. Quite frankly, I'd expected my most enthusiastic support from them.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1905. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 19:00:46 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <yViw8.21140$3z3.1906699@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41124

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)
>

Are you saying that hams should not be encouraged to experiment with new
ideas?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1906. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 19:11:32 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <E3jw8.21208$3z3.1908698@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41125

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams can
use
> all of the bands for such experimentation.
>

That seems to be the "pat answer" out of your vicinity on this topic.

Of course, if _you_ want to try something new and novel, I'm sure K1ZZ will
give Chris Imlay an assignment to write an STA request. Us
plain-brown-rrap'ers don't seem to have that sort of clout.

Now why are you _really_ tossing cold water on the idea?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Member, ARRL

1907. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:07:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420160729.29940.00000548@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 41126

In article <20020419201958.06885.00004553@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3c@fast.net
>
>>I assume from his comments that Hans would prohibit ALL
>>"legacy" modes from these small segments of spectrum, not
>>just Morse, but (conventional) RTTY, SSTV, SSB, AM, et al ...
>
>The MFSK and Hellschreiber modes are also decades old.

PSK31 is at least 5 years old. Packet's going on 20. I dunno about PACTOR but it's probably "legacy".
>
>Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)

Already got one - 220-222 MHz.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1908. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:07:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420160729.29940.00000547@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 41128

In article <0m_t8.22741$K5.2369052@bin5.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>, "dnb"
<dnb@comcastt.com> writes:

>Would that be anything like gathering weather reports for one's employer?

That's what he was doing - going on the repeater and asking other hams to
gather
traffic info for his employer, as part of his job duties. FCC defined that as
violating the pecuniary interest rules. But only he violated them because only
he
had the pecuniary interest.

> I
>frequently hear TV weather jocks referring to the amatuer radio reports
>they've received. OK, technically (perhaps) filtered through the NWS, but
>ultimately they get credited on commercial broadcasts.

But none of the hams worked for those services or were paid for their use of
amateur radio. Not a violation.
>
>Sounds kinda "grey".
>
Not to the FCC.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>> He was actively soliciting the information for rebroadcast by his
>employer, not
>> just listening. The enforcement reports (there was followup in later
>> enforcement letters) make it clear (to me, anyway) that the violation was
>in
>> the use of amateur radio to gather info specifically for commercial
>> rebroadcast, not for the traffic reports themselves.
>>
>> Take a look and tell us what you think.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1909. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:07:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420160730.29940.00000549@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 41127

In article <3CC171D7.3FA20244@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> 1) Phone bands stay as they are.
>> 2) Existing Novices and Tech Pluses get access to all the non-phone
>non-Extra
>> HF/MF amateur spectrum with the same power as today (nobody loses)
>> 3) The 80, 40 and 15 meter "Novice" bands become the "digital" subbands.
>All
>> modes allowed except analog voice and image. The current bandwidth/data
>> rate/symbol rate regs do not apply in those subbands. Want to develop
>"PSK10"
>> or "Pactor 3" or digital voice? Have at it!
>
>Sounds good to me.

ohmygawsh, we agree on something. Betcha Carl, Ed and a whole bunch of others
would sign on to the above too. Maybe even Hans?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1910. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:07:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420160731.29940.00000550@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 41129

In article <3CC19D66.EF25D2D9@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
<wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>I think the opposite stance is appropriate. Let
>*everything* be permitted!, at least in the 3675 to 3725,
>7100 to 7150, 21100 to 21200, and 28100 to 28500 KHz
>subbands.

Does this include analog voice/image modes, like AM, SSB, and FM voice?

> Perhaps there should be some restrictions on max.
>power, and using private encoding schemes, but nothing more.

Max power of 200 watts is already in place for all of those except 10 meters.
The use of private (i.e. secret) encoding schemes by hams is already
prohibited.

>1. This would avoid the contentious and divisive attempts at
>defining what is legacy and what is new.

Exactly. Is a new version of PSK31 legacy or new?

>2. This would be a pilot program for complete deregulation
>of the HF bands which fits nicely with the FCC policies.

My first reaction is NO WAY!!! If absolutely everything that will fit in the
subband was allowed there, we'd probably have either chaos or what would amount
to a widening of the 'phone subbands. Might be an embarrassing demo of what
would result from total mode deregulation.

>3. This would be a demonstration that the ARS is capable of
>policing itself, which fits nicely with the FCC policies.

Maybe - or it could be an embarrassment if it turns into something like 3950,
14313 or the 'NUT repeater, rather than a haven for new modes.
>
>4. This would provide a proving ground for development of
>new modes with little or no restrictions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1911. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:12:23 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <HYjw8.21452$3z3.1875355@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41130

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote

> I assume from his comments that Hans would prohibit ALL
> "legacy" modes from these small segments of spectrum, not
> just Morse, but (conventional) RTTY, SSTV, SSB, AM, et al ...

That's the basis of my notion.

> From a philosophical point of view, that would seem fair, but
> I have a problem with it ... I made a pledge that I would not
> seek to, nor support a move to, restrict Morse usage ... and
> I will stick to that pledge.

A pity.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1912. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:25:18 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <O8kw8.21512$3z3.1921042@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41131

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> ohmygawsh, we agree on something. Betcha Carl, Ed and a whole bunch of
others
> would sign on to the above too. Maybe even Hans?

Nope.

I want a place where hams can showcase only "truly new" ideas, things that
today would require an STA before we could stoke up a transmitter.

And I want that place to be "visible" to other hams who might be interested
by innovation and progress, not cluttered up with signals from legacy modes.

If those segments remain empty then maybe we will have also sent a signal to
the regulators, but I'm betting that QEX subscribers would come flocking.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1913. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:42:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9sk0k$6kk$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41132

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc1765d.14024547@news.montanavision.net...
> On Fri, 12 Apr 2002 11:04:41 -0400, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> >news:3CB66934.7EA9E7A4@ix.netcom.com...
> >> I suppose an extra never needs a control op. Unless
> >> it's a courtesy to the person whose' station you are a
> >> guest at.
> >
> >Correct. Even a tech, if operating within the confines
> >of the tech's permitted frequencies and modes doesn't need
> >a control op.
>
> Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
> radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.
> Stacey, AA7YA

Stacey,

Where'd you get that idea? Please quote chapter/verse of Part 97.

Anyone can operate another hams station without that person
being present as long as they operate within their individual
privileges. I am an Extra, I can leave a novice "home alone"
at my station and he can operate that station with his call
sign all he wants as long as he operates within Novice
proivileges while I am not there.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1914. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:46:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc1d426$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41133

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020420091802.29940.00000546@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >
>
> The context of the conversation was the amateur HF bands. I'm cutting you
a
> break by not holding you to the literal meaning of all bands.
>

Wait, Jim. Now you're even sounding like Larry--which is really quite
funny. You are *"cutting me a break"* ROFLMAO...from *what* are you
cutting me a break?

Kim W5TIT

1915. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:49:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc1d4da_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41135

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020420091802.29940.00000546@mb-cb.aol.com...
>
> I could also mention that back on January 3 of this year you wrote that
you had
> never been on any amateur band below 25 MHz, but that's old stuff.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Then I was lying, probably without malicious intent. But, that wouldn't
matter a bit to you, Jim...you're an idiot.

Kim W5TIT

1916. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:50:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc1d52c$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41136

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC17417.BAB50B90@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > "All" means "each and every" or "the complete set". If even one thing is
> > left out, "all" does not apply.
>
> If Kim had said that her high school boyfriend was "all hands",
> would you have disagreed with her statement?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Oh, he probably would, Cecil. Just because he can't stand me and he can't admit it, he must use some other form of warism to demonstrate it...

Kim W5TIT

1917. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:56:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc1d673_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41138

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc177b7.14371247@news.montanavision.net...
> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 08:30:19 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >Then, you don't know Jim very well. Jim probably has a predetermined
> >percentage that, for him, defines "most." Here's some other alls I've
done:
>
> Shouldn't matter whether I know Jim or not. What matters is, I know
> the difference between the meaning of "all" and "most". Most of
> -all-, I know what mode(s) are used on 30 meters, you have yet to
> demonstrate you have knowledge of that, without dodging the question,
> "what mode did you operate on 30 meters?"
>
> >I have worked all my life
> >I have traveled all my life
> >I like all stormy weather
> >I like all animals
> >I like all people
> >I like all little babies
> >I like all nature scents
> >
> >Like most of us, Stacey, I am sure you are capable of automatically
knowing
> >that, when someone says they have "worked all their life," they don't
mean
> >even when they were an infant and small child. I am certain that when
> >someone says they have traveled "all their life," you don't take that to
> >mean they've never stopped traveling.
>
>
> Then you should have said "I've operated on most of the HF bands",
> instead of saying "all". "All" and "most" don't mean the same thing,
> as you've pointed out above.
>
> That's why there's an award called "Worked ALL States Awared", not
> "Worked Some Of The States Award" or "Most Of The States".
>
> >
> >Most of us, Stacey, don't hold each other to the fire whenever we make
> >comments. If you said to me, "I have worked all bands" it would never
even
> >cross my mind to even question your definition of that. Unless, as is

the
> >case with Jim, you were one of those people I don't like. Don't know how
> >long you've been reading the newsgroup, but you'll see that when all else
> >fails and we just plain don't like someone or what they said, people get
> >their dictionaries, slide rules, and thesauruses out.
>
> If you can't answer a simple question, be prepared to be held to the
> fire.
>
> Since I don't have an antenna for 160 meters, I don't go on ham radio
> newsgroups saying I've "worked all bands", and dodge and weave for a
> week when asked "What mode did you operate on 30 meters?".
>
> Stacey, AA7YA
>

Aw, and here I was about to tell you that it was good to see another YL on the newsgroup. Actually it is, even if you will be among the ranks of those who think they are holding others "to the fire." ROFLMAO...I have no idea if I've been on 30M or not, Stacey. I can tell you that I've never been on any digital modes, except for the couple of times that I've had CW QSOs (yep, there I go again with ambiguities...can you handle it?) I also know that I was not on 30M either of those two times because both times I was within *my* operating privileges.

I also have a tendency to stare at all the stars every night.

Kim W5TIT

1918. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:56:47 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc1d697_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41139

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC1A4EC.B24C93E3@IEEE.org...
> "S. Hanrahan" wrote:
> >
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> > >> I suppose an extra never needs a control op. Unless
> > >> it's a courtesy to the person whose' station you are a
> > >> guest at.
> > >
> > >Correct. Even a tech, if operating within the confines
> > >of the tech's permitted frequencies and modes doesn't need
> > >a control op.
> >
> > Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
> > radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.
> > Stacey, AA7YA
>
> Is he senile or what? :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Naw, she's holding him to the fire...

Kim W5TIT

1919. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:57:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc1d6b9$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41140

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC1A5A2.51320BC5@IEEE.org...
> "S. Hanrahan" wrote:
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
> >
> > >Then, you don't know Jim very well. Jim probably has a predetermined
> > >percentage that, for him, defines "most." Here's some other alls I've
done:
> >
> > Shouldn't matter whether I know Jim or not. What matters is, I know
> > the difference between the meaning of "all" and "most".
>
> Perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

heh heh heh, or I'm all tits... :O

Kim W5TIT

1920. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 20:58:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9sku9vcf1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41134

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020419201445.06885.00004549@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >If a rig must have certain features, such as automatic power control, in
> >order
> >to be used in those subbands, how is that feature to be guaranteed
without
> >type
> >acceptance?
>
> I don't believe that any equipment is still type accepted today. Most
> intentional emitters are certificated. The exception to that is most ham
> equipment. Of the amateur transmitting equipment, only HF/6M amplifiers
must
> be certificated.

Additionally, there is a clear "maximum" power level for
hams and no equipment capable of operating at or near
maximum power is required to be type accepted... other
than the limited situation Ed W1RFI notes.

There was a time that novices were required to ONLY
use crystal control...no type acceptance was needed
then. Bottom line (IMHO) is that we can and do have
technical ruyles which ham equipment is expected to be operated
within...but that doesn't require type acceptance and (except
for Ed's noted exception) never has.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1921. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 21:02:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc22298_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41218

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC1B709.5D08FBCB@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > The only person here who does the dictionary quick-draw is in Texas.
>
> Yep, and why couldn't "I've worked all HF bands" be in the same sense
> as "I'm all ears"?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

CECIL!! LOL, because *THAT* is different! ;)

Kim W5TIT, staring at all the grass blades in my front yard. But, of course, what's the definition of a yard? My "yard" is actually just an old cow pasture. So, let's see, there's probably not really one blade of grass in the front yard. Oh wait, I may neither have a yard or any blades of grass. OHMYGAWD...I am soooooo confused...

It's much easier, for the sake of time and convenience to just say, I am staring at all the grass blades in my front yard than to try and define for JimtheAnalRetentiveCritic what, exactly, does grow in out the front door of my house...or is that actually the back door since it points toward no main road. Hmmmm, what *is* the front of house?

Kim W5TIT

1922. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 21:05:51 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204202046370.22832-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41137

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002, W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0204200641040.22489-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> >
>> > And the RACES operations and "stations" will be remain but will be
>> > licensed to participating amateur radio operators rather than to the
>> > RACES entity.
>> >
>> > Just a different coat of paint.
>>
>> The fact that they won't have their own license anymore is more than "a
>> different coat of paint." It's non-existance.
>>
>
>No, that is not true. The only thing that has changed is that there will no
>more RACES station licenses, and that is it. There will continue to be
>City, State, and County civil defense organizations who include RACES in
>their regimen for emergency response operations. There will continue to be
>RACES organizations and they will continue to operate under the same R&R as
>always. And, FEMA will continue to be the "mother" organization of RACES.

Then explain this: How does one have a "radio service" without anyone having a
license for that service? RACES stands for "radio amateur communications
emergency service." My point is: Without the separate RACES license, there is
no difference between RACES and the amateur radio service at all. Without the
license, there is no such thing as a RACES station or a RACES net. It's ALL
amateur radio without distinction. [It's also not a service where licensing
isn't required....]

>> There will be little difference between a former races organization and
>ANY
>> radio club which volunteers in disasters - except that the radio club may
>have
>> its OWN license while the races organization can't.
>>
>
>That exists now, thanks to the hard work of many amateurs. There are
>harline RACES folks and hardline ARES folks, but the truth is that the two
>organizations have actually been hard to distinguish over the last few
>years...as emergency communication in amateur radio has begun to take itself
>more seriously. There are still the folks who love the label "wannabe," but
>they are also on the fringe of most ham radio organizations anyway.
>
>>
>> Without a license, it's a disavowed entity type.

>>
>
>*THAT* is sooooo wrong. You are absolutely wrong in your assessment of
>this. As stated, the *only* thing that is changing is that the FCC will
>issue no more RACES station licenses. That's it, nothing more. To say what
>you said above is to also say that Restructuring was the end of ham radio.
>Maybe you are one of those people who believes that, but you couldn't be
>further from the truth.

Then what is the distinction between RACES and an organized collection of licensed radio amateurs? I say that there is NONE - and by that fact, RACES has effectively disappeared.

The FCC's non-renewal of RACES station licenses was like pulling out the bottom card from a house of cards. As soon as the last such station has its license expired, the house of cards collapses.

I have never said that restructuring was the end of amateur radio.

>> It would be like our recent restructuring but not allowing novice
>licensees to
>> renew: The HF subbands would still be there, but (ignoring Tech+HF for
>the
>> moment) there would be no one for which those rules would apply to.
>>
>
>Ya can't "ignore" something that is there just to make your statement true.
>And refarming of bands isn't quite the same as saying something won't exist
>any more...hardly so. I challenge you to write to any Emergency Operations
>officials of your city, state, or county, and ask them if they will be
>changing a thing about their RACES organization. In fact, I don't care if
>you write to any or all city, state, or county organizations. You'll get
>the answer that they will continue as always...either RACES or
>ARES...whichever the case may be. And, in some really progressive and
>politically benign areas, both!

There's one thing you missed: Some of those RACES organizations themselves won't be valid anymore. The establishment of RACES stations did NOT require that the trustee (i.e. person in charge) hold an amateur radio license. With RACES licenses gone, these people no longer have the operating authority to contact their amateur support group over the air. This means that the former trustee (either himself or by his replacement) must now hold an amateur license - and CANCELS OUT the distinction between RACES and merely an organized group of amateurs.

1923. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 22:07:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420180742.13101.00000794@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 41141

In article <1Niw8.21103$3z3.1907582@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>How about this. Retain the current absolute power limit of 200W in those >sub-bands.

Yup.

>Further, any transmitter adjusted for more than 50W output must >include auto-adaptive devices to hold power to the minimum needed for >reliable communications.

Double yup.

>Then you *could* use your current Yaesu, Icom, >Heathkit, or whatever, but you'd need to crank the output down to 50W.

Which you'd probably have to do anyway if the digital mode has a high duty cycle.

Doubleplus yup.

>The >idea is to encourage experimentation with pro-active power reduction to >reduce congestion.

Of course.

This scheme is better than both the original 'all must adapt' idea and the 'no limits' idea. It permits the use of existing rigs and also offers an incentive to include power control.

If ya want a REAL incentive, make it 1500 W peak power in the subbands if you have automatic power control and ~100 W without automatic power control. For all modes. BWAAAHAAAAHAAA!

That problem's fixed, as I see it. Thanks, Hans.

--

Now just allow all non-analog-voice modes and the thing will fly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1924. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 22:42:07 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc1ee80.44784687@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41142

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 15:56:10 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Aw, and here I was about to tell you that it was good to see another YL on
>the newsgroup. Actually it is, even if you will be among the ranks of those
>who think they are holding others "to the fire." ROFLMAO...I have no idea
>if I've been on 30M or not, Stacey. I can tell you that I've never been on
>any digital modes, except for the couple of times that I've had CW QSOs
>(yep, there I go again with ambiguities...can you handle it?) I also know
>that I was not on 30M either of those two times because both times I was
>within *my* operating privileges.
>

That's what you should have said in the first place.

>I also have a tendency to stare at all the stars every night.

Figures, you spaced out on the question, what mode you used on 30
meters?

1925. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 22:44:58 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc1ef47.44983852@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41143

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 12:27:08 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>"S. Hanrahan" wrote:
>>
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>> >"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>> >> I suppose an extra never needs a control op. Unless
>> >> it's a courtesy to the person whose' station you are a
>> >> guest at.
>> >
>> >Correct. Even a tech, if operating within the confines
>> >of the tech's permitted frequencies and modes doesn't need
>> >a control op.
>>
>> Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
>> radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.
>> Stacey, AA7YA
>
>Is he senile or what? :-)

Nope. I asked him what modes he's operated on 30 meters, and he
didn't dodge the question.

1926. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 22:45:45 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc1ef7a.45035162@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41144

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 15:56:47 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CC1A4EC.B24C93E3@IEEE.org...
>> "S. Hanrahan" wrote:
>> >
>> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>> >
>> > >"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>> > >> I suppose an extra never needs a control op. Unless
>> > >> it's a courtesy to the person whose' station you are a
>> > >> guest at.
>> > >
>> > >Correct. Even a tech, if operating within the confines
>> > >of the tech's permitted frequencies and modes doesn't need
>> > >a control op.
>> >
>> > Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
>> > radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.
>> > Stacey, AA7YA
>>
>> Is he senile or what? :-)
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>>
>>
>
>Naw, she's holding him to the fire...

I would in a heartbeat, that's the kind of guy I am.

Stacey, AA7YA

1927. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 22:53:27 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.20.18.53.26.624207.21417@arrl.org>
Source record: 41145

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 14:51:48 -0400, K0HB wrote:
> Without the resources of Chris Imlay, most of us out here in the real
> world don't have the capability to get an STA to try anything really new
> or novel on the air. It is somewhat disappointing that the two people
> tossing cold water on my idea here are ARRL HQ guys, W1RFI and KE3Z.
> Quite frankly, I'd expected my most enthusiastic support from them.

So far, the only rationale you've put forth as the need for this proposal
is a flawed understanding of what the FCC rules permit.

If experimentation with new modes cannot be done now, how is it that new
modes keep springing up?

Jon, KE3Z

1928. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 22:59:59 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Ppmw8.21993$3z3.1944634@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41146

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote

>
> Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
> radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.
>

That may be your rule, but it's not an FCC rule.

I hold 3 stations licenses for K0HB, K0RT, and W0EF. It is routine for all three stations to be on the air at the same time during contests, etc., and I need not be present at any of them. Nothing in the FCC rules requires me to be at any of those stations so long as the operator at the controls is operating within the bounds of his own operator license.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1929. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 23:00:25 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.20.19.00.24.931504.21417@arrl.org>
Source record: 41147

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 15:11:32 -0400, K0HB wrote:
> Of course, if _you_ want to try something new and novel, I'm sure K1ZZ
> will give Chris Imlay an assignment to write an STA request. Us
> plain-brown-rrap'ers don't seem to have that sort of clout.

Even assuming an STA were needed, most of the STAs I'm aware of were
obtained by individuals who simply wrote a letter requesting one. No
"clout" involved. For example:
http://www.tapr.org/tapr/html/Fss.buasssta.html

Jon

1930. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 23:02:28 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc1f343.46003852@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41148

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 16:55:32 GMT, Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
wrote:

>I think the opposite stance is appropriate. Let
>*everything* be permitted!, at least in the 3675 to 3725,
>7100 to 7150, 21100 to 21200, and 28100 to 28500 KHz
>subbands. Perhaps there should be some restrictions on max.
>power, and using private encoding schemes, but nothing more.
>
>1. This would avoid the contentious and divisive attempts at
>defining what is legacy and what is new.
>
>2. This would be a pilot program for complete deregulation
>of the HF bands which fits nicely with the FCC policies.
>
>3. This would be a demonstration that the ARS is capable of
>policing itself, which fits nicely with the FCC policies.
>
>4. This would provide a proving ground for development of
>new modes with little or no restrictions.
>
>73,
>Clay N4AOX

I agree with all 4 of these, and I would add in #5, from the FCC's
perspective.

5. Either use it or lose it.

Stacey, AA7YA

1931. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 23:15:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC1F6A8.EE66D465@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41149

"D. Stussy" wrote:
> Then explain this: How does one have a "radio service" without anyone having a
> license for that service?

You mean like the Citizen's Band Radio Service. ;-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1932. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 23:17:28 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <cGmw8.22042$3z3.1947185@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41150

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote

> So far, the only rationale you've put forth as the need for this proposal
> is a flawed understanding of what the FCC rules permit.

And so far all you've done is make me seriously consider making some phone
calls.

Hans, K0HB
Member, ARRL

1933. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 23:26:22 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <yOmw8.22067$3z3.1932900@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41201

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote

>
> Even assuming an STA were needed, most of the STAs I'm aware of were
> obtained by individuals who simply wrote a letter requesting one. No
> "clout" involved.
>

Thank you for your cooperation and support of my attempt to encourage
experimentation and tinkering in the Amateur Radio service.

Your attitude is simply unbelievable!

Hans, K0HB
Member, ARRL

1934. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 23:29:34 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc1f7bb.47148252@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41202

```
On Tue, 16 Apr 2002 21:34:09 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:a9im2s$k4q$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>>
>> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
>> news:3cbb988b_2@newsa.ev1.net...
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:a9fudk$qbp$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>> > >
>> > > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
>> > > news:3cbb66b5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
>> > > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > > > news:a9emjv$sfs$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>> > > > >
>> > > > > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
>> > > > > news:3cb9b236$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
>> > > > > > We can, however, retransmit items from the NWS, I
>> > > > > > think.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > We can, in our own words, retransmit (as part
>> > > > > of a QSO...not as a one way broadcast) just about anything.
>> > > > > That'd include the latest stock quote, news items,
>> > > > > weather reports or whatever.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Cheers,
>> > > > > Bill K2UNK
>> > > > >
>> > > > It is my understanding that we absolutely *cannot* retransmit things
>> on
>> > > > emergency frequencies (police in particular).
>> > > >
>> > > Are you suggesting that if I have a scanner and
>> > > hear that there's an accident at 5th and Main
>> > > that I can't mention it to another ham...or anyone else
>> > > for that matter?
>> > >
>> > > If yes, please let us know what FCC rule applies.
>> > > If one exists, it is not likly in Part 97 at all.
>> > >
>> > > Cheers,
>> > > Bill K2UNK
>> >
```

>> > You might want to read the following, Bill. Hey, Larry, you might want
>to
>> > pay attention here to, and I suppose Jim/N2EY might want to get in on
>> this.
>> > Bill, for your benefit, you may wish to just skip to the end of the
>> message.
>> > However, to respond to your query, Jim's smugness, and Larry's attempted
>> > insults that I don't know what I'm talking about:
>> >
>> > How 'bout this: 97.113(a)(5): "Prohibited Transmissions. No amateur
>> station
>> > shall transmit communications, on a regular basis, which could
>reasonably
>> be
>> > furnished alternatively through other radio services." Hmmmm, seems to
>me
>> > that traffic reporting would come under the "could reasonably be
>furnished
>> > alternatively through other radio services" category...
>>
>> Who cares, so what...that does NOT make the discussion of traffic
>> illegal.
>>
>> > And, now specifically for you, Bill (yeah, I strung you along a little
>> > here--kinda like Jim/N2EY likes to do:
>> >
>> > 97.113 (again):
>> > (e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from
>> > any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except
>> > propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the
>> > general public and originated from United States Government stations and
>> > communications, including incidental music, originating on United States
>> > Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth
>> > stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained
>> > from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
>> > retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
>> > Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
>> > conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
>> > normal amateur radio communications.
>> >
>> > I cited the whole section, but you need only pay particular attention to
>> > "*or signals* emanating from *any* type of radio station *other than* an
>> > amateur station..."
>> >
>> > Now, here's the quiz: can ya guess *why* we shouldn't/cannot retransmit
>> > things we hear on broadcast stations?
>>
>> Bzzzt...wrong!
>>
>> If I tell another ham something I heard, I am NOT retransmiting

>> a "program" or "signal".... in other words...not applicable.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>>
>
>Well, that's the Part 97 part that I quoted. See Phil Kane's post. By the
>way...it's my regarded opinion that the reason we shouldn't/can't do this is
>twofold: liability and the fact that the FCC did not want to be dragged into
>court continuously when amateurs repeat things over the air that are either
>copyrighted or that end up being "mistakes" by the media.

The FCC disagree's with your "regarded opinion".

Liability has nothing to do with this; but the FCC would be held
liable if they didn't issue Notice's Of Proprosed Rulemaking, with a
set time limit for Public Comments.

If an overwhelming majority agree with a new proprosed rule, it
becomes set in stone, otherwise it gets tossed as "not a good idea
anyway".

I'd rather hear about the weather, or traffic reports, or any other
interesting conversation, than hearing someone fumbling around with an
autopatch to order a pizza, when they've got a cell phone laying next
to them.

To each their own.

Stacey, AA7YA

1935. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 23:45:26 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc1fbaf.48160607@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41203

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 22:59:59 GMT, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
wrote:

>That may be your rule, but it's not an FCC rule.
>
>I hold 3 stations licenses for K0HB, K0RT, and W0EF. It is routine for all
>three stations to be on the air at the same time during contests, etc., and
>I need not be present at any of them. Nothing in the FCC rules requires me
>to be at any of those stations so long as the operator at the controls is
>operating within the bounds of his own operator license.

Actually, it's within the bounds of the station license. As an
example, if I volunteered to fill in one hour on a "Novice station"
during Field Day, I can't operate in the Extra class part of the band,
because I would jeopardize the station license for which that Novice
class station is permitted to operate. With an Extra class license I
could, if I used my callsign, but it's not the callsign designated as
the "Novice Station" license.

You can bend the rules all you want, you can interpret them any way
you like, but there's no gray matter when it comes to the explicit FCC
Part 97 rulebook.

Stacey, AA7YA

1936. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-20 23:58:47 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc2004b.49340832@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41204

On Thu, 18 Apr 2002 20:07:55 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>
>*Maybe* you can explain to me how it blew up in my face? Or, when I say
>I've travelled a lot, you'd expect me to meet your definition of "travel"
>and "a lot." Right? Just as Jim wants me to meet his definition of "all"
>in all bands. Like I said, my all is different from his all. Wonder why he
>didn't choose any of the Ghz stuff (I've never been there, either), and
>there's probably lots of other bands I've never been on.

Because the "GHz stuff" isn't in the HF spectrum, that "stuff" is part
of the UHF spectrum.

>You keep clinging to your semantics, you and Jim. It's your dislike of
>someone that determines your attitude...not the content of their material.

No semantics at all, it's common knowledge within the fraternity.

Stacey, AA7YA

1937. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 00:05:35 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <jnnw8.22174$3z3.1953758@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41205

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote:

> Actually, it's within the bounds of the station license.

I believe you are mistaken. 97.105(b) grants priveleges based on the class of OPERATOR LICENSE held by the control operator. If you are absent from your station and have granted your dad the temporary control of the station, then his OPERATOR license determines his privileges, not your station license.

> As an example, if I volunteered to fill in one hour on a "Novice station"
> during Field Day, I can't operate in the Extra class part of the band,
> because I would jeopardize the station license for which that Novice
> class station is permitted to operate.

Let's for the moment presume a fictitious Novice holds a station license with the callsign KN7XXX, and he gives you (an Extra licensee) permission to fill in while he takes a potty break. You are free to use his novice station on any frequency available to any license class up to your license class (Extra). The only requirement (paragraph 97.119(e) refers) is that you would have to sign "KN7XXX/AA7YA" if you transmitted outside the Novice sub-bands.

73, Hans, K0HB

1938. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 00:07:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420200748.07448.00000826@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 41206

In article <3cc1d4da_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020420091802.29940.00000546@mb-cb.aol.com...
>>
>> I could also mention that back on January 3 of this year you wrote that
>you had
>> never been on any amateur band below 25 MHz, but that's old stuff.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>Then I was lying, probably without malicious intent.

To *most* people, lying almost always implies malicious intent.

Which time were you lying - when you wrote that you hadn't been on any
amateur band below 25 MHz, or when you wrote that you'd been on "all"
HF amateur bands "lots of times"? Or both?

> But, that wouldn't matter a bit to you, Jim..

It doesn't really matter to me - I'm just a little curious.

>.you're an idiot.

Ah, the old' ad hominem attack when you don't have a rational argument.
So far it's jerk, idiot, and probably a few I missed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1939. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 00:07:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420200749.07448.00000827@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 41207

In article <3cc1d52c$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CC17417.BAB50B90@IEEE.org...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> > "All" means "each and every" or "the complete set". If even one thing is
>> > left out, "all" does not apply.
>>
>> If Kim had said that her high school boyfriend was "all hands",
>> would you have disagreed with her statement?
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

>Oh, he probably would, Cecil.

BZZZT!!! Wrong.

I already wrote that I wouldn't disagree, Kim.

>Just because he can't stand me and he can't
>admit it,

Oh dear - Kim, you have a very exaggerated estimate of your
own importance if you think I can't stand somebody on rrap.

>he must use some other form of warism to demonstrate it...
>
I have no idea what "warism" means. Not in the dictionary, either.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1940. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 00:26:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guvvdj4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41208

On 20 Apr 2002 03:23:44 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>Why would you want to be involved in RACES anyway? If you are
>truly interested in local ham radio emergency communications service,
>ARES is where the action should be.

Don't know how it is in other parts of the country, but here in
Oregon RACES and ARES are one organization. To get into it you
have to meet its requirements of both.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1941. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 00:26:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guvw8v5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41209

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 06:45:40 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>> Just a different coat of paint.
>
>The fact that they won't have their own license anymore is more than "a
>different coat of paint." It's non-existance.
>
>There will be little difference between a former races organization
>and ANY radio club which volunteers in disasters - except that the
>radio club may have its OWN license while the races organization
>can't.

So? RACES stations must have a licensed radio operator as the control operator anyhow. The only difference will be which call sign is being used. The RACES organization is not being abolished.

Nothing will prevent the formation and licensing of a "Podunk RACES Operator Amateur Radio Club", retaining the former RACES station call sign under the "vanity" program. In our local ARES/RACES setups, several clubs have assumed the responsibility of providing equipment and operators at various institutions, under the control of the County Emergency Manager who runs RACES (and is a ham himself).

The intent, similar to the elimination of Military Recreation Stations a while back, is to eliminate amateur station licenses issued to non-amateur radio personnel or organizations.

>Without a license, it's a disavowed entity type.

Say that again in English.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1942. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 00:26:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guvwzx6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41210

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 06:55:15 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>ARES is the ARRL's delusion that they are doing something helpful. There is no
>guarentee that anyone in ARES has contact to any emergency organization.
>
>RACES was organized directly by the local governments, presumedly directly
>under the agencies which would be providing emergency assistance. Direct
>oversight guarenteed contact with government (or other aid organizations).

More and more jurisdictions are integrating one into the other, so
ARES members get emergency radio training as RACES members. The
advantage of that is that there is no limitation on the type of
events that ARES can provide service for, and our unit does a LOT of
that.

For continuing authorization, our unit requires checking into the
weekly County net or the daily Regional net at least once a month,
attending four monthly meetings or class/training sessions each
year, and participating in at least one "hands-on" exercise each
year.

Which are you signed up for? What do they require?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1943. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 00:36:58 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204210036270.22977-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41211

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002, CAM wrote:
>"D. Stussy" wrote:
>> Then explain this: How does one have a "radio service" without anyone having a
>> license for that service?
>
>You mean like the Citizen's Band Radio Service. ;-)

You missed the part where I talked about unlicensed "services." Read more carefully.

1944. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 00:55:10 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204210038210.22977-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41212

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 06:55:15 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>>ARES is the ARRL's delusion that they are doing something helpful. There is no
>>guarentee that anyone in ARES has contact to any emergency organization.
>>
>>RACES was organized directly by the local governments, presumedly directly
>>under the agencies which would be providing emergency assistance. Direct
>>oversight guarenteed contact with government (or other aid organizations).
>
> More and more jurisdictions are integrating one into the other, so
> ARES members get emergency radio training as RACES members. The
> advantage of that is that there is no limitation on the type of
> events that ARES can provide service for, and our unit does a LOT of
> that.
>
> For continuing authorization, our unit requires checking into the
> weekly County net or the daily Regional net at least once a month,
> attending four monthly meetings or class/training sessions each
> year, and participating in at least one "hands-on" exercise each
> year.
>
> Which are you signed up for? What do they require?

I'm currently involved in neither.

From 1993-1998, I was an operator on call for a federal facility (local VA hospital). We were only called out once - On January 16, 1994 - for the Northridge, CA earthquake. Our facility was not hit, but the next one over (Sepulveda) was within 3 miles of the epicenter. The only "emergency" thing we did was at the direction of the VA police: Their radio equipment couldn't reach the Sepulveda facility and telco was down. Using our equipment (better than their puny 5w HT's), we contacted the other facility to arrange for patient transfer. That's it.

The primary way I give to the community is by being a volunteer examiner.

Around these parts (Los Angeles), I find that most of the radio operators who "volunteer" for the County's DCS program are self-important, arrogant idiots (some of whom are suspected of having bought their licenses); at least the ones I know, except for two: One being the sheriff deputy who ran the program until 2000 (I believe he was rotated to another job that year), and another who works on LAPD radios at Piper Tech.

1945. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 00:58:40 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204210055340.22977-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41213

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 06:45:40 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>>> Just a different coat of paint.
>>
>>The fact that they won't have their own license anymore is more than "a
>>different coat of paint." It's non-existance.
>>
>>There will be little difference between a former races organization
>>and ANY radio club which volunteers in disasters - except that the
>>radio club may have its OWN license while the races organization
>>can't.
>
> So? RACES stations must have a licensed radio operator as the
> control operator anyhow. The only difference will be which call sign
> is being used. The RACES organization is not being abolished.

Without the license, there is no such thing as a RACES station. There is only "amateur stations participating in RACES" at best. Remember that a RACES station license didn't require an amateur licensed trustee and that trustee (or anyone else in the CD organization) could operate [only] that station (unless he was also licensed). There is a difference here.

> Nothing will prevent the formation and licensing of a "Podunk RACES
> Operator Amateur Radio Club", retaining the former RACES station
> call sign under the "vanity" program. In our local ARES/RACES
> setups, several clubs have assumed the responsibility of providing
> equipment and operators at various institutions, under the control of
> the County Emergency Manager who runs RACES (and is a ham himself).
>
> The intent, similar to the elimination of Military Recreation
> Stations a while back, is to eliminate amateur station licenses
> issued to non-amateur radio personnel or organizations.
>
>>Without a license, it's a disavowed entity type.
>
> Say that again in English.....

That is English. Ask your Congresscritter! :-)

1946. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 01:55:49 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC21C02.D81D15C4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41214

Jon Bloom wrote:
> enthusiastic support from them.
>
> So far, the only rationale you've put forth as the need for this proposal
> is a flawed understanding of what the FCC rules permit.
>
> If experimentation with new modes cannot be done now, how is it that new
> modes keep springing up?
>

The more I study this issue, the more I agree with Hans' comments, with some notable exceptions.

First, the "refarming" item in the petition should be set aside or preempted because it is potentially too important to be in a mixed bag with SS at 222 MHz, CW vs MCW for computer ID, 1 X 1 calls, and 33 cm pps in CO and WY. The FCC should invite the ARRL to resubmit the "refarming" item in a separate petition.

Second, the "refarming" part of the ARRL petition seems to fly in the face of the reasons stated in WT Docket 98-143 for restructuring and removing (essentially) code testing requirements for HF operation. The "refarming" is obviously a consequence of devaluing Morse CW operation in HF. So, refarming should attempt to meet the loftier goals stated by the FCC in 98-143. Just providing additional room for legacy operating modes does not seem to do that. It would appear that Morse CW is simply being sacrificed for SSB phone in HF bands. [Jon's statements above also seem to contradict Imlay's reasoning at other places within the ARRL petition, namely justification for SS in the 222-225 MHz band.]

IMHO, the weakness in Hans' proposal, comes in trying to define what is "legacy" and what is "new" in his section II-b. To borrow Chairman Powell's phrase, the current communication technology development is "...chaotic...". Attempts to define what is "legacy" and what is "new" is futile and can be counterproductive. This show stopper can be avoided by allowing any and all forms of communication technology within the bounds of a minimum of regulation to occur within these "experimental reservations".

Both Chairman Kennard, and Chairman Powell have testified before congress that an important action item in the model

of an "FCC for the 21st Century" is deregulation. Powell stated "The fundamental mission of the FCC is ...competition, innovation, deregulation...". Here is an opportunity for the FCC to execute a pilot study of deregulation and demonstate user self-regulation, by minimization of all regulations for operation in these subbands.

As such, I would modify Hans's II-b to substitute "all communications methods". I would propose to modify II.c.,Hans' power limits, to 100 watts peak output with a view toward minimizing spectrum RF power density.

73,
Clay N4AOX

1947. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:02:24 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Q4pw8.22564$3z3.1971705@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41215

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)
>

Here you go. Knock yourself out!

The International Astronomical Union has asked for protection on the
following frequency bands from in-band, band-edge and harmonic emissions,
especially from space-borne transmitters.

Substance Rest Frequency Protected Segment Notes (1)
Deuterium (DI) 327.3840 MHz 327.0 - 327.7 MHz
Hydrogen (HI) 1420.406 MHz 1370.0 - 1427.0 MHz 2),3)
Hydroxyl radical (OH) 1612.231 MHz 1606.8 - 1613.8 MHz 3),4)
Hydroxyl radical (OH) 1665.402 MHz 1659.8 - 1667.1 MHz 4)
Hydroxyl radical (OH) 1667.359 MHz 1661.8 - 1669.0 MHz 4)
Hydroxyl radical (OH) 1720.530 MHz 1714.8 - 1722.2 MHz 3),4)
Methyladyne (CH) 3263.794 MHz 3252.9 - 3267.1 MHz 3),4)
Methyladyne (CH) 3335.481 MHz 3324.4 - 3338.8 MHz 3),4)
Methyladyne (CH) 3349.193 MHz 3338.0 - 3352.5 MHz 3),4)
Formaldehyde (H2CO) 4829.660 MHz 4813.6 - 4834.5 MHz 3),4)
Methanol (CH2OH) 6668.518 MHz 6661.8 - 6675.2 MHz 3),6)
Ionized Helium Isotope (3HeII) 8665.650 MHz 8660.0 - 8670.0 MHz
Methanol (CH3OH) 12.178 GHz 12.17 - 12.19 GHz 3),6)
Formaldehyde (H2CO) 14.488 GHz 14.44 - 14.50 GHz 3),4)
Cyclopropenylidene (C3H2) 18.343 GHz 18.28 - 18.36 GHz 3),4),6)
Water Vapour (H2O) 22.235 GHz 22.16 - 22.26 GHz 3),4)
Ammonia (NH3) 23.694 GHz 23.61 - 23.71 GHz 4)
Ammonia (NH3) 23.723 GHz 23.64 - 23.74 GHz 4)
Ammonia (NH3) 23.870 GHz 23.79 - 23.89 GHz 4)
Silicon monoxide (SiO) 42.821 GHz 42.77 - 42.86 GHz
Silicon monoxide (SiO) 43.122 GHz 43.07 - 43.17 GHz
Carbon monosulphide (CS) 48.991 GHz 48.94 - 49.04 GHz
Deuterated formylium (DCO+) 72.039 GHz 71.96 - 72.11 GHz 3)
Silicon monoxide (SiO) 86.243 GHz 86.16 - 86.33 GHz
Formylium (H13CO+) 86.754 GHz 86.66 - 86.84 GHz
Silicon monoxide (SiO) 86.847 GHz 86.76 - 86.93 GHz
Ethynyl radical (C2H) 87.300 GHz 87.21 - 87.39 GHz 5)
Hydrogen cyanide (HCN) 88.632 GHz 88.34 - 88.72 GHz 4)
Formylium (HCO+) 89.189 GHz 88.89 - 89.28 GHz 4)
Hydrogen isocyanide (HNC) 90.664 GHz 90.57 - 90.76 GHz
Diazenylium (N2H) 93.174 GHz 93.07 - 93.27 GHz
Carbon monosulphide (CS) 97.981 GHz 97.65 - 98.08 GHz 4)

Carbon monoxide (C18O) 109.782 GHz 109.67 - 109.89 GHz
Carbon monoxide (13CO) 110.201 GHz 109.83 - 110.31 GHz 4)
Carbon monoxide (C17O) 112.359 GHz 112.25 - 112.47 GHz 6)
Carbon monoxide (CO) 115.271 GHz 114.88 - 115.39 GHz 4)
Formaldehyde (H213CO) 137.450 GHz 137.31 - 137.59 GHz 3),6)
Formaldehyde (H2CO) 140.840 GHz 140.69 - 140.98 GHz
Carbon monosulphide (CS) 146.969 GHz 146.82 - 147.12 GHz
Water vapour (H2O) 183.310 GHz 183.12 - 183.50 GHz
Carbon monoxide (C18O) 219.560 GHz 219.34 - 219.78 GHz
Carbon monoxide (13CO) 220.399 GHz 219.67 - 220.62 GHz 4)
Carbon monoxide (CO) 230.538 GHz 229.77 - 230.77 GHz 4)
Carbon monosulphide (CS) 244.953 GHz 244.72 - 245.20 GHz 6)
Hydrogen cyanide (HCN) 265.886 GHz 265.62 - 266.15 GHz
Formylium (HCO+) 267.557 GHz 267.29 - 267.83 GHz
Hydrogen isocyanide (HNC) 271.981 GHz 271.71 - 272.25 GHz
Dyazenulium (N2H+) 279.511 GHz 279.23 - 279.79 GHz
Carbon monoxide (C18O) 312.330 GHz 329.00 - 329.66 GHz
Carbon monoxide (13CO) 330.587 GHz 330.25 - 330.92 GHz
Carbon monosulphide (CS) 342.883 GHz 342.54 - 343.23 GHz
Carbon monoxide (CO) 345.796 GHz 345.45 - 346.14 GHz
Hydrogen cyanide (HCN) 354.484 GHz 354.13 - 354.84 GHz
Formylium (HCO+) 356.734 GHz 356.37 - 357.09 GHz
Dyazenulium (N2H+) 372.672 GHz 372.30 - 373.05 GHz
Water vapour (H2O) 380.197 GHz 379.81 - 380.58 GHz
Carbon monoxide (C18O) 439.088 GHz 438.64 - 439.53 GHz
Carbon monoxide (13CO) 440.765 GHz 440.32 - 441.21 GHz
Carbon monoxide (CO) 461.041 GHz 460.57 - 461.51 GHz
Heavy water (HDO) 464.925 GHz 464.46 - 465.39 GHz
Carbon (CI) 492.162 GHz 491.66 - 492.66 GHz
Water vapour (H218O) 547.676 GHz 547.13 - 548.22 GHz
Water vapour (H2O) 556.936 GHz 556.37 - 557.50 GHz
Ammonia (15NH3) 572.113 GHz 571.54 - 572.69 GHz
Ammonia (NH3) 572.498 GHz 571.92 - 573.07 GHz
Carbon monoxide (CO) 691.473 GHz 690.78 - 692.17 GHz
Hydrogen cyanide (HCN) 797.433 GHz 796.64 - 789.23 GHz
Formylium (HCO+) 802.653 GHz 801.85 - 803.85 GHz
Carbon monoxide (CO) 806.652 GHz 805.85 - 807.46 GHz
Carbon (CI) 809.350 GHz 808.54 - 810.16 GHz

Notes:

If Note 4) or Note 2) are not listed, the band limits are Doppler-shifted frequencies corresponding to radial velocities of +/- 300 km/s (consistent with line radiation occurring in our galaxy).

An extension to lower frequencies of the allocation of 1400-1427 MHz is required to allow for the Doppler shifts for HI observed in distant galaxies.

The current international allocation is not primary and/or does not meet bandwidth requirements. See: ITU-R Radio Regulations (Table 8) for more

detailed information.

Because these line frequencies are also being used for observing other galaxies, the listed bandwidths include Doppler shifts corresponding to radial velocities of up to 1000 km/s. It should be noted that HI has been observed at frequencies redshifted to 500 MHz, while some lines of the most abundant molecules have been detected in galaxies with velocities up to 50 000 km/s, corresponding to a frequency reduction of up to 17%.

There are six closely spaced lines associated with this molecule at this frequency. The listed band is wide enough to permit observations of all six lines.

This line is not mentioned in Article 8 of the ITU-R Radio Regulations.

1948. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:09:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020420220943.20725.00004635@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 41216

>Subject: Re: America's Most Wanted
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/20/02 13:58 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020420135820.14735.00000917@mb-fr.aol.com>

>
>It was probably the usual rage and anger of a PCTA who did
>not have a computer to take out his frustrations on NCTAs!

Tsk tsk tsk...Another rant from the Man From U.N.C.L.E.

(U)nlicensed
(N)uisance
(C)ontinuously
(L)ambasting
(E)veryone

(With apologies to Napoleon Solo and Illya Kyuriakin)

Close channel D.

1949. Re: America's Most Wanted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:18:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Yjpw8.3234$HN3.170774697@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41217

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020420135820.14735.00000917@mb-fr.aol.com...
> In article <Kn3w8.2435$Fh1.122237120@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
> >news:3cbb33eb$1_1@news7.fast.net...
> >> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >> news:3CBAD059.37FF7718@IEEE.org...
> >> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > "S. Hanrahan" wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Yes, the ex-AA8DP.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > I knew him going back to early 1993, when I started checking into
the
> >> > > > 3905 Century Club WAS Net when I was still licensed as KB7PKE.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > He wasn't as radical then, but things started going downhill
around
> >> > > > 1995. He didn't check in as often, and was often heard up the
band
> >> > > > between 3930 and 3950.
> >> > >
> >> > > So what's he wanted for?
> >> >
> >> > A host of weapons charges including emptying a 30 round magazine from
> >> > an automatic rifle into a highway patrol vehicle with the officer
> >> > hiding behind it. (attempted murder of a police officer)
> >> > --
> >> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >>
> >> Sure glad he's not a radical PCTA :-)
> >>
> >> Carl - wk3c
> >
> >Should never have happened. He was code tested, after all. It screens
out
> >stuff like this.
>
> It was probably the usual rage and anger of a PCTA who did
> not have a computer to take out his frustrations on NCTAs!
> :-)

I suppose. Hey, I'll bet even Steve took a code test once. Not that you'd know it.

1950. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:20:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc224ac_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41222

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:jnnw8.22174$3z3.1953758@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> > Actually, it's within the bounds of the station license.
>
> I believe you are mistaken. 97.105(b) grants priveleges based on the
class
> of OPERATOR LICENSE held by the control operator. If you are absent from
> your station and have granted your dad the temporary control of the
station,
> then his OPERATOR license determines his privileges, not your station
> license.
>
> > As an example, if I volunteered to fill in one hour on a "Novice
station"
> > during Field Day, I can't operate in the Extra class part of the band,
> > because I would jeopardize the station license for which that Novice
> > class station is permitted to operate.
>
> Let's for the moment presume a fictitious Novice holds a station license
> with the callsign KN7XXX, and he gives you (an Extra licensee) permission
to
> fill in while he takes a potty break. You are free to use his novice
> station on any frequency available to any license class up to your license
> class (Extra). The only requirement (paragraph 97.119(e) refers) is that
> you would have to sign "KN7XXX/AA7YA" if you transmitted outside the
Novice
> sub-bands.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
>

When I sit at the radio Cliff bought, and that I consider his, if I am on it
without him around, I operate it as my station and only stay in the Tech+
portion of 10M. Quite legal...

Kim W5TIT

1951. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:24:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc22583_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41223

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:anv2cuo4n15rn80igods6ihm7qcj8l6upl@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 07:45:17 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >Oh no...another kid in the sandbox...
>
> Well, you know, if you would stop the innuendos, you wouldn't have
> that problem. I hope you don't do the same thing on the radio. That
> would be just awful. What if children were listening to daddy's
> scanner and overheard you?
>
> Please remember, innuendo is actually created in the mind of the
> listener. If you want to lambast someone's radio conversations, try
> doing it on what they actually said and not what your own deviant
> little mind cooked up or what you wish they had said.
>
> Otherwise, i'll just keep laughing at you.

Oh *yawn* no, *yawn*, not that!

Kim W5TIT (pssst, please laugh all you like)

1952. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:25:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc225ef_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41225

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:yViw8.21140$3z3.1906699@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)
> >
>
> Are you saying that hams should not be encouraged to experiment with new
> ideas?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Don't these over-reactions ever cease?

Kim W5TIT

1953. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:27:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Cspw8.3236$FO3.170810557@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41219

"Fred Garvin" <Garvin@Truss.net> wrote in message
news:1faxpy5.1oi4af91qojqmnN%Garvin@Truss.net...
> Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> > "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020416175519.00480.00004147@mb-mj.aol.com...
> > > >Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
> > > >From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> > > >Date: 04/16/02 15:00 Eastern Daylight Time
> > > >Message-id: <3CBC74DA.E6A5273D@psu.edu>
> > >
> > > >There are a few things about the
> > > >ARS that aren't so good.
> > >
> > > Sure there is, Mike, but at the end of the day, which outweighs
the
> > other
> > > by a long way?
> > >
> > > >It says a lot about a person in what they focus upon.
> > >
> > > I'm focusing upon the fact that NASA has Ham Radio on board an
> > orbiting
> > > space station and they're bragging about it...and I bet there ain't a
> > cellphone
> > > within 300 miles of it!~
> > >
> > > 73
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > What's the orbit altitude of the ISS?
>
> I'm showing about 396 miles as of this post.

Then Steve got lucky. There might not be one withing 300 miles, but there's
10's of millions within 400 miles.

1954. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:32:11 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.20.22.32.10.933689.16499@arrl.org>
Source record: 41220

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 19:26:22 -0400, K0HB wrote:
>
> Your attitude is simply unbelievable!

Why, because I think your idea is not a good one? Sorry, but that's what I think. Maybe you shouldn't take it so personally. You feel free to state that others' ideas are bad when you think they are. Why can't others disagree with your ideas?

Jon, KE3Z

1955. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:32:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Pwpw8.3237$CY3.171206750@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41221

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:8Niw8.21104$3z3.1907582@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote
>
> >
> > If there is insufficient experimentation in ham radio it's not because
> > hams lack a dedicated subband in which to experiement.
> >
>
> Without the resources of Chris Imlay,

Hey, hey, hey. We don't want Dave coming on here telling us what a crappy
little apartment Chris lives in, do we?

most of us out here in the real world
> don't have the capability to get an STA to try anything really new or
novel
> on the air. It is somewhat disappointing that the two people tossing cold
> water on my idea here are ARRL HQ guys, W1RFI and KE3Z. Quite frankly,
I'd
> expected my most enthusiastic support from them.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Its all about CW on HF.

1956. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:37:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4Cpw8.3238$O_3.171300078@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41224

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:yOmw8.22067$3z3.1932900@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote
>
> >
> > Even assuming an STA were needed, most of the STAs I'm aware of were
> > obtained by individuals who simply wrote a letter requesting one. No
> > "clout" involved.
> >
>
> Thank you for your cooperation and support of my attempt to encourage
> experimentation and tinkering in the Amateur Radio service.
>
> Your attitude is simply unbelievable!
>
> Hans, K0HB
> Member, ARRL

What did I say about the ARRL concerning restructuring?

Lacks Leadership and Vision.

Brian
Member ARRL

1957. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:45:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zJpw8.3241$a64.171590030@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41226

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cbcdd53_2@newsa.ev1.net...

> That was actually a snied comment. I actually have no idea if I've ever
> been on 30...I don't think I have, since 30 meters is strictly digital, is
> it not? I haven't done any digital.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Not strictly digital, it's CW and digital.

1958. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:49:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc22b65_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41230

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0204202046370.22832-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002, W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0204200641040.22489-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >> >
> >> > And the RACES operations and "stations" will be remain but will be
> >> > licensed to participating amateur radio operators rather than to the
> >> > RACES entity.
> >> >
> >> > Just a different coat of paint.
> >>
> >> The fact that they won't have their own license anymore is more than "a
> >> different coat of paint." It's non-existance.
> >>
> >
> >No, that is not true. The only thing that has changed is that there will
no
> >more RACES station licenses, and that is it. There will continue to be
> >City, State, and County civil defense organizations who include RACES in
> >their regimen for emergency response operations. There will continue to
be
> >RACES organizations and they will continue to operate under the same R&R
as
> >always. And, FEMA will continue to be the "mother" organization of
RACES.
>
> Then explain this: How does one have a "radio service" without anyone
having a
> license for that service? RACES stands for "radio amateur communications
> emergency service." My point is: Without the separate RACES license,
there is
> no difference between RACES and the amateur radio service at all. Without
the
> license, there is no such thing as a RACES station or a RACES net. It's
ALL
> amateur radio without distinction. [It's also not a service where
licensing
> isn't required....]
>

As I understand it, the RACES licenses that were issued were more issued as
station appointments than anything. In other words, a local EOC, a RACES
Radio Officer maybe, or something like that. Were individuals issued RACES

licesnes, separate from their radio amateur licenses?

In Hunt County, I know there is no RACES license that is called on the air. And, when a RACES net is in operation, it is at the direction of the County EOC, with whom the relationship has been established. There is s *distinct* difference (well, used to be--not so much any more) between RACES and ARES. The Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service is established throughout this country--but doesn't necessarily *have* to be the service of choice for emergencies. In other words, the exact same service *could* be provided through ARES. An ARES organization could even require background checks, if that is how the served agencies wish to establish their relationship with radio amateur provided communication.

With regard to the inherrent issue of the Presidential War Powers Act, RACES is specifically targeted, is still established (with or without existing licenses) and is still organized at the direction of city, county, and state officials. The fact that the FCC will no longer be issuing RACES licenses does not change the established relationship between RACES and its served agencies.

> >>
> >> There will be little difference between a former races organization and
> >ANY
> >> radio club which volunteers in disasters - except that the radio club
may
> >have
> >> its OWN license while the races organization can't.
> >>
> >
> >That exists now, thanks to the hard work of many amateurs. There are
> >harline RACES folks and hardline ARES folks, but the truth is that the
two
> >organizations have actually been hard to distinguish over the last few
> >years...as emergency communication in amateur radio has begun to take
itself
> >more seriously. There are still the folks who love the label "wannabe,"
but
> >they are also on the fringe of most ham radio organizations anyway.
> >
> >>
> >> Without a license, it's a disavowed entity type.
> >>
> >
> >*THAT* is sooooo wrong. You are absolutely wrong in your assessment of
> >this. As stated, the *only* thing that is changing is that the FCC will
> >issue no more RACES station licenses. That's it, nothing more. To say
what
> >you said above is to also say that Restructuring was the end of ham
radio.
> >Maybe you are one of those people who believes that, but you couldn't be
> >further from the truth.

>
> Then what is the distinction between RACES and an organized collection of
> licensed radio amateurs? I say that there is NONE - and by that fact,
RACES
> has effectively disappeared.
>

The distinction between the two, specifically, is which one is recognized officially by the served agencies? If the City of Dallas recognizes RACES as the only amateur organization from which they will seek emergency communication, then RACES it is. If they choose ARES, then it is ARES. In some locales, there is enough trust established between the two organizations that ARES works side by side with RACES, yet RACES is the organization to which the nod goes for items such as entry into restricted areas, etc. That does *not* have to be the case. As I said, the controlling functions can decide that they want their ARES members to have background checks.

>
> The FCC's non-renewal of RACES station licenses was like pulling out the
bottom
> card from a house of cards. As soon as the last such station has its
license
> expired, the house of cards collapses.
>
> I have never said that restructuring was the end of amateur radio.
>

I didn't mean to imply that you did...I meant that as a comparitive comment.

> >>
> >> It would be like our recent restructuring but not allowing novice
> >licensees to
> >> renew: The HF subbands would still be there, but (ignoring Tech+HF for
> >the
> >> moment) there would be no one for which those rules would apply to.
> >>
> >
> >Ya can't "ignore" something that is there just to make your statement
true.
> >And refarming of bands isn't quite the same as saying something won't
exist
> >any more...hardly so. I challenge you to write to any Emergency
Operations
> >officials of your city, state, or county, and ask them if they will be
> >changing a thing about their RACES organization. In fact, I don't care
if
> >you write to any or all city, state, or county organizations. You'll get
> >the answer that they will continue as always...either RACES or
> >ARES...whichever the case may be. And, in some really progressive and
> >politically benign areas, both!

>
> There's one thing you missed: Some of those RACES organizations
themselves
> won't be valid anymore.
>

They will be no less valid if they are still the organization of choice by the official decision makers for our city, county, state, and even federal government. And, I seriously doubt that you will see any change in status for RACES.

>
> The establishment of RACES stations did NOT require
> that the trustee (i.e. person in charge) hold an amateur radio license.
With
> RACES licenses gone, these people no longer have the operating authority
to
> contact their amateur support group over the air. This means that the
former
> trustee (either himself or by his replacement) must now hold an amateur
license
> - and CANCELS OUT the distinction between RACES and merely an organized
group
> of amateurs.
>

You mean someone such as a governmental emergency management official that may not have an amateur license? That's an interesting point. *However* in the FCC R&R, is it not already established that a person with a civil defense organization is allowed to enter a RACES net? I believe the new language accommodates such interaction between an agency and the RACES net. I may be wrong. I can only relate what happens around here with RACES, and here everyone on a RACES is a licensed amateur as well. I never even *heard* of "RACES licenses" until I heard they were taking them away...

I don't think there's going to be a drastic change in RACES served agencies just because the licensing is "going away."

Kim W5TIT--Interesting conversation by the way...thanks!

1959. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:51:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2Ppw8.3244$9b4.171795829@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41227

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc177b7.14371247@news.montanavision.net...

> I don't go on ham radio
> newsgroups saying I've "worked all bands", and dodge and weave for a
> week when asked "What mode did you operate on 30 meters?".
>
> Stacey, AA7YA

Stacey, what are "all bands?"

Do you differentiate between 75M and 80M? Or is it all 80M?

1960. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:55:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YSpw8.3246$%e4.171965556@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41228

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc1765d.14024547@news.montanavision.net...

> Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
> radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.
>
> Stacey, AA7YA

I'll bet he can.

1961. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:58:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kVpw8.3247$O54.171573454@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41229

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc1fbaf.48160607@news.montanavision.net...
> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 22:59:59 GMT, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
> wrote:
>
> >That may be your rule, but it's not an FCC rule.
> >
> >I hold 3 stations licenses for K0HB, K0RT, and W0EF. It is routine for
all
> >three stations to be on the air at the same time during contests, etc.,
and
> >I need not be present at any of them. Nothing in the FCC rules requires
me
> >to be at any of those stations so long as the operator at the controls is
> >operating within the bounds of his own operator license.
>
> Actually, it's within the bounds of the station license. As an
> example, if I volunteered to fill in one hour on a "Novice station"
> during Field Day, I can't operate in the Extra class part of the band,
> because I would jeopardize the station license for which that Novice
> class station is permitted to operate. With an Extra class license I
> could, if I used my callsign, but it's not the callsign designated as
> the "Novice Station" license.
>
> You can bend the rules all you want, you can interpret them any way
> you like, but there's no gray matter when it comes to the explicit FCC
> Part 97 rulebook.
>
> Stacey, AA7YA

Stacey, do you pay "repeater dues?"

1962. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 02:58:24 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc22d9c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41234

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc1ee80.44784687@news.montanavision.net...
> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 15:56:10 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >Aw, and here I was about to tell you that it was good to see another YL
on
> >the newsgroup. Actually it is, even if you will be among the ranks of
those
> >who think they are holding others "to the fire." ROFLMAO...I have no
idea
> >if I've been on 30M or not, Stacey. I can tell you that I've never been
on
> >any digital modes, except for the couple of times that I've had CW QSOs
> >(yep, there I go again with ambiguities...can you handle it?) I also
know
> >that I was not on 30M either of those two times because both times I was
> >within *my* operating privileges.
> >
>
> That's what you should have said in the first place.
>

Hmmmm, now you're going to dictate just as Jim does on how someone is
supposed to communicate. Sorry, I'll do the entry; you can read it or not.

By the way...I misunderstood and called you a YL. Sorry.

> >
> >I also have a tendency to stare at all the stars every night.
>
> Figures, you spaced out on the question, what mode you used on 30
> meters?
>

So, now staring at stars brings about some kind of negative connotation, eh?
Wow, you'll fit right into the newsgroup. There are only very opinionated
people here. By the way, it'll piss Jim of to no end for me to tell you
that...no, I didn't "space out" on the 30M question. More, that I realized
the band is set aside for digital modes only and so I must never have been
on that band; as I don't use digital modes. The thing that probably really
pisses Jim and others off--more than anything--is that they couldn't dupe me
into some stupid answer out of ignorance of the 30M set aside. As soon as I
saw the question, I recognized it for the trap it was. That's what they're
pissed at...

Kim W5TIT

1963. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:06:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020420230610.04364.00001904@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41233

In article <_%ew8.2931$Ba2.144370069@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >Yep, enlisted retired pay is so low that even that added to GS-7 pay is
>> >pretty pathetic.
>>
>> Brian:
>>
>> Well, you ought to know all about that!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Welp, that's why I'm no longer with the Corp's of Engineers. You on the
>other hand can keep driving your bus to the bank. Verrry lucrative, HA!

Brian:

I drive it to banks, hospitals, Renal Care centers, doctor's offices, schools, churches, etc., and, ultimately, the homes of all my clients. Lucrative? It does pay very well, has great benefits, and offers just about all the overtime you want.

BTW, I'm on Jury Duty for the next two weeks, so why don't you go ahead and make fun of that as well?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1964. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:06:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020420230611.04364.00001905@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41232

In article <3cc1765d.14024547@news.montanavision.net>, aa7ya@hotmail.com (S. Hanrahan) writes:

>Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
>radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.
>
>Stacey, AA7YA

Very interesting. Assuming we're talking about *amateur* radio equipment here, for what possible reason would your Extra-class licensed father need you to be present before transmitting? There is certainly no reason I can find in Part 97! Is your father physically disabled, and requires you to physically manipulate the radio controls for him? That's the only thing that comes to mind. Please explain.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1965. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:06:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020420230612.04364.00001906@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41231

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.guvvdj4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>>Why would you want to be involved in RACES anyway? If you are
>>truly interested in local ham radio emergency communications service,
>>ARES is where the action should be.
>
> Don't know how it is in other parts of the country, but here in
> Oregon RACES and ARES are one organization. To get into it you
> have to meet its requirements of both.

Phil:

That's pretty weird.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1966. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:12:29 UTC
From: Jimick <jimick1@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <x6qw8.41391$WV1.14474770@typhoon.ne.ipsvc.net>
Source record: 41236

It's not ham radio that is dying...it's the spirit of ham radio that is
dying. It is being replaced by apathy...

jimi

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:Cspw8.3236$FO3.170810557@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Fred Garvin" <Garvin@Truss.net> wrote in message
> news:1faxpy5.1oi4af91qojqmnN%Garvin@Truss.net...
> > Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
> >
> > > "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20020416175519.00480.00004147@mb-mj.aol.com...
> > > > >Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
> > > > >From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> > > > >Date: 04/16/02 15:00 Eastern Daylight Time
> > > > >Message-id: <3CBC74DA.E6A5273D@psu.edu>
> > > > >
> > > > >There are a few things about the
> > > > >ARS that aren't so good.
> > > > >
> > > > Sure there is, Mike, but at the end of the day, which outweighs
> the
> > > other
> > > > by a long way?
> > > > >
> > > > >It says a lot about a person in what they focus upon.
> > > > >
> > > > I'm focusing upon the fact that NASA has Ham Radio on board an
> > > orbiting
> > > > space station and they're bragging about it...and I bet there ain't
a
> > > cellphone
> > > > within 300 miles of it!~
> > > > >
> > > > 73
> > > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > >
> > > What's the orbit altitude of the ISS?
> >
> > I'm showing about 396 miles as of this post.
>
> Then Steve got lucky. There might not be one withing 300 miles, but

there's
> 10's of millions within 400 miles.
>
>

1967. Re: "Amateurs" and Education

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:12:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <A6qw8.3249$9t4.172560607@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41235

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:4ab04b6b6646f00f803e1a1509ceae71.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Naw, I'm not on 2. I'm on 440, and it would have done your heart a wee
> bit o good to hear us one night when one guy was ranting about the
> necessity of keeping the code. All head full and damn the torpedoes ..
> 40 WPM F2 ahoy! That was fun ;) ... Heck, I spent some time at 'NAC as
> well (the hospital - as a ham, not a patient!). Ahhh ... Agana ... I
> forget what club it was, but they had a REAL pinball machine. The
> ancient type with fixed pins (nails?) and you had to try and see how far
> down the thing you could get the ball. Ho boy, and Old Swill (Old
> Milwaukee beer) had just been introduced to the em club. 5 cents got
> you a 16 ounce can of old swill. If you were broke, just borrow a
> quarter! I saw a short movie on Guam on the satellite. I wouldn't
> recognize it today for all the high-rise fancy hotels and such.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
> ps - what was it, KUAM? The TV station where if they didn't get part
> two ahead of part three, they'd play part three of the movie one night
> followed by part two the next .... And the weather reports - if it was
> raining, you could hear the rain pounding on the quonset hut!

Tarague Beach, beer in hand, wire over the palm, scratching away at the DX
log.

1968. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:20:12 UTC
From: Jimick <jimick1@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Mdqw8.41392$WV1.14480440@typhoon.ne.ipsvc.net>
Source record: 41238

At least the Air Force has a few boats!!

jimi

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:Beqw8.3252$ym4.172290230@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020412180225.19503.00000582@mb-cm.aol.com...
>
> > For half a century, the US military has had a policy of REQUIRING
> > commissioned officers to have a college education or the
> > equivalency of one. The USAF has made it a policy of requiring
> > all pilots to be commissioned officers. The US Army took a more
> > realistic view in the Warrant Officer requirements for helicopter
> > pilots (there are more helos in the US military than fixed-wing
> > aircraft).
>
> Yep, we forgot about helicopters when we took the airplanes away from the
> Army in 1947. Everybody wants to be in the Air Force. Army's got
> helicopters, Navy's got little pointy nosed planes, Marine Corps has both,
> Coast Guard has C-130's. Someday the Air Force should buy tanks and
> submarines.
>
>
>
>

1969. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:20:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc232e0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41242

The first post I made to answer Jim's question:

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >Anyway, the
> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
I've
> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
>
> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Er, no digital...no CW...LOL

Kim W5TIT
****

That seems like a pretty direct answer to me. I said "no digital...no
CW...LOL" so it should have been quite obvious to him that I had probably
never been on 30M.

He didn't like that answer, so:

In article <3cb78636$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Anyway, the
>> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
I've
>> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
>>
>> What mode did you use on 30 meters?

>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>Er, no digital...no CW...LOL
>
I don't understand, Kim.

You wrote:

"I've done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times."

The context was HF bands, of course. 30 meters is an HF band.
What mode did you use on 30 meters?

It's a simple question.

73 de Jim, N2EY
****

I guess at some point he is looking for a different answer. There isn't one.

Kim W5TIT

1970. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:21:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Beqw8.3252$ym4.172290230@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41237

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020412180225.19503.00000582@mb-cm.aol.com...

> For half a century, the US military has had a policy of REQUIRING
> commissioned officers to have a college education or the
> equivalency of one. The USAF has made it a policy of requiring
> all pilots to be commissioned officers. The US Army took a more
> realistic view in the Warrant Officer requirements for helicopter
> pilots (there are more helos in the US military than fixed-wing
> aircraft).

Yep, we forgot about helicopters when we took the airplanes away from the Army in 1947. Everybody wants to be in the Air Force. Army's got helicopters, Navy's got little pointy nosed planes, Marine Corps has both, Coast Guard has C-130's. Someday the Air Force should buy tanks and submarines.

1971. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:25:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc233ce$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41243

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020420230612.04364.00001906@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.guvvdj4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:
>
> >>Why would you want to be involved in RACES anyway? If you are
> >>truly interested in local ham radio emergency communications service,
> >>ARES is where the action should be.
> >
> > Don't know how it is in other parts of the country, but here in
> > Oregon RACES and ARES are one organization. To get into it you
> > have to meet its requirements of both.
>
> Phil:
>
> That's pretty weird.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Phil: shhhhhhh, anything outside those four walls is beyond Larry's
comprehension. :)

Kim W5TIT

1972. Re: Technician, to "Tech Plus" or "Advanced"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:25:02 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <iiqw8.3254$WE4.173102369@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41239

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc18a45.19122288@news.montanavision.net...

> If one has a Tech Plus license, no reason why they shouldn't just go
> for the Extra, since the "dumbing down" of ham radio took place 2
> years ago.

Why go for anything? Our experts here say "they just give it away."

1973. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:31:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <voqw8.3257$YI4.173292986@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41240

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020420230611.04364.00001905@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3cc1765d.14024547@news.montanavision.net>, aa7ya@hotmail.com
(S.
> Hanrahan) writes:
>
> >Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my
> >radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him.
> >
> >Stacey, AA7YA
>
> Very interesting. Assuming we're talking about *amateur* radio
> equipment here, for what possible reason would your Extra-class
> licensed father need you to be present before transmitting? There
> is certainly no reason I can find in Part 97! Is your father physically
> disabled, and requires you to physically manipulate the radio
> controls for him? That's the only thing that comes to mind. Please
> explain.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I was thinking she might have a lock on her shack door.

1974. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:33:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8qqw8.3259$l94.171731307@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41241

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cc22d9c_1@newsa.ev1.net...

>
> By the way...I misunderstood and called you a YL. Sorry.

Great! I just referred to Stacey as "her." Thanks Kim.

Brian

1975. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:36:41 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc2368c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41244

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:2Ppw8.3244$9b4.171795829@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:3cc177b7.14371247@news.montanavision.net...
>
> > I don't go on ham radio
> > newsgroups saying I've "worked all bands", and dodge and weave for a
> > week when asked "What mode did you operate on 30 meters?".
> >
> > Stacey, AA7YA
>
> Stacey, what are "all bands?"
>
> Do you differentiate between 75M and 80M? Or is it all 80M?
>
>

Here's the irony. Try this one on for size...LOL No, Stacey does *not* go on ham radio newgroups saying "I've worked all bands." Nope, sure doesn't. He goes on ham radio newsgroups saying:

"Wrong, my father, also an Extra class operator, can't transmit on my radio equipment without me physically in the shack with him."

Now, the thing here, Stacey, is that I think it's quite petty for me to point out the above. However, I'd also like you to note that you jumped all over the bandwagon with Jim, who's having his fun with semantics.

We are all going to say things in a way that is incorrect. None of us, not even Jim, are precise with every communication we make. When I say I have been on all HF ham bands, it is truly my belief that a) no one except Jim is going to get that analytical with such a comment, b) no one but Jim is going to feel all that compelled to challenge something so idiotic, c) no one but Jim is going to stretch so far to challenge something I say, and d) no one sits there, except Jim, and starts thinking up some smartass trap question for the simple matter of attempting to embarrass someone. Not that I am embarrassed. I stand by what I said. In essence, I have been on all HF ham bands. Nor do I feel compelled to play Jim's game any more.

Stacey, as you may just now be realizing...we all say things that may be off. We do not mean them to be malicious in any way. Some are just so egotistical that they *have* to make a point; however inflated that point may be.

Kim W5TIT

1976. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:38:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc2370a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41245

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.04.20.22.32.10.933689.16499@arrl.org...
> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 19:26:22 -0400, K0HB wrote:
> >
> > Your attitude is simply unbelievable!
>
> Why, because I think your idea is not a good one? Sorry, but that's what I
> think. Maybe you shouldn't take it so personally. You feel free to state
> that others' ideas are bad when you think they are. Why can't others
> disagree with your ideas?
>
> Jon, KE3Z

WOW!!! Perfectly said, Jon. May I use the above as a tagline in my
messages? :o

Kim W5TIT

1977. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:40:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc23776$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41246

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:cGmw8.22042$3z3.1947185@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote
>
> > So far, the only rationale you've put forth as the need for this
proposal
> > is a flawed understanding of what the FCC rules permit.
>
> And so far all you've done is make me seriously consider making some phone
> calls.
>
> Hans, K0HB
> Member, ARRL
>

Naw, I know that's not a threat coming from Hans...I just know it's not.
Hans would in no way try to snuff out dissention in that way, would he?

Kim W5TIT

1978. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 03:47:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc2392b$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41247

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:8qqw8.3259$l94.171731307@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cc22d9c_1@newsa.ev1.net...
>
> >
> > By the way...I misunderstood and called you a YL. Sorry.
>
> Great! I just referred to Stacey as "her." Thanks Kim.
>
> Brian
>
>

ROFLMAO....LOL, yeah. Jim'll jump all over you for that mistake...LOL I completely missed the "e" in Stacey's name. Actually I am lying, I did not miss the "e", I paid no attention to what that means...

Kim W5TIT

1979. Re: FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 04:12:46 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <g0f4cus2v9gipv0u7bu92440alj7pclp46@4ax.com>
Source record: 41248

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 21:24:01 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:anv2cuo4n15rn80igods6ihm7qcj8l6upl@4ax.com...
>> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 07:45:17 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
>> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>>
>> >Oh no...another kid in the sandbox...
>>
>> Well, you know, if you would stop the innuendos, you wouldn't have
>> that problem. I hope you don't do the same thing on the radio. That
>> would be just awful. What if children were listening to daddy's
>> scanner and overheard you?
>>
>> Please remember, innuendo is actually created in the mind of the
>> listener. If you want to lambast someone's radio conversations, try
>> doing it on what they actually said and not what your own deviant
>> little mind cooked up or what you wish they had said.
>>
>> Otherwise, i'll just keep laughing at you.
>
>Oh *yawn* no, *yawn*, not that!
>
>Kim W5TIT (pssst, please laugh all you like)
>

Thanks, I will and now that I know it's deliberate on your part, I
won't feel bad about it.

1980. ARNewsline 1288 - April 19 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 07:51:39 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421035139.11843.00007290@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 41249

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1288 - April 19 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1288 with a release date of
Friday, April 19th, 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Amateur Radio volunteerism is praised at the N-A-B Ham Radio Reception and a Montana senator calls for a change in the way the United States oversees the electromagnetic spectrum. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1288 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: HAMS PRAISED AT NAB AMATEUR RADIO MIXER

The heroism of ham radio operators who donate their services in times of national disaster, and especially those who volunteered in the days following the 911 terrorist attacks was not forgotten at this years National Association of Broadcasters Ham Radio Reception. The April 10th gathering was co-hosted by Kenwood Communications and CQ Magazine. It was CQ publisher Dick Ross, K2MGA, who took time to honor those hams who put their lives on hold, to be there when needed:

--
K2MGA: “I do want to take a moment to focus a little bit of attention on how proud we have a right to be as Radio Amateurs. I think we saw that on September 11th, when thousands upon thousands of hams throughout the United States jumped in their cars -- or -- in the New York are -- hopped onto the subways -- with back packs filled with radio equipment and did whatever they could. They are still doing ‘whatever they can,’ and that is really what Amateur Radio is all about.”
--

Ross comments were enthusiastically received. CQ was represented at the gathering by Ross and Editor Rich Moseson, W2VU. Also making presentations were Kenwood’s Paul Middelton K4NUH and ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP. 600 to 800 radio amateurs who attended the NAB convention also usually show up at the Ham Radio Reception.

**

SPECTRUM ISSUES: SENATOR TO ASK FOR COMPLETE SPECTRUM REVIEW

A U-S Senator says that its time to overhaul the method by which the United States manages the entire electromagnetic spectrum. Montana Senator Conrad Burns, said on Monday, April 15th that he plans to introduce such legislation. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details:

--

Senator Conrad Burns says that he expects a two to three year battle over the legislation he plans to introduce this congressional season. But Burns also told a packed audience at the recent National Association of Broadcasters Convention in Las Vegas that he is going to put together a total spectrum reform bill because he does not think that Congress should be piecemealing how it makes spectrum available.

Senator Burns told the NAB audience that he predicts an intense battle over the legislation affecting multiple constituencies. He noted that many frequency bands are used by government agencies like the Department of Defense Department. Burns said that he is still awaiting a report from the General Accounting Office which is reviewing a large number of spectrum issues and related government practices.

And what does this mean to ham radio? In the short term probably very little. In the long run it could affect our future survival.

Depending on the scope of the Burns legislation and how much of it -- if any -- is ever enacted by Congress, the future use of all spectrum could well come under a bureaucratic microscope. Those services that legislators do not feel justify spectrum could -- eventually -- loose it.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP

--

Earlier plans to move some government operations to other spectrum now have little support in the wake of the September 11th terrorist attacks. Meantime, numerous telecommunications companies are pressuring the government to make large portions of spectrum available quickly, to introduce new consumer wireless services. (Published reports)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: NEW FRENCH HAMSATS COMING

AMSAT has announced that two new French Amateur Radio mini satellites or picosats are planned for launch on May 3rd. This, as secondary payloads with the SPOT-5 satellite.

The two hamsats are being funded, designed and built by AMSAT-France. They are battery powered and should operate from orbit about 40 days. Both will transmit recorded voice messages using Narrow Band FM along with digital telemetry. Data will be transmitted at 400 baud BPSK. Downlink frequencies are listed as 145.84 MHz and 435.27 MHz.

An Ariane 4 booster will carry the satellites to orbit but the ham radio birds will not be free floating. Rather they will remain fastened to the Ariane’s third stage at a panned altitude of about 800 kilometers. Both of these new birds will switched on about ten days after the launch. (ANS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT-NA TO RE-EVALUATE THE FUTURE

Meantime, AMSAT North America President Robin Haighton, VE3FRH, has called a special Board of Directors meeting for April 20th. This, to review the current fiscal situation and to decide on a proper course of action for upcoming ham radio space projects.

In a published column earlier this year, Haighton had commented that financial support coming to AMSAT for the Eagle satellite and other projects have been reduced as a result 911. Haighton now says that this continues to be the case.

Haighton does say that the design of another satellite called Echo is progressing and he should have more information to make public next month. The AMSAT North America president adds that the organizations forum at the upcoming Dayton Hamvention will offer a closer look at several proposed satellite projects. (ANS)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the N-4-G-G-D Repeater serving Greensboro North Carolina.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT NEEDED: WORLDWIDE QRM TO 40 METERS

The March issue of the Monitoring System Newsletter talked about a rogue broadcast from Eritrea on 7.100 Mhz. A transmission that continues to be heard well in eastern North America.

According to the IARU, this broadcast can at times also be heard around the world. Also, the report says that its lower sideband can dominate the top few kilohertz of the 7.000 to 7.100 MHz Amateur band. (ANS)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC ARRESTS NYC UNLICENSED BROADCASTER

An unlicensed broadcaster has been arrested for refusing to shut down operations. Paul Dorleans was taken into federal custody on April 15th for operating an unlicensed FM radio station on 87.9 MHz in Brooklyn New York.

The FCC says that earlier enforcement actions had failed to discourage Dorleans’ unlicensed operation of the FM Station. The FCC, on more than one occasion, had issued notices to Dorleans directing him to cease operation. And the U.S. Marshal’s Service, in conjunction with the United States Attorney’s Office and the FCC, had seized his radio equipment on one previous occasion.

The United States Marshals Service arrested Dorleans working in conjunction with FCC Agents and the Office of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York. So far this year, investigation of unlicensed broadcast operation by the FCC’s Enforcement Bureau has resulted in the shutdown of

over 20 unlicensed stations. Dorleans faces the possibility of a heavy fine and a prison sentence if convicted. (FCC Release)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC TO UTILITIES - DON’T INTERFERE WITH HAMS

The FCC has issued letters to five power utility companies to request that they contact and work with Amateur Radio operators in the area to resolve power line interference problems. According to FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth the utility companies are:

--
Hollingsworth: “Anderson Indiana City Utility, the Dominion Power Company in Richmond Virginia, Northeast Utilities in Berlin Connecticut, Southern California Edison in Rosemont California and the Soccoro Electric Co-Op in Soccoro New Mexico.”
--

Hollingsworth says that the companies were instructed to report back in 90 days to outline the progress made in clearing these interference complaints. (FCC, RAIN)

**

SPECIAL COMMS: RADIO SOLO NOW ON THE GROUND

The United States military broadcasts to Afghanistan are still being widely heard on 8.700 Mhz, but are now land based. The broadcasts are being produced by the same unit that produced the Commando Solo airborne transmissions during the early stages of the war on terrorism. (Media Network)

**

NET INFO: BAJA NET MOVES

WB0YCQ reports that the Baja Maritime Mobile Net which meets 7 days a week at 8:00 am Pacific Daylight savings time has moved to 7.262 MHz plus or minus a few kilohertz. This is due to interference on the original net frequency. (WB0YCQ)

**

CONVENTIONS & HAMFESTS: SEVHFS IN LATE APRIL

The Sixth Annual Southeastern VHF Society Conference is slated for April 26th and 27th in Oak Ridge Tennessee. Program highlights include, antenna gain measurements, pre-amp gain and noise figure measurements, a Friday evening flea market with vendor displays, a Friday evening tour of nearby Ten Tec, and Saturday evening banquet with guest speaker Joe Dooley, P.E. of Oak Ridge National Laboratory. For more information contact Greg Robinson KB4NVD by e-mail to Rover@wireco.net (SEVHFS via VHF Reflector)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: MT. BEACON HAMFEST POSTPONED

The Mt. Beacon New York Hamfest, scheduled for Sunday April 21st has been postponed. Planners say they are looking to reschedule. Stay tuned to Amateur Radio Newsline for an announcement of the new date. (KL7JCQ, WA2BSS)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for todays radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

**

THE SUPPORT FUND REPORT WITH ANDY JAREMA N6TCQ

Ladies and gentlemen, with some words regarding Amateur Radio Newsline's current fiscal situation, here is Support Fund Administrator Andy Jarema, N6TCQ:

--
That's right. Its me. A.J.. And when you hear my voice you know I am here for one of two reasons. One is the bad – as in – help we need your financial support. The other is to say thanks to those of you who have kicked in to keep amateur Radio Newsline coming your way.

This week it's the bad. The numbers for the first three months of 2002 are in and its not good news. Right now we have about $145 in the bank and close to a thousand dollars in back bills sitting on my desk. And the people we owe money to like the phone company and our Internet providers want to be paid.

The bottom line is that this is once again a financial emergency. Only you can keep these weekly newscasts coming your way. We need your help, and we need it right now.

And remember. Amateur Radio Newsline Newsline is a federal 501c 3 corporation and a California certified non-profit corporation. This means that all contributions are tax-deductible.

The address for the Newsline Support fund is PO Box 660937, Arcadia, CA 91066.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline Support Fund, I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Again that's the Amateur Radio Newsline Support Fund, P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia California 91066. (ARNewsline™ Support Fund)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: JERRY ROSS SETS SPACEWALK RECORD

United States Astronaut Jerry Ross, N-5-S-C-W has set a personal best . On Tuesday April 16th Ross made his 9th spacewalk on the latest of his seven

orbital flights. In doing this, the 54 year old retired Air Force Colonel set the record for the greatest number of flights and spacewalks ever by an Astronaut or Cosmonaut.

Prior to his current flight, N5SCW had logged 1133 hours in space.
Ross is flying for the seventh time and may not get an eighth turn. This is because of other astronauts in line for flights. (Published reports)

**

INTERNATIONAL-RUSSIA: SPACE TOURIST READY TO FLY

The world's second would-be space tourist is almost ready for takeoff. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, has the details:

--
Russian space officials say that Internet industrialist Mark Shuttleworth has completed most of his training and is ready to visit the International Space Station.

Shuttleworth is a 28-year-old South African economist who made his fortune with an Internet business. He said he would conduct gene engineering studies while on the space station using animal stem cells. He said he hoped his research could be used to help find cures for Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease.

Liftoff of has been set for April 25th from the Baikonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan. Shuttleworth confirmed that he is paying $20 million for the trip but in installments that will be complete only when the mission is over. That's the same sum American Dennis Tito, KG6FZX, paid Russian space agencies last year to fly to the international station, becoming the world's first space tourist.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Jeramy Boot, G4NJH

--

Its not yet known if Shuttleworth will be licensed to operate the ham radio gear on board the I-S-S. (Space Adventures, published reports)

**

INTERNATIONAL - NEW ZEALAND: POWER COMMS STANDARDS TO BE SET

Powerline telecommunications and its potential as a source of interference will be a major topic to be discussed in New Zealand. This, from September 16th to the 30th. The gathering is slated for the city of Christchurch where a newly established committees, is working to create common standards for information technology equipment and radio and television products. According to NZART, this should prove beneficial to that nations radio amateurs. (NZART)

**

INTERNATIONAL – ZIMBABWE: BBC SUSPENDED FROM CAB

The Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation has been suspended from the Commonwealth Broadcasting Association for a year. This, as the print Media in Zimbabwe is becoming increasingly outspoken about the Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation and its political role in that nation. More information is on the web at http://www.rnw.nl/realradio/html/zimbabwe-latest.html. (Media Network)

**

DX

In D-X, The VK9ML DXpedition to Mellish Reef should be on the air as this newscast goes to air. The multi-national team will be on the air through the 22nd of April. (GB2RS)

Also, GB2RS reports that another major multi-operator DXpedition will be active as XW1HS from Laos. The operators, all resident in Thailand, include American, British, Swedish and Spanish operators, as well as 11 Thai nationals. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM - HAM RADIO IN THE MOVIES: IMAX ISS MOVIE PREMIERES

And finally this week, ham radio is not only at a film premiere. It is actually an important part of the movie. This as the new 3-D motion picture about the International Space Station gets to the giant screen in a press preview on April 16th. Amateur Radio Newslines Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--
The movie we are talking about is the new IMAX film called Space Station. Amateur Radio on the International Space Station is a part of it. According to ARISS Program Manager Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, the film simply breathtaking:

--
KA3HDO: “It was the closest way that an individual could experience space without going to it themselves. It was spectacular from the persoective that you really felt like you were there. hat you were part of the team that was making Space Station happen.

It just was phenominal. Breathtaking views of the Earth, of Space Station and inside the cabin of the space station.”
--

Bauer says that it was pretty awesome to see Astronaut Bill Shepherd talk to the Texas students with using ham radio equipment. Also, ARISS appears in the movie’s credits.

According to Bauer, there were 21 members of the ARISS volunteer team attending and supporting the sneak preview. Visitors included Astronauts Bill Shepherd and Yuri Usachev. Also attending were the film’s producer Toni Meyers and National Air and Space Museum Curator Jack Dailey. The comments were all glowing and Bauer says that this is a must see movie.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

--

Consult local listings to find out when Space Station will be shown at an IMAX or OMNIMAX theater near you. (KA3HDO, ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm).

Before we go, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2002 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year award is now open. No significant changes from last year. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules, an application and information on contacting us is on our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Mert Garlick, N6AWE, 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

1981. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 08:11:31 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204210723320.23176-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41250

```
On Sat, 20 Apr 2002, W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0204202046370.22832-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002, W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0204200641040.22489-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> >> >
>> >> > And the RACES operations and "stations" will be remain but will be
>> >> > licensed to participating amateur radio operators rather than to the
>> >> > RACES entity.
>> >> >
>> >> > Just a different coat of paint.
>> >>
>> >> The fact that they won't have their own license anymore is more than "a
>> >> different coat of paint." It's non-existance.
>> >>
>> >
>> >No, that is not true. The only thing that has changed is that there will
>no
>> >more RACES station licenses, and that is it. There will continue to be
>> >City, State, and County civil defense organizations who include RACES in
>> >their regimen for emergency response operations. There will continue to
>be
>> >RACES organizations and they will continue to operate under the same R&R
>as
>> >always. And, FEMA will continue to be the "mother" organization of
>RACES.
>>
>> Then explain this: How does one have a "radio service" without anyone
>having a
>> license for that service? RACES stands for "radio amateur communications
>> emergency service." My point is: Without the separate RACES license,
>there is
>> no difference between RACES and the amateur radio service at all. Without
>the
>> license, there is no such thing as a RACES station or a RACES net. It's
>ALL
>> amateur radio without distinction. [It's also not a service where
>licensing
>> isn't required....]
>>
>
>As I understand it, the RACES licenses that were issued were more issued as
>station appointments than anything. In other words, a local EOC, a RACES
```

>Radio Officer maybe, or something like that. Were individuals issued RACES
>licesnes, separate from their radio amateur licenses?

Prior to restructuring, yes - to the organization. It was even in the rules that the "responsible person" (i.e. trustee) need only be part of the sponsoring organization or government agency - he (or she) need NOT hold any amateur license whatsoever. Although it also said that only an amateur licenseholder may be the "control operator," there was NO requirement for a RACES station to HAVE a control operator (it's NOT in 31 CFR 97.109 - which defines station control of ONLY an amateur station, nor is it in 31 CFR 97.407 which defined RACES itself fully).

>In Hunt County, I know there is no RACES license that is called on the air.
>And, when a RACES net is in operation, it is at the direction of the County
>EOC, with whom the relationship has been established. There is s *distinct*
>difference (well, used to be--not so much any more) between RACES and ARES.
>The Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service is established throughout this
>country--but doesn't necessarily *have* to be the service of choice for
>emergencies. In other words, the exact same service *could* be provided
>through ARES. An ARES organization could even require background checks, if
>that is how the served agencies wish to establish their relationship with
>radio amateur provided communication.
>
>With regard to the inherrent issue of the Presidential War Powers Act, RACES
>is specifically targeted, is still established (with or without existing
>licenses) and is still organized at the direction of city, county, and state
>officials. The fact that the FCC will no longer be issuing RACES licenses
>does not change the established relationship between RACES and its served
>agencies.

Except for the fact that it doesn't exist any more.... As I said, there is NO DIFFERENCE between "RACES" in its current form and any collection of licensed amateurs who have volunteered community service to a government agency - because there's NOTHING that distinguishes the two. When the FCC effectively repealed RACES station licenses (by attrition), they took away the difference.

>> >> There will be little difference between a former races organization and
>> >ANY
>> >> radio club which volunteers in disasters - except that the radio club
>may
>> >have
>> >> its OWN license while the races organization can't.
>> >>
>> >
>> >That exists now, thanks to the hard work of many amateurs. There are
>> >harline RACES folks and hardline ARES folks, but the truth is that the
>two
>> >organizations have actually been hard to distinguish over the last few
>> >years...as emergency communication in amateur radio has begun to take
>itself
>> >more seriously. There are still the folks who love the label "wannabe,"

>but
>> >they are also on the fringe of most ham radio organizations anyway.
>> >
>> >>
>> >> Without a license, it's a disavowed entity type.
>> >>
>> >
>> >*THAT* is sooooo wrong. You are absolutely wrong in your assessment of
>> >this. As stated, the *only* thing that is changing is that the FCC will
>> >issue no more RACES station licenses. That's it, nothing more. To say
>what
>> >you said above is to also say that Restructuring was the end of ham
>radio.
>> >Maybe you are one of those people who believes that, but you couldn't be
>> >further from the truth.
>>
>> Then what is the distinction between RACES and an organized collection of
>> licensed radio amateurs? I say that there is NONE - and by that fact,
>RACES
>> has effectively disappeared.
>>
>
>The distinction between the two, specifically, is which one is recognized
>officially by the served agencies? If the City of Dallas recognizes RACES
>as the only amateur organization from which they will seek emergency
>communication, then RACES it is. If they choose ARES, then it is ARES. In
>some locales, there is enough trust established between the two
>organizations that ARES works side by side with RACES, yet RACES is the
>organization to which the nod goes for items such as entry into restricted
>areas, etc. That does *not* have to be the case. As I said, the
>controlling functions can decide that they want their ARES members to have
>background checks.

There you have it: "... as the only AMATEUR organization from ...." (emphasis
added). It no longer has its separate component! [ARES never was separate.]

>> The FCC's non-renewal of RACES station licenses was like pulling out the
>bottom
>> card from a house of cards. As soon as the last such station has its
>license
>> expired, the house of cards collapses.
>>
>> I have never said that restructuring was the end of amateur radio.
>>
>
>I didn't mean to imply that you did...I meant that as a comparitive comment.
>
>> >>
>> >> It would be like our recent restructuring but not allowing novice
>> >licensees to
>> >> renew: The HF subbands would still be there, but (ignoring Tech+HF for

>> >the
>> >> moment) there would be no one for which those rules would apply to.
>> >>
>> >
>> >Ya can't "ignore" something that is there just to make your statement
>true.
>> >And refarming of bands isn't quite the same as saying something won't
>exist
>> >any more...hardly so. I challenge you to write to any Emergency
>Operations
>> >officials of your city, state, or county, and ask them if they will be
>> >changing a thing about their RACES organization. In fact, I don't care
>if
>> >you write to any or all city, state, or county organizations. You'll get
>> >the answer that they will continue as always...either RACES or
>> >ARES...whichever the case may be. And, in some really progressive and
>> >politically benign areas, both!
>>
>> There's one thing you missed: Some of those RACES organizations
>themselves
>> won't be valid anymore.
>>
>
>They will be no less valid if they are still the organization of choice by
>the official decision makers for our city, county, state, and even federal
>government. And, I seriously doubt that you will see any change in status
>for RACES.

Of course not - not now, that there's no more licenses for them, etc....

>> The establishment of RACES stations did NOT require
>> that the trustee (i.e. person in charge) hold an amateur radio license.
>With
>> RACES licenses gone, these people no longer have the operating authority
>to
>> contact their amateur support group over the air. This means that the
>former
>> trustee (either himself or by his replacement) must now hold an amateur
>license
>> - and CANCELS OUT the distinction between RACES and merely an organized
>group
>> of amateurs.
>>
>
>You mean someone such as a governmental emergency management official that
>may not have an amateur license? That's an interesting point. *However* in
...

That is correct. Formerly, 31 CFR 97.5(d)(4) read:

"A RACES station license (FCC form 660) issued to a person by the FCC.

"A RACES station license is issued only to the person who is the license custodian designated by the official responsible for the governmental agency served by that civil defense organization. ... The custodian need not hold an amateur operator license."

[Military recreation stations also have no requirement that the station custodian hold an amateur license.]

>the FCC R&R, is it not already established that a person with a civil
>defense organization is allowed to enter a RACES net? I believe the new
>language accommodates such interaction between an agency and the RACES net.
>I may be wrong. I can only relate what happens around here with RACES, and
>here everyone on a RACES is a licensed amateur as well. I never even
>*heard* of "RACES licenses" until I heard they were taking them away...

There is no mention of "nets" in the rules; just communications. We have 31 CFR 97.407(d) that still reads:

"An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization may only communicate with:
"(1) A RACES station licensed to the civil defense organization with which the amateur station is registered; [*]
"(2) The following stations upon authorization of the responsible civil defense official for the organization with which the amateur station is registered;
"(i) A RACES station licensed to another civil defense organization; [*]
"(ii) An amateur station registered with the same or another civil defense organization;
"(iii) A United States Government station authorized by the responsible agency to communicate with RACES stations; and [*]
"(iv) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such communication is authorized by the FCC."

[*] - marks sunsetted cases which disappear with the last RACES station expiration. Without the license, there is no such thing as a RACES station, just amateur stations which participate in civil defense.

Interestingly enough, those amateur stations which do sign up restrict themselves (they can no longer talk to just any amateur station - note that it didn't say "an amateur station while operating in RACES ..." but just "amateur station"). Also noted, "(iv)" above is redundant to 31 CFR 97.111(a)(2), since "RACES activation" would only be during an "emergency."

This means that for registered amateur stations, they can ONLY talk to others registered to the same organization (or another) UPON PERMISSION and upon the expiration of the RACES station license for that organization, NO OTHER STATION AT ALL unless they have permission from the responsible official, or decertify themselves from ALL civil defense organizations they are registered with.

[Note very carefully that what the rules actually say may be quite different from the logical intent of the rules when it comes to the restrictions....]

>I don't think there's going to be a drastic change in RACES served agencies
>just because the licensing is "going away."

That's because no one has really analyzed the changes - because except for non-renewal, all the rules are still present; i.e. there has been no change to the text of the regulation (31 CFR 97.407). They won't realize that non-renewal has these "snowball effects" until their licenses actually expire and they try to then figure out what it means. [If there are any other differences, I haven't compared them against the current CFR text.]

The "restructuring" changes were defective in other places too, like effectively doing away with the "Tech Plus" license yet allowing permanent operating privilege to those with element 1 CSCE's on the "HF novice bands", giving element 1 credit only for expired novice licenses, but not general or higher, etc....

1982. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 08:17:45 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <1ct4cug330268710dn2aimro5fkidrd5rq@4ax.com>
Source record: 41251

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 13:41:51 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >> "All" means "each and every" or "the complete set". If even one thing is
>> >> left out, "all" does not apply.
>> >
>> >If Kim had said that her high school boyfriend was "all hands",
>> >would you have disagreed with her statement?
>>
>> Nope.
>
>Then perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".

Gee, can I use that kind of a concept for WAS? It sure would help a
lot!

1983. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 10:55:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CC29AC3.4032C52B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 41252

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CBFE20E.70864BB2@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Jim hasn't set the definition of the term "all HF bands". The phrase
> > can only mean one thing. If you are the only person who feels that she
> > can leave out a band or two and still claimed to have been active on
> > "all HF bands", you are the one with the problem of definition. Let's
> > take your travel analogy: If you claimed to have visited every state
> > and it happened to come out later that you meant that you'd been to all
> > of 'em except Missouri, Alaska and Hawaii, your statement would have
> > blown up in your face. When you state that you've operated on "all HF
> > bands" but you mean "most HF bands", your statement has blown up in your
> > face. I trust my explanation is sufficient.
> >
>
> Ah, OK, back to the matter of semantics again. Maybe you've got the time to
> be that analytical, Dave...and maybe Jim does, too. However, I think most
> of us would be able to ascertain that, when someone says they have worked
> all bands or been on all bands, they're probably either bored as hell or
> they probably mean *most.* I'll try to remember that you and a couple of
> others are so anal that you've got to have your things inside the box...

I have plenty of time to be analytical, Kim. If "having your things
inside the box" means that I'd like to be able to believe your
statements as factual, put me down for that. I don't believe that when
someone says he has been on all HF bands that he means "most" anymore
than I believe than someone means "most" when he says he has visited
every state, worked all counties or taken all of his medicine.

> > > You keep clinging to your semantics, you and Jim. It's your dislike of
> > > someone that determines your attitude...not the content of their
> material.
> >
> > I don't know about clinging to semantics, Kim but semantics are
> > important and can't be simply tossed aside. You could make an effort to
> > make your statements factual to begin with. That would have made it
> > possible to avoid the game of dodge ball you played when questioned
> > about what mode you used on 30 meters.
>
> Don't flatter yourself, Dave. Why in the world would someone be concerned
> about dodging a question about 30M? The only thing I can tell you about
> that band is that I *think* it is an all digital band. So, when the
> question arose, I knew I had not been on that band--as I know I've never

> done any digital work.

You could have easily come right out and said as much when first asked.
You didn't.

Dave K8MN

1984. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 11:07:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CC29D6B.E0DACBFF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 41253

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > "All" means "each and every" or "the complete set". If even one thing is
> > left out, "all" does not apply.
>
> If Kim had said that her high school boyfriend was "all hands",
> would you have disagreed with her statement?

I seem to remember that he was in the Navy. They spent a lot of time
calling him on deck.

Dave K8MN

1985. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 11:09:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CC29E01.9A8B0301@earthlink.net>
Source record: 41254

CAM wrote:
>
> "S. Hanrahan" wrote:
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
> >
> > >Then, you don't know Jim very well. Jim probably has a predetermined
> > >percentage that, for him, defines "most." Here's some other alls I've done:
> >
> > Shouldn't matter whether I know Jim or not. What matters is, I know
> > the difference between the meaning of "all" and "most".
>
> Perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".

Nope. That's not Kim. That's a corn field.

Dave K8MN

1986. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 14:25:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC2CBDC.5879E844@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41255

Bob Brock wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >Then perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".
>
> Gee, can I use that kind of a concept for WAS? It sure would help a
> lot!

I know a ham who got the WAS award without working Alaska and Hawaii. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

1987. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 14:29:33 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <h1Aw8.24883$3z3.2057341@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41256

"W5TwIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> Naw, I know that's not a threat coming from Hans.

I don't threaten, Kim. I promise.

> Hans would in no way try to snuff out dissention in that way, would he?

Through rational discussion, Jim (N2EY) and I were able to agree on a change in my proposal.

Through condescending and patronizing comments, Jon was able to piss off someone who contributes to his salary.

I'm sure there's a lesson in there if you look for it.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1988. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 14:42:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc2d295$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41258

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CC29AC3.4032C52B@earthlink.net...
>
> You could have easily come right out and said as much when first asked.
> You didn't.
>
>
> Dave K8MN

My very first response to Jim was reposted here last night. If that is not an answer, I don't know what is. Since 30M is a CW/digital mode band only, it should be obvious to any semi-intelligent baffoon that I had not be on 30M; and therefore had declared all HF bands in error. But, you're obviously far from the most intelligent baffoon.

I think what pisses you folks off more is that I wasn't caught by Jim's obvious attempt to snarl me...I have enough knowledge to realize right up front that 30M is set aside for digital/CW.

Kim W5TIT

1989. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 14:46:25 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.21.10.46.25.539836.24126@arrl.org>
Source record: 41257

> Through condescending and patronizing comments, Jon was able to piss off
> someone who contributes to his salary.

My comments were neither condescending nor patronizing. I simply
expressed disagreement with a proposal for which I see no need and which
appears to me to be based on an erroneous view of the present state of
the ARS. Getting pissed off about my disagreeing with you doesn't advance
your case any.

> I'm sure there's a lesson in there if you look for it.

What's that you were saying about being condescending and patronizing?

Jon, KE3Z

1990. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 15:01:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc2d6f8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41259

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:h1Aw8.24883$3z3.2057341@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TwIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
> > Naw, I know that's not a threat coming from Hans.
>
> I don't threaten, Kim. I promise.
>
> > Hans would in no way try to snuff out dissention in that way, would he?
>
> Through rational discussion, Jim (N2EY) and I were able to agree on a
change
> in my proposal.
>
> Through condescending and patronizing comments, Jon was able to piss off
> someone who contributes to his salary.
>
> I'm sure there's a lesson in there if you look for it.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that Ed Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he makes--when Ed Hare is here separate from the ARRL when he is on this newsgroup. You seem to think that folks like Jon Bloom and Ed Hare should not be allowed to participate in ham-related matters just because they work for the ARRL.

Why is it OK for you guys, i.e., you, Larry, Dave Heil, Jim/N2EY, Dick Carroll, to name a few, to react the way you do when you get soooooooo pissed off when one of us, i.e., me, Cecil, Brian, Rick Adams, etc., yet you are all so immediate to jump on the indignant bandwagon when we disagree with you all? In fact, *you* carry it even further here by threatening someone's job, a *SHAMEFUL* human act!!!

The pity is that when *we* get ruffled, that's all there is to it. We all go to bed at night and wake up to new days. While you guys carry around some kind of axe to constantly grind, chest to thump about, with an ego that crowds out anything near logical.

Jon Bloom has every right to approach your ideas in any way he chooses, and I think you are quite typical in reacting to his reasoning as being

"patronizing and condescending" which it wasn't at all. He made some quite valid observations and you were wrong, yet he wasn't supposed to ask questions, was he? You know, it's kind of pitiful when you enjoy wearing the labels you unleash to others. There are support groups for such things.

Shame on you, Hans. I can tell you one thing: if the ARRL ever dared to chastise Jon Bloom, Ed Hare, or *any* paid HQ staff member for voicing their opinion, I would make it a personal campaign to advertise such on the air and not shut up about it. That's ridiculous if you think you have *ANY* support by "making your [fucking-my words] phone call."

If you want condescending, try having a conversation with Jim Haynie when he disagrees with you. Now, there's a master at condescension, humiliation, and embarrassment.

Take your tears, your whines, and your mommy's boy attitude somewhere else, because you are wrong on this one.

Jon: if you read this, I'd truly like to know the outcome of Hans' *supposed* powerful phone call he thinks he can make. I am serious, I would smite the ARRL hands-down if they ever told anyone they could not be themselves on this newsgroup. And, I think the ARRL is much more grown up than to get in Hans' sandbox with him.

Hans: YOU DON'T THREATEN PEOPLE WHEN THEY DISSENT, asshole Anti-American.

Kim W5TIT

1991. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 15:05:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc2d7f3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41260

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.04.21.10.46.25.539836.24126@arrl.org...
> > Through condescending and patronizing comments, Jon was able to piss off
> > someone who contributes to his salary.
>
> My comments were neither condescending nor patronizing. I simply
> expressed disagreement with a proposal for which I see no need and which
> appears to me to be based on an erroneous view of the present state of
> the ARS. Getting pissed off about my disagreeing with you doesn't advance
> your case any.
>
> > I'm sure there's a lesson in there if you look for it.
>
> What's that you were saying about being condescending and patronizing?
>
> Jon, KE3Z

I don't think I've been this angry in a long, long time. Hans brings himself off as this proud, balanced, objective American. Yet, he threatens the job of another man for disagreeing with him. What a cheap, cheap shot. It scares me to think that Hans, or anyone else on this newsgroup, would actually call someone's employer to whine and cry about something that was said in conversation--here or elsewhere.

My God, what is this country coming to?

Kim W5TIT

1992. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 15:14:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc2da2c$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41262

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:7bm5cukfqe6qvgohujgv15749n4jqvhpjd@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 09:25:32 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> >Then perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".
> >>
> >> Gee, can I use that kind of a concept for WAS? It sure would help a
> >> lot!
> >>
> >>I know a ham who got the WAS award without working Alaska and Hawaii. :-)
>
> Dang, I was hoping that perhaps a little over half would do it. ;-)

Just state it on the air, duplicate the certificate, fake some QSL cards,
beat some envelopes up to make them look good...hmmmm, much easier to get on
the air, wouldn't it be? ;)

Kim W5TIT

1993. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 15:24:19 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <7bm5cukfqe6qvgohujgv15749n4jqvhpjd@4ax.com>
Source record: 41261

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 09:25:32 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> >Then perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".
>>
>> Gee, can I use that kind of a concept for WAS? It sure would help a
>> lot!
>
>I know a ham who got the WAS award without working Alaska and Hawaii. :-)

Dang, I was hoping that perhaps a little over half would do it. ;-)

1994. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 15:24:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc2dc6b$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41265

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:j0n5cus7pjpmtnvh8vuu0r9m9pl2m2ud7e@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 10:14:48 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>
> >
> > >Just state it on the air, duplicate the certificate, fake some QSL cards,
> > >beat some envelopes up to make them look good...hmmmm, much easier to get
on
> > >the air, wouldn't it be? ;)
>
> Is that how you would do it?

Actually I don't waste my time chasing paper. I really don't even waste my time on HF all that much. I can't stand the static noise and the clamoring for a callsign. But, yeah, if I were to do it I would do by getting on the air. I don't think dishonesty is a trait that I'd like to take up...

You really should stop while you're ahead...if it's pissing me off you wish to do. You see, as most on this newsgroup already know--I fell in love with myself years ago. For me to bother wasting my time over your behavior is way, way below me.

Kim W5TIT

1995. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 15:34:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204210734.752d047e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41264

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<knKv8.5244$4K5.114989295@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020416085741.07506.00003516@mb-cc.aol.com...
> > For those who like to moan and whine about Amateur Radio's death
> throes, I
> > can't help but wonder how they rationalize thier rants when NASA, the most
> > conservative of any technology based agency in the world, see's fit to
> > incorporate it into it's multi-billion dollar pet.
> >
> > Also...for those (or "the one") who always whine about how little
> Amateur
> > radio get's any media exposure, here's another prick in the balloon.
>
> Steve, relax, the ARS isn't going away any time soon. It'll take another
> decade for the actuarial table to do any real damage. The first boomer
> turns 65 in 2010.
>
Yeah, then watch all those well-heeled tech-smart boomers pile into ham radio.
>
>
w3rv

1996. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 15:35:31 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <j0n5cus7pjpmtnvh8vuu0r9m9pl2m2ud7e@4ax.com>
Source record: 41263

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 10:14:48 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:7bm5cukfqe6qvgohujgv15749n4jqvhpjd@4ax.com...
>> On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 09:25:32 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Bob Brock wrote:
>> >>
>> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> >> >Then perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".
>> >>
>> >> Gee, can I use that kind of a concept for WAS? It sure would help a
>> >> lot!
>> >
>> >I know a ham who got the WAS award without working Alaska and Hawaii. :-)
>>
>> Dang, I was hoping that perhaps a little over half would do it. ;-)
>
>Just state it on the air, duplicate the certificate, fake some QSL cards,
>beat some envelopes up to make them look good...hmmmm, much easier to get on
>the air, wouldn't it be? ;)

Is that how you would do it?

1997. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 15:51:30 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <amn5cu0a3jrd7lutvu0dvuckic47m80cb4@4ax.com>
Source record: 41266

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 10:24:23 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:j0n5cus7pjpmtnvh8vuu0r9m9pl2m2ud7e@4ax.com...
>> On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 10:14:48 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
>> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >Just state it on the air, duplicate the certificate, fake some QSL cards,
>> >beat some envelopes up to make them look good...hmmmm, much easier to get
>on
>> >the air, wouldn't it be? ;)
>>
>> Is that how you would do it?
>
>Actually I don't waste my time chasing paper. I really don't even waste my
>time on HF all that much. I can't stand the static noise and the clamoring
>for a callsign. But, yeah, if I were to do it I would do by getting on the
>air. I don't think dishonesty is a trait that I'd like to take up...

I'm not talking about HF. I'm talking VHF.

>
>You really should stop while you're ahead...if it's pissing me off you wish
>to do. You see, as most on this newsgroup already know--I fell in love with
>myself years ago. For me to bother wasting my time over your behavior is
>way, way below me.

If me replying upsets you, I'd suggest that you don't reply to my
posts. I have full intentions of ignoring you in public and laughing
at you in private unless you are replying to a post that I made to
someone other than yourself. If you talk to me, I talk to you. If
that upsets you off...to bad.

1998. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 15:57:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020421115754.24943.00000251@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 41267

In article <3cc22298_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Hmmmm, what *is* the front of house?
>
>Kim W5TIT

The front of a house is the side which is oriented at a 180ï¿½ angle
from the back of the house.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1999. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 16:38:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc2eb81_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41269

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a9uq3t$sp2$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cc224ac_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
> > news:jnnw8.22174$3z3.1953758@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > > Actually, it's within the bounds of the station license.
> > >
> > > I believe you are mistaken. 97.105(b) grants priveleges based on the
> > class
> > > of OPERATOR LICENSE held by the control operator. If you are absent
> from
> > > your station and have granted your dad the temporary control of the
> > station,
> > > then his OPERATOR license determines his privileges, not your station
> > > license.
> > >
> > > > As an example, if I volunteered to fill in one hour on a "Novice
> > station"
> > > > during Field Day, I can't operate in the Extra class part of the
band,
> > > > because I would jeopardize the station license for which that Novice
> > > > class station is permitted to operate.
> > >
> > > Let's for the moment presume a fictitious Novice holds a station
license
> > > with the callsign KN7XXX, and he gives you
> > > (an Extra licensee) permission to
> > > fill in while he takes a potty break. You are free to use his novice
> > > station on any frequency available to any license class up to your
> license
> > > class (Extra). The only requirement (paragraph 97.119(e) refers) is
> that
> > > you would have to sign "KN7XXX/AA7YA" if you transmitted outside
> > > the Novice sub-bands.
> > > 73, Hans, K0HB
> >
> > When I sit at the radio Cliff bought, and that I consider his, if I am
on
> it
```

> > without him around, I operate it as my station and only stay in the
Tech+
> > portion of 10M. Quite legal...
>
> The bottom line....an Extra can operate any station at any
> authorized frequency/mode for Extra.
>

Well, the *real* bottom line is that any licensee can operate any station,
within their own (not the person who "owns" the equipment) operating
privileges, using just their call...Extra, General, Tech+, Tech, or Novice.

Correct?

Kim W5TIT

2000. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 16:38:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9uq3t$sp2$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41268

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cc224ac_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
> news:jnnw8.22174$3z3.1953758@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >
> > > Actually, it's within the bounds of the station license.
> >
> > I believe you are mistaken. 97.105(b) grants priveleges based on the
> class
> > of OPERATOR LICENSE held by the control operator. If you are absent
from
> > your station and have granted your dad the temporary control of the
> station,
> > then his OPERATOR license determines his privileges, not your station
> > license.
> >
> > > As an example, if I volunteered to fill in one hour on a "Novice
> station"
> > > during Field Day, I can't operate in the Extra class part of the band,
> > > because I would jeopardize the station license for which that Novice
> > > class station is permitted to operate.
> >
> > Let's for the moment presume a fictitious Novice holds a station license
> > with the callsign KN7XXX, and he gives you
> > (an Extra licensee) permission to
> > fill in while he takes a potty break. You are free to use his novice
> > station on any frequency available to any license class up to your
license
> > class (Extra). The only requirement (paragraph 97.119(e) refers) is
that
> > you would have to sign "KN7XXX/AA7YA" if you transmitted outside
> > the Novice sub-bands.
> > 73, Hans, K0HB
> >
> When I sit at the radio Cliff bought, and that I consider his, if I am on
it
> without him around, I operate it as my station and only stay in the Tech+
> portion of 10M. Quite legal...

The bottom line....an Extra can operate any station at any
authorized frequency/mode for Extra. If I go over a friend's
house who happens to be a Novice, I can even operate

that station as if it were mine at that time...I dont
HAVE to sign with the actual station owner's
call at all. Such holding to a physical station license
at a fixed location isn't of any concern anymore and is why
the FCC stopped issuing separate station licenses...and why
none of us have to sign as "portable" anymore. The FCC holds
the operator responsible...not the owner of the equipment (IMHO).

As a licensed ham, I can have multiple stations at different
locations....none of which might be the address on my
license. I believe there was a time when the FCC expected us to
"register/license" each such station if it was to be fixed for greater
than a certain time. That just isn't the case anymore.

Thousands of hams have two or more stations these days...
one at a traditional home base and the other at a vacation
or summer retireemnet home. Then there are all those
mobiles, HTs, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2001. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 16:54:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9ur1k$m45$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41270

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020420180742.13101.00000794@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <1Niw8.21103$3z3.1907582@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >How about this. Retain the current absolute power limit of 200W in those
> >sub-bands.
>
> Yup.
>
> >Further, any transmitter adjusted for more than 50W output must
> >include auto-adaptive devices to hold power to the minimum needed for
> >reliable communications.
>
> Double yup.
>
> >Then you *could* use your current Yaesu, Icom,
> >Heathkit, or whatever, but you'd need to crank the output down to 50W.
>
> Which you'd probably have to do anyway if the digital mode has a high duty
> cycle.
>
> Doubleplus yup.
>
> >The
> >idea is to encourage experimentation with pro-active power reduction to
> >reduce congestion.
>
> Of course.
>
> This scheme is better than both the original 'all must adapt' idea and the
'no
> limits' idea. It permits the use of existing rigs and also offers an
incentive
> to include power control.
>
> If ya want a REAL incentive, make it 1500 W peak power in the subbands if
you
> have automatic power control and ~100 W without automatic power control.
For
> all modes. BWAAAHAAAAHAAA!
>
> That problem's fixed, as I see it. Thanks, Hans.

I like this approach also. I fully agree that we need proactive power limiting functionality. Go for it Hans.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2002. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 17:07:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9urpvcan1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41271

```
"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cc2eb81_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a9uq3t$sp2$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> > news:3cc224ac_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
> > > news:jnnw8.22174$3z3.1953758@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Actually, it's within the bounds of the station license.
> > > >
> > > > I believe you are mistaken. 97.105(b) grants priveleges based on
the
> > > class
> > > > of OPERATOR LICENSE held by the control operator. If you are absent
> > from
> > > > your station and have granted your dad the temporary control of the
> > > station,
> > > > then his OPERATOR license determines his privileges, not your
station
> > > > license.
> > > >
> > > > > As an example, if I volunteered to fill in one hour on a "Novice
> > > station"
> > > > > during Field Day, I can't operate in the Extra class part of the
> band,
> > > > > because I would jeopardize the station license for which that
Novice
> > > > > class station is permitted to operate.
> > > >
> > > > Let's for the moment presume a fictitious Novice holds a station
> license
> > > > with the callsign KN7XXX, and he gives you
> > > > (an Extra licensee) permission to
> > > > fill in while he takes a potty break. You are free to use his
novice
> > > > station on any frequency available to any license class up to your
> > license
> > > > class (Extra). The only requirement (paragraph 97.119(e) refers) is
> > that
> > > > you would have to sign "KN7XXX/AA7YA" if you transmitted outside
```

> > > > the Novice sub-bands.
> > > > 73, Hans, K0HB
> > >
> > > When I sit at the radio Cliff bought, and that I consider his, if I am
> on
> > it
> > > without him around, I operate it as my station and only stay in the
> Tech+
> > > portion of 10M. Quite legal...
> >
> > The bottom line....an Extra can operate any station at any
> > authorized frequency/mode for Extra.
> >
>
> Well, the *real* bottom line is that any licensee can operate any station,
> within their own (not the person who "owns" the equipment) operating
> privileges, using just their call...Extra, General, Tech+, Tech, or
Novice.
>
> Correct?
> Kim W5TIT

Yes, Correct.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2003. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 17:10:19 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <6F183E62F89F41F8.9D18381BAFD9328A.246EFA257DF97950@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 41273

On Mon, 15 Apr 2002 18:21:50 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Just thought about this one. Do the cable companies still have to provide
>"public access" channels for general use?

AT&T Extended Basic in Dallas includes a bunch of public access and
educational access channels, and at least one local government access
channel.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2004. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 17:10:21 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <D68A38ED8852280A.29AEA8B240EDFA96.719D2A2C708109D3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 41274

On 18 Apr 2002 22:04:42 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>:) I agree about the grounding issue, as that could apply to many different
>>aspects of a non-hams life. Especially when dealing with RFI from their
>>computers, home stereo's etc....
>
>If I could find someone to handle the video end of things, I do a pretty good
>1-hour presentation on RFI. :-)

Oh great, an hour of Ed keying up and the display going blue.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2005. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 17:15:16 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <88FEB92B6B2D7856.FF4F2F61DA76DD38.DBCFAF6E5CD30E4A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 41275

On 17 Apr 2002 19:21:46 -0700, ceejaay1@yahoo.com (CJ) wrote:

>how will this differentiate me from other TECHS w/o Tech plus privlidges?
>DO I still have TECH plus privledges? I had to take 5wpm code back in 1989
>to get my license.
>
>HOW do I prove this.. cj

Take the General written. It's not that hard.

--
Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH/AG
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2006. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 17:16:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020421131614.24943.00000254@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 41272

In article <3cc2d6f8_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that Ed
>Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he makes

Kim:

Please provide direct quotes from me supporting your statement above, or
provide an immediate and sincere apology for this grievous canard.

>--when
>Ed Hare is here separate from the ARRL when he is on this newsgroup.

As are we all, should we happen to be ARRL members, employees, or
unpaid officials.

>You
>seem to think that folks like Jon Bloom and Ed Hare should not be allowed to
>participate in ham-related matters just because they work for the ARRL.

Who do you think said THAT? Again, provide the quotes, or apologize for
lying.

>Why is it OK for you guys, i.e., you, Larry, Dave Heil, Jim/N2EY, Dick
>Carroll, to name a few, to react the way you do when you get soooooooo
>pissed off when one of us, i.e., me, Cecil, Brian, Rick Adams, etc., yet you
>are all so immediate to jump on the indignant bandwagon when we disagree
>with you all? In fact, *you* carry it even further here by threatening
>someone's job, a *SHAMEFUL* human act!!!

Kim, it's starting to look like you're once again embarking on a jeremiad over
something that you don't even understand yourself. You seem to be
typing away just to hear your own keyboard clicking -- pretty much the same
way I'm sure you're constantly yakking to hear your own voice.

>The pity is that when *we* get ruffled, that's all there is to it. We all
>go to bed at night and wake up to new days. While you guys carry around
>some kind of axe to constantly grind, chest to thump about, with an ego that
>crowds out anything near logical.

What would you know about things that are "near logical" (sic)? There's
absolutely no evidence of it from *any* of your postings to date. You seem
to be possessed of the most disorganized thought processes I've ever
witnessed coming from a woman, starting with your stupid call sign
selection and going down from there.

>Jon Bloom has every right to approach your ideas in any way he chooses, and
>I think you are quite typical in reacting to his reasoning as being
>"patronizing and condescending" which it wasn't at all.

YOU, Kim, W5TIT, are totally UNQUALIFIED to judge ANYONE else's behavior on this newsgroup. You have no standing to make comments about Jon, Hans, me, Dick, or ANYONE else. Go stand in the corner, and speak only when spoken to (which, on any given day in this newsgroup, would be NEVER).

(Remainder of the Tit-Tirade excised as a public service)

73 de Larry, K3LT

2007. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 17:46:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421134655.27628.00000684@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 41277

In article <d22b54c3.0204210734.752d047e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message >news:<knKv8.5244$4K5.114989295@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...

>> Steve, relax, the ARS isn't going away any time soon. It'll take another >> decade for the actuarial table to do any real damage. The first boomer >> turns 65 in 2010. >> >Yeah, then watch all those well-heeled tech-smart boomers pile into ham >radio.

>w3rv

Why would "tech-smart" folks want to work CW on HF a la 1930s?

2008. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 17:46:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421134656.27628.00000685@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 41276

In article <3cc2d7f3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
>news:pan.2002.04.21.10.46.25.539836.24126@arrl.org...
>> > Through condescending and patronizing comments, Jon was able to piss off
>> > someone who contributes to his salary.
>>
>> My comments were neither condescending nor patronizing. I simply
>> expressed disagreement with a proposal for which I see no need and which
>> appears to me to be based on an erroneous view of the present state of
>> the ARS. Getting pissed off about my disagreeing with you doesn't advance
>> your case any.
>>
>> > I'm sure there's a lesson in there if you look for it.
>>
>> What's that you were saying about being condescending and patronizing?
>>
>> Jon, KE3Z
>
>I don't think I've been this angry in a long, long time. Hans brings
>himself off as this proud, balanced, objective American. Yet, he threatens
>the job of another man for disagreeing with him. What a cheap, cheap shot.
>It scares me to think that Hans, or anyone else on this newsgroup, would
>actually call someone's employer to whine and cry about something that was
>said in conversation--here or elsewhere.
>
>My God, what is this country coming to?
>
>Kim W5TIT

The country is in pretty good shape...it's a few individual egos who
can dish it out but can't take it. They are the "terrorists" against
freedom despite their calls for blood for those "against the
American Way of Freedom."

I can recall an incident where an amateur extra, pissed off because
he was not acknowledged as a "leader" in here, attempted to
dissuade an agency of the US government to "forget" or "ignore"
the comments of a citizen not licensed in amateur radio. That is in
the public database of comments on 98-143. According to that
creature, he is "proud" of his one-paragraph comment.

Maybe it's the water in some parts of the country... :-)

2009. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 17:58:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc300a0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41282

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC2FE74.D9D29DF5@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> > >Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that
Ed
> > >Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he makes
> >
> > Please provide direct quotes from me supporting your statement above, or
> > provide an immediate and sincere apology for this grievous canard.
>
> Here she be:
>
> > From: Larry Roll K3LT (yodoc@aol.comnospam)
> > Subject: Re: What's a "Real Ham?" REAL EASY... K3LT's reply (long)
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2001-05-15 01:46:00 PST
> >
> > Yes, Ed, I'm sure you do see it that way. However, you also are
> > required to reflect ARRL policy without any significant diversion from
> > same, ...
>
> "Required to reflect ARRL policy" seems pretty clear. Ain't google a
bitch?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Not only that, that post is certainly *not* the only time Larry has said such to Ed Hare. An important distinction between Hans and Larry, though, is that Larry has never stated that he would "make a phone call," implying that he'd try overt influence to have another person lose their job. At least, I don't recall Larry ever doing that.

Kim W5TIT

2010. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 18:00:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421140004.01569.00000344@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41278

In article <20020421131614.24943.00000254@mb-fo.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>YOU, Kim, W5TIT, are totally UNQUALIFIED to judge ANYONE else's behavior on
>this newsgroup. You have no standing to make comments about Jon, Hans,
>me, Dick, or ANYONE else. Go stand in the corner, and speak only when
>spoken to (which, on any given day in this newsgroup, would be NEVER).

Ah, yes, the good old American Way (of misogyny) spoken
like a leader of men in an elite group of "service" men. :-)

Go specialize your paratransit, Larrah. It may need a good
talking to...

2011. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 18:01:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC2FE74.D9D29DF5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41279

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that Ed
> >Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he makes
>
> Please provide direct quotes from me supporting your statement above, or
> provide an immediate and sincere apology for this grievous canard.

Here she be:

> From: Larry Roll K3LT (yodoc@aol.comnospam)
> Subject: Re: What's a "Real Ham?" REAL EASY... K3LT's reply (long)
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2001-05-15 01:46:00 PST
>
> Yes, Ed, I'm sure you do see it that way. However, you also are
> required to reflect ARRL policy without any significant diversion from
> same, ...

"Required to reflect ARRL policy" seems pretty clear. Ain't google a bitch?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2012. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 18:08:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC30001.E4A39BC0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41281

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that Ed
> >Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he makes
>
> Please provide direct quotes from me supporting your statement above, or
> provide an immediate and sincere apology for this grievous canard.

Here's more:

> My only agenda is to make the rest of the readers understand that when
> you (Ed) say something smacking of the ARRL's typical political correctness,
> that you are doing so as a parrot of ARRL policy.

> And, whether it complies with ARRL policy by design or coincidence, the
> reality is that I don't recall you (Ed) ever saying anything that would
> NOT. Perceive THAT!

Perceive THAT! :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2013. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 18:08:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421140809.09489.00000673@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 41280

In article <O8kw8.21512$3z3.1921042@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> ohmygawsh, we agree on something. Betcha Carl, Ed and a whole bunch of >others
>> would sign on to the above too. Maybe even Hans?
>
>Nope.

Dang.
>
>I want a place where hams can showcase only "truly new" ideas, things that >today would require an STA before we could stoke up a transmitter.

Me, too. That's what the reused subbands are for.
>
>And I want that place to be "visible" to other hams who might be interested >by innovation and progress, not cluttered up with signals from legacy modes.

This business of keeping the old modes off the experimental reservation seems to be the sticky wicket on the deal, Hans.

Are the subbands in question "cluttered up" by those signals now? If so, how many of those signals would remain once the new rules went into effect? Not many in either case, I think.

On 40 meters, the real problem (at least here on the East Coast) is not other hams but SWBC signals.

It should also be remembered that if the USA enacts your proposal, other countries' hams will still use those subbands just as they always have, so 80 and 15 will still be subject to those signals from other countries, as well as 40 in IARU Region 2.

Prohibiting "old modes" raises a whole bunch of problems from an administrative and enforcement point of view because the FCC will have to decide what's a "legacy" mode and what isn't. For example, how much do I have to modify PSK31 in order for it to qualify as a "new mode"? Or suppose I digitize a voice signal and feed it into one of those SCS boxes Cecil loves, and it spits out digital voice via PACTOR II - is that a new mode or an old one? FCC isn't going to want to get tangled up in that sort of mess.

It will also preclude direct comparisons of performance between old and new modes, such as 'PACTOR III' vs. PACTOR II, and coordination of experiments using modes like (gasp!) CW to set up the coordination.

There is also the question of ID and "public notice". If developers of new modes add an auto ID at the end of their transmissions telling where the decode metiods are available, "tuners by" will be able to look up the info and join in. Without such information, all that will be heard by those "not in the know" will be weird-sounding, undecipherable noises. The auto ID will have to be in an old mode, though.

I think the bandplan and current trends would keep practically all non-experimenters out of the experimental subbands.

From where I write it looks like the best compromise is to allow but discourage the use of non-experimental modes in the experimental subbands.

>If those segments remain empty then maybe we will have also sent a signal to >the regulators, but I'm betting that QEX subscribers would come flocking.

I'm pretty sure the regulators will be able to tell the new modes from the old ones in order to determine occupancy.

Most of all, though, I think the FCC will balk at complex regulations aimed at defining certain modes as "legacy" (ugh) and others as "new" and keeping them apart. And to get your subband idea going in the face of the inevitable ARRL BoD opposition, you need a wide consensus of support. Which you're not going to get if the old modes are pushed out of the subbands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2014. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 18:16:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc304c9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41283

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020421131614.24943.00000254@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3cc2d6f8_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that Ed
> >Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he makes
>
> Kim:
>
> Please provide direct quotes from me supporting your statement above, or
> provide an immediate and sincere apology for this grievous canard.
>

Cecil posted one. Would you like others? They can be had quite easily.

> >
> >--when
> >Ed Hare is here separate from the ARRL when he is on this newsgroup.
>
> As are we all, should we happen to be ARRL members, employees, or
> unpaid officials.
>

I think your dimentia is unleashed, Larry.

> >
> >You
> >seem to think that folks like Jon Bloom and Ed Hare should not be allowed
to
> >participate in ham-related matters just because they work for the ARRL.
>
> Who do you think said THAT? Again, provide the quotes, or apologize for
> lying.
>

Larry, get English lessons, puhleeze. "You seem to think" is not "you
said." And the only way I'd ever apologize to you is...well, come to think
of it you don't deserve a damned apology for *anything* from me.

> >
> >Why is it OK for you guys, i.e., you, Larry, Dave Heil, Jim/N2EY, Dick
> >Carroll, to name a few, to react the way you do when you get soooooooo
> >pissed off when one of us, i.e., me, Cecil, Brian, Rick Adams, etc., yet
you

> >are all so immediate to jump on the indignant bandwagon when we disagree
> >with you all? In fact, *you* carry it even further here by threatening
> >someone's job, a *SHAMEFUL* human act!!!
>
> Kim, it's starting to look like you're once again embarking on a jeremiad
over
> something that you don't even understand yourself. You seem to be
> typing away just to hear your own keyboard clicking -- pretty much the
same
> way I'm sure you're constantly yakking to hear your own voice.
>

Larry, you're incapable of being a human being in any way. Do you think that what you say plays *any* impression upon me at all? It seems to me that you are condoning Hans' statement that he is "seriously consider making some phone calls," which is a serious threat to another person about their livelihood. Or maybe you missed the part where Hans confirms my suspicion that he is, indeed, threatening Jon Bloom's job (noted between asterisks below):

I said to Hans:
****
> Naw, I know that's not a threat coming from Hans.

Hans said:

I don't threaten, Kim. I promise.

I said:

> Hans would in no way try to snuff out dissention in that way, would he?

Hans said:

Through rational discussion, Jim (N2EY) and I were able to agree on a change in my proposal.

Through condescending and patronizing comments, Jon was able to piss off someone who contributes to his salary.

I'm sure there's a lesson in there if you look for it.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
****

Do you support Hans' statements, above, Larry? Speaking of direct question, get a direct answer--are you even going to bother answering that?

> >
> >The pity is that when *we* get ruffled, that's all there is to it. We
all
> >go to bed at night and wake up to new days. While you guys carry around
> >some kind of axe to constantly grind, chest to thump about, with an ego

that
> >crowds out anything near logical.
>
> What would you know about things that are "near logical" (sic)? There's
> absolutely no evidence of it from *any* of your postings to date. You
seem
> to be possessed of the most disorganized thought processes I've ever
> witnessed coming from a woman, starting with your stupid call sign
> selection and going down from there.
>

Because you've never gotten beyond Kindergarten reading ability doesn't mean
I should bring myself down to your level of communication, Larry.

> >
> >Jon Bloom has every right to approach your ideas in any way he chooses,
and
> >I think you are quite typical in reacting to his reasoning as being
> >"patronizing and condescending" which it wasn't at all.
>
> YOU, Kim, W5TIT, are totally UNQUALIFIED to judge ANYONE else's behavior
on
> this newsgroup. You have no standing to make comments about Jon, Hans,
> me, Dick, or ANYONE else. Go stand in the corner, and speak only when
> spoken to (which, on any given day in this newsgroup, would be NEVER).
>

If only you had that kind of power over someone, Larry, you'd be in your
glory, wouldn't you? I pray you never find a thing out about my personal
life, as I fear you'd be first in line to act like Hans.

>
> (Remainder of the Tit-Tirade excised as a public service)
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You don't know the meaning of public service. You lie right through your
teeth when you say you have never equated Ed Hare's performance on this
newsgroup with any other than "towing the ARRL line," yet you bring into
question my actions. You're an asshole king of assholes, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

2015. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 18:18:29 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc3053a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41284

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC30001.E4A39BC0@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> > >Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that
Ed
> > >Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he makes
> >
> > Please provide direct quotes from me supporting your statement above, or
> > provide an immediate and sincere apology for this grievous canard.
>
> Here's more:
>
> > My only agenda is to make the rest of the readers understand that when
> > you (Ed) say something smacking of the ARRL's typical political
correctness,
> > that you are doing so as a parrot of ARRL policy.
>
> > And, whether it complies with ARRL policy by design or coincidence, the
> > reality is that I don't recall you (Ed) ever saying anything that would
> > NOT. Perceive THAT!
>
> Perceive THAT! :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Larry's nothing but a 1-bit liar and is no brighter than a 2-watt lightbulb.
Hey, Larry, if anything you *OWE ME AN APOLOGY*!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Jerk.

Kim W5TIT

2016. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 19:12:50 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC30F12.97C45520@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41285

N2EY wrote:
>
> the FCC will have to decide what's a
> "legacy" mode and what isn't.
> FCC isn't going
> to want to get tangled up in that sort of mess.
>
>
>
> Most of all, though, I think the FCC will balk at complex regulations aimed at
> defining certain modes as "legacy" (ugh) and others as "new" and keeping them
> apart.

You hit the nail on the head there! Today's Commission will
NEVER put itself in the position of determining such
things. Of course it could subcontract such arbitration to
a disinterested third party who only has the "good of the
amateur radio service" at heart, such as W5YI (betcha
thought I was going to say the League ;-)).

> And to get your subband idea going in the face of the inevitable ARRL
> BoD opposition, you need a wide consensus of support. Which you're not going to
> get if the old modes are pushed out of the subbands.
>

The ARRL board, via the Newington crowd influence, has shown
it is interested in anything related to sustaining or
increasing revenues from magazine sales. As such it will
oppose anything that does not result in more subscriptions,
and/or more YaComWood radio sales.

I think that the novice band refarming issue has the
potential to be the real test of future policy for both the
ARS and the Commission. Is the FCC just blowing smoke when
it gives lip service to promoting innovation? Will the
Commission cave in to the ARRL's magazine salesmen? Will
the US ARS be willing to take the challenge to be
self-regulating within a frame a minimum of Commission rules
in these subbands, or will they founder on self-serving
interests (more refugees from CB running 2KW phone)?

73,
Clay N4AOX

2017. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 20:51:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YCFw8.4095$q73.202913167@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41286

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020420230610.04364.00001904@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <_%ew8.2931$Ba2.144370069@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >Yep, enlisted retired pay is so low that even that added to GS-7 pay
is
> >> >pretty pathetic.
> >>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> Well, you ought to know all about that!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Welp, that's why I'm no longer with the Corp's of Engineers. You on the
> >other hand can keep driving your bus to the bank. Verrry lucrative, HA!
>
> Brian:
>
> I drive it to banks, hospitals, Renal Care centers, doctor's offices,
> schools, churches, etc., and, ultimately, the homes of all my clients.
> Lucrative? It does pay very well, has great benefits, and offers just
> about all the overtime you want.

Who wants overtime? Like I don't have enough to do already, what with
having to count out my AF pension every month, and storing all the excess
cash in a foot locker.

> BTW, I'm on Jury Duty for the next two weeks, so why don't you
> go ahead and make fun of that as well?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Hey pal, you're the one making fun of how much I used to make.

BTW, you'll never make it into a court room unless you say absolutely
nothing, hide your military background, and never let on that you've even
heard of Rush Limbo.

73 and good luck getting picked.

Brian

2018. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 20:53:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NEFw8.4097$3T2.202212575@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41287

Yep, 17' basstrackers for rent at MWR!

73, Brian

"Jimick" <jimick1@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:Mdqw8.41392$WV1.14480440@typhoon.ne.ipsvc.net...
> At least the Air Force has a few boats!!
>
> jimi
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:Beqw8.3252$ym4.172290230@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020412180225.19503.00000582@mb-cm.aol.com...
> >
> > > For half a century, the US military has had a policy of REQUIRING
> > > commissioned officers to have a college education or the
> > > equivalency of one. The USAF has made it a policy of requiring
> > > all pilots to be commissioned officers. The US Army took a more
> > > realistic view in the Warrant Officer requirements for helicopter
> > > pilots (there are more helos in the US military than fixed-wing
> > > aircraft).
> >
> > Yep, we forgot about helicopters when we took the airplanes away from
the
> > Army in 1947. Everybody wants to be in the Air Force. Army's got
> > helicopters, Navy's got little pointy nosed planes, Marine Corps has
both,
> > Coast Guard has C-130's. Someday the Air Force should buy tanks and
> > submarines.
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

2019. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 20:56:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <EHFw8.4100$Wa3.203070532@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41288

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0204210734.752d047e@posting.google.com...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message news:<knKv8.5244

> > Steve, relax, the ARS isn't going away any time soon. It'll take
another
> > decade for the actuarial table to do any real damage. The first boomer
> > turns 65 in 2010.
> >
> Yeah, then watch all those well-heeled tech-smart boomers pile into ham
radio.
> >
> >
> w3rv

Brian, you are so damned paranoid that you might actually have to talk to
someone new on the radio, aren't you?

2020. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 21:03:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <KOFw8.4103$J%2.202584186@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41289

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020421134656.27628.00000685@mb-bj.aol.com...
> In article <3cc2d7f3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> >news:pan.2002.04.21.10.46.25.539836.24126@arrl.org...
> >> > Through condescending and patronizing comments, Jon was able to piss
off
> >> > someone who contributes to his salary.
> >>
> >> My comments were neither condescending nor patronizing. I simply
> >> expressed disagreement with a proposal for which I see no need and
which
> >> appears to me to be based on an erroneous view of the present state of
> >> the ARS. Getting pissed off about my disagreeing with you doesn't
advance
> >> your case any.
> >>
> >> > I'm sure there's a lesson in there if you look for it.
> >>
> >> What's that you were saying about being condescending and patronizing?
> >>
> >> Jon, KE3Z
> >
> >I don't think I've been this angry in a long, long time. Hans brings
> >himself off as this proud, balanced, objective American. Yet, he
threatens
> >the job of another man for disagreeing with him. What a cheap, cheap
shot.
> >It scares me to think that Hans, or anyone else on this newsgroup, would
> >actually call someone's employer to whine and cry about something that
was
> >said in conversation--here or elsewhere.
> >
> >My God, what is this country coming to?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> The country is in pretty good shape...it's a few individual egos who
> can dish it out but can't take it. They are the "terrorists" against
> freedom despite their calls for blood for those "against the
> American Way of Freedom."
>

> I can recall an incident where an amateur extra, pissed off because
> he was not acknowledged as a "leader" in here, attempted to
> dissuade an agency of the US government to "forget" or "ignore"
> the comments of a citizen not licensed in amateur radio. That is in
> the public database of comments on 98-143. According to that
> creature, he is "proud" of his one-paragraph comment.
>
> Maybe it's the water in some parts of the country... :-)

There -are- lead mines in southern Missouri. Perhaps his drinking water is
filtered through mine tailings.

2021. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 21:09:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <TTFw8.4107$j73.202905872@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41290

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020421131614.24943.00000254@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3cc2d6f8_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that Ed
> >Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he makes
>
> Kim:
>
> Please provide direct quotes from me supporting your statement above, or
> provide an immediate and sincere apology for this grievous canard.

Four years of inuendo otta be enough, unless you decide to misquote yourself
again.

2022. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 21:12:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <GWFw8.4111$up3.203633710@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41291

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC2FE74.D9D29DF5@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> > >Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that
Ed
> > >Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he makes
> >
> > Please provide direct quotes from me supporting your statement above, or
> > provide an immediate and sincere apology for this grievous canard.
>
> Here she be:
>
> > From: Larry Roll K3LT (yodoc@aol.comnospam)
> > Subject: Re: What's a "Real Ham?" REAL EASY... K3LT's reply (long)
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2001-05-15 01:46:00 PST
> >
> > Yes, Ed, I'm sure you do see it that way. However, you also are
> > required to reflect ARRL policy without any significant diversion from
> > same, ...
>
> "Required to reflect ARRL policy" seems pretty clear. Ain't google a
bitch?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil, this was completely unnecessary. Anyone with half their brain tied behind their back knows that Larry has said what Kim claims that he said.

2023. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-21 23:02:49 UTC
From: Jimick <jimick1@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <tyHw8.46032$WV1.15152290@typhoon.ne.ipsvc.net>
Source record: 41292

Did you know about the Happy Hooker and the Dolphin at Patrick Air Force
Base, Florida?

I been out fishin' on both of em.... O'course that was back in the late
70's.

jimi

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:NEFw8.4097$3T2.202212575@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> Yep, 17' basstrackers for rent at MWR!
>
> 73, Brian
>
> "Jimick" <jimick1@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:Mdqw8.41392$WV1.14480440@typhoon.ne.ipsvc.net...
> > At least the Air Force has a few boats!!
> >
> > jimi
> >
> > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> > news:Beqw8.3252$ym4.172290230@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20020412180225.19503.00000582@mb-cm.aol.com...
> > > >
> > > > For half a century, the US military has had a policy of REQUIRING
> > > > commissioned officers to have a college education or the
> > > > equivalency of one. The USAF has made it a policy of requiring
> > > > all pilots to be commissioned officers. The US Army took a more
> > > > realistic view in the Warrant Officer requirements for helicopter
> > > > pilots (there are more helos in the US military than fixed-wing
> > > > aircraft).
> > > >
> > > Yep, we forgot about helicopters when we took the airplanes away from
> the
> > > Army in 1947. Everybody wants to be in the Air Force. Army's got
> > > helicopters, Navy's got little pointy nosed planes, Marine Corps has
> both,
> > > Coast Guard has C-130's. Someday the Air Force should buy tanks and
> > > submarines.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >

> >
> >
>
>

2024. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 00:10:48 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1fazs79.1gg20o61u2888vN%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 41293

Jimick <jimick1@hotmail.com> wrote:

> It's not ham radio that is dying...it's the spirit of ham radio that is
> dying. It is being replaced by apathy...
>
> jimi

Naah, I'm just as excited about it today as I was when I got my ticket
in 1994. There is SO MUCH to do in ham radio there is no way one could
get bored with it IMHO.

> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:Cspw8.3236$FO3.170810557@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Fred Garvin" <Garvin@Truss.net> wrote in message
> > news:1faxpy5.1oi4af91qojqmnN%Garvin@Truss.net...
> > > Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20020416175519.00480.00004147@mb-mj.aol.com...
> > > > > >Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
> > > > > >From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> > > > > >Date: 04/16/02 15:00 Eastern Daylight Time
> > > > > >Message-id: <3CBC74DA.E6A5273D@psu.edu>
> > > > > >
> > > > > >There are a few things about the
> > > > > >ARS that aren't so good.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Sure there is, Mike, but at the end of the day, which outweighs
> > the
> > > > other
> > > > > by a long way?
> > > > >
> > > > > >It says a lot about a person in what they focus upon.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm focusing upon the fact that NASA has Ham Radio on board an
> > > orbiting
> > > > > space station and they're bragging about it...and I bet there ain't
> a
> > > cellphone
> > > > > within 300 miles of it!~
> > > > >
> > > > > 73
> > > > >
> > > > > Steve, K4YZ

> > > >
> > > > What's the orbit altitude of the ISS?
> > >
> > > I'm showing about 396 miles as of this post.
> >
> > Then Steve got lucky. There might not be one withing 300 miles, but
> there's
> > 10's of millions within 400 miles.
> >
> >

--
If love is blind, why is lingerie so popular?
- George Carlin

2025. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 01:01:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421210152.04515.00000082@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 41294

In article <Cspw8.3236$FO3.170810557@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> > > I'm focusing upon the fact that NASA has Ham Radio on board an orbiting
>> > > space station and they're bragging about it...and I bet there ain't a cellphone
>> > > within 300 miles of it!~
>> > >
>> > > 73
>> > >
>> > > Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> > What's the orbit altitude of the ISS?
>>
>> I'm showing about 396 miles as of this post.
>
>Then Steve got lucky. There might not be one withing 300 miles, but there's
>10's of millions within 400 miles.

The Tennessee Teuton didn't answer, probably didn't know. Fred answered for him. :-)

About one in four USA citizens is a cellular telephone subscriber now. That's a LOT of low-L-band two-way digital radios (that connect directly into the telephone system). Cell telephony has become a Way of Life for more Americans than amateur radio and Working DX on HF with CW. :-)

2026. I apologize to KE3Z....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 01:14:52 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <guJw8.221$3Z4.16918@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41295

....and to the rest of the rrap'ers for engaging in a public pissing match.
He knows my proposal is wrong, and I know he is wrong, so that makes us both
right. I'll buy him a beer at Dayton.

73, de Hans, K0HB

I also want to apologize to twits everywhere for calling W5TIT a twit.

2027. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 01:53:47 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <L2Kw8.21$iQ5.6675@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41296

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Now just allow all non-analog-voice modes and the thing will fly.
>

I think that would pull the heart right out of the idea. How can I propose
a "Experimentation Reservation" and then tolerate the use of decades-old
technology on that reservation?

73, Hans, K0HB

2028. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 02:04:21 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <FcKw8.45$iQ5.9098@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41297

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> And to get your subband idea going in the face of the inevitable ARRL
> BoD opposition, you need a wide consensus of support.

I know my idea is not going to be a shoo-in, but on the other hand I am sort of counting on the FCC being observant enough to notice that the ARRL petition is essentially non-responsive to 98-143, where the FCC literally begs the Amateur Service to make some proposals "regarding implementation of new technologies" for those subbands. Perhaps FCC will be inclined to look outside the ARRL non-proposal and consider some unconventional ideas.

I am also of the mind that 98-143 signaled amateurs that ARRL BoD enjoys but a single vote in their deliberations, just like every other amateur and amateur organization.

73, Hans, K0HB

2029. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 02:08:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421220837.08742.00000502@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41298

In article <3cc232e0_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>The first post I made to answer Jim's question:
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Anyway, the
>> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
>I've
>> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
>>
>> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Er, no digital...no CW...LOL
>
>Kim
>**********
>
>That seems like a pretty direct answer to me.

It was not clear to me at all.

>I said "no digital...no
>CW...LOL" so it should have been quite obvious to him that I had probably
>never been on 30M.

It wasn't. It was not clear whether you were talking about yourself, someone
else,
your opinion, or something else.

Why not a simple, straight, direct answer in plain American English, Kim?

Something like:

'I've never operated 30 meters.'

>He didn't like that answer, so:

It wasn't a question of "didn't like". It was a question of 'wasn't clear what
you were trying to say'.

>
>In article <3cb78636$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
>>> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >Anyway, the
>>> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
>I've
>>> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
>>>
>>> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>>>
>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>Er, no digital...no CW...LOL
>>
>I don't understand, Kim.
>
>You wrote:
>
>"I've done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times."
>
>The context was HF bands, of course. 30 meters is an HF band.
>What mode did you use on 30 meters?
>
>It's a simple question.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>**
>
>I guess at some point he is looking for a different answer.
> There isn't one.

Yes, there is.

'I've never operated 30 meters'

is one possible answer.

You wrote that your all was different from my all, that you didn't remember,
and a bunch of other stuff, instead of just answering my simple direct question
with a simple direct answer.

What's wrong with simply telling the truth straight out?

My best guess is that you've never been on 30 meters at all. I also suspect
that your HF/MF amateur experience is extremely limited - probably never been

on most of the amateur bands below 25 MHz. And probably never had a complete QSO on any nonvoice mode. None of that is a bad thing. Being evasive about it IS a bad thing, I think.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2030. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 02:08:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421220838.08742.00000503@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41299

In article <a9ur1k$m45$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020420180742.13101.00000794@mb-ct.aol.com...
>> In article <1Niw8.21103$3z3.1907582@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"K0HB"
>> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>>
>> >How about this. Retain the current absolute power limit of 200W in those
>> >sub-bands.
>>
>> Yup.
>>
>> >Further, any transmitter adjusted for more than 50W output must
>> >include auto-adaptive devices to hold power to the minimum needed for
>> >reliable communications.
>>
>> Double yup.
>>
>> >Then you *could* use your current Yaesu, Icom,
>> >Heathkit, or whatever, but you'd need to crank the output down to 50W.
>>
>> Which you'd probably have to do anyway if the digital mode has a high duty
>> cycle.
>>
>> Doubleplus yup.
>>
>> >The
>> >idea is to encourage experimentation with pro-active power reduction to
>> >reduce congestion.
>>
>> Of course.
>>
>> This scheme is better than both the original 'all must adapt' idea and the
>'no
>> limits' idea. It permits the use of existing rigs and also offers an
>incentive
>> to include power control.
>>
>> If ya want a REAL incentive, make it 1500 W peak power in the subbands if
>you
>> have automatic power control and ~100 W without automatic power control.
>For

>> all modes. BWAAAHAAAAHAAA!
>>
>> That problem's fixed, as I see it. Thanks, Hans.
>
>I like this approach also.

That's three so far. Anybody else?

>I fully agree that we need proactive
>power limiting functionality.

oh mama - PPLF. Kewl!

>Go for it Hans.

What about allowing/disallowing existing modes in the experimental subbands,
Bill? You fer it or agin it?

--

In case you missed it, I apologize for my earlier misuse of the term "type
acceptance" in connection with PPLF.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2031. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 02:09:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc37170_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41300

Whatever you wish to think, Jim, you think.

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020421220837.08742.00000502@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <3cc232e0_1@newsa.ev1.net>, " Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> >The first post I made to answer Jim's question:
> >
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Anyway, the
> >> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
> >I've
> >> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
> >>
> >> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Er, no digital...no CW...LOL
> >
> >Kim
> >**********
> >
> >That seems like a pretty direct answer to me.
>
> It was not clear to me at all.
>
> >I said "no digital...no
> >CW...LOL" so it should have been quite obvious to him that I had probably
> >never been on 30M.
>
> It wasn't. It was not clear whether you were talking about yourself,
someone
> else,
> your opinion, or something else.
>

> Why not a simple, straight, direct answer in plain American English, Kim?
>
> Something like:
>
> 'I've never operated 30 meters.'
>
> >He didn't like that answer, so:
>
> It wasn't a question of "didn't like". It was a question of 'wasn't clear
what
> you were trying to say'.
> >
> >In article <3cb78636$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>news:20020411080711.29940.00000378@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >>> In article <3cb24b00$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
> ><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> >>> writes:
> >>>
> >>> >Anyway, the
> >>> >reason Riley would not have a problem with me working on all bands is
> >I've
> >>> >done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times.
> >>>
> >>> What mode did you use on 30 meters?
> >>>
> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>Er, no digital...no CW...LOL
> >>
> >I don't understand, Kim.
> >
> >You wrote:
> >
> >"I've done all bands in the presence of control ops, lots of times."
> >
> >The context was HF bands, of course. 30 meters is an HF band.
> >What mode did you use on 30 meters?
> >
> >It's a simple question.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >**********
> >
> >I guess at some point he is looking for a different answer.
> > There isn't one.
>
> Yes, there is.

>
> 'I've never operated 30 meters'
>
> is one possible answer.
>
> You wrote that your all was different from my all, that you didn't
remember,
> and a bunch of other stuff, instead of just answering my simple direct
question
> with a simple direct answer.
>
> What's wrong with simply telling the truth straight out?
>
> My best guess is that you've never been on 30 meters at all. I also
suspect
> that your HF/MF amateur experience is extremely limited - probably never
been
> on most of the amateur bands below 25 MHz. And probably never had a
complete
> QSO on any nonvoice mode. None of that is a bad thing. Being evasive about
it
> IS a bad thing, I think.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2032. Re: I apologize to KE3Z....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 02:11:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc371f6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41352

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:guJw8.221$3Z4.16918@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> ....and to the rest of the rrap'ers for engaging in a public pissing
match.
> He knows my proposal is wrong, and I know he is wrong, so that makes us
both
> right. I'll buy him a beer at Dayton.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> I also want to apologize to twits everywhere for calling W5TIT a twit.
>
>

I guess since you consider me a twit, that must be as close to an apology as
I'll get--and I accept it as one for Jon Bloom.

Thank you for reconsidering.

Kim W5TIT

2033. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 02:20:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a9vs6u$ak2$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41351

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020421220838.08742.00000503@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <a9ur1k$m45$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020420180742.13101.00000794@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >> In article <1Niw8.21103$3z3.1907582@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> >"K0HB"
> >> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
> >>
> >> >How about this. Retain the current absolute power limit of 200W in
those
> >> >sub-bands.
> >>
> >> Yup.
> >>
> >> >Further, any transmitter adjusted for more than 50W output must
> >> >include auto-adaptive devices to hold power to the minimum needed for
> >> >reliable communications.
> >>
> >> Double yup.
> >>
> >> >Then you *could* use your current Yaesu, Icom,
> >> >Heathkit, or whatever, but you'd need to crank the output down to 50W.
> >>
> >> Which you'd probably have to do anyway if the digital mode has a high
duty
> >> cycle.
> >>
> >> Doubleplus yup.
> >>
> >> >The
> >> >idea is to encourage experimentation with pro-active power reduction
to
> >> >reduce congestion.
> >>
> >> Of course.
> >>
> >> This scheme is better than both the original 'all must adapt' idea and
the
> >'no
> >> limits' idea. It permits the use of existing rigs and also offers an
> >incentive

> >> to include power control.
> >>
> >> If ya want a REAL incentive, make it 1500 W peak power in the subbands
if
> >you
> >> have automatic power control and ~100 W without automatic power
control.
> >For
> >> all modes. BWAAAHAAAAHAAA!
> >>
> >> That problem's fixed, as I see it. Thanks, Hans.
> >
> >I like this approach also.
>
> That's three so far. Anybody else?
>
> >I fully agree that we need proactive
> >power limiting functionality.
>
> oh mama - PPLF. Kewl!
>
> >Go for it Hans.
>
> What about allowing/disallowing existing modes in the experimental
subbands,
> Bill? You fer it or agin it?

I really don't care either way. I doubt the FCC wants
more rules...odds are we'd be better off looking for
volunteer approach first.

> In case you missed it, I apologize for my earlier misuse of the term "type
> acceptance" in connection with PPLF.

Yes, I saw that.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2034. Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 02:27:09 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cc3758a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 41354

A recent outburst here has evoked in me a rash of thoughts to consider all day. I download this newsgroup, for whatever reason, each evening and know full well there is nothing of any substance on it, certainly nothing that interests me.

I allow myself to be engaged by reprehensible thoughts from reprehensible people. I allow myself to get caught up in petty meandering about what was meant to be said; and know full well the main defense is simply against another for their challenge only through their dislike of something I said, and not necessarily that what I said was all that important; or wrong. I allow myself the anger that I have always been able to ignore or overcome, simply. I get extremely angry at injustices and choose to get wrapped up in how wrong someone is while I, myself, am just as wrong for the way in which I respond to them.

I will no longer participate in this newsgroup and am actually seriously considering dropping ham radio altogether. While this newsgroup is insignificant in terms of being representative of ham radio, I have no passion for a hobby in which people enjoy nothing but constant challenges with each other--and it seems to be that more than anything else lately. Perhaps the FCC is a governmental business, but the people have decided that the ARS is a proving ground for how much more important one is than the other; rather than the supposed "fraternity" to which many endear the hobby. If a fraternity means constant hazing, then leave me out.

This is my last post, my last time to logon to the newsgroup. So, any responses will truly not be seen by me. If you plan to make them for my benefit, then you may as well not bother. You brothers have probably been at it for years, and you'll probably be at it for many more.

This recent exchange, and the fact that tempers can flare so very much as to threaten each other personally really concerns me. I hope you will all fight your strongest fights, blare your loudest words, but leave out personal affronts and assaults toward personal lives...that is way, way too much folks. And, trade the semantics for real issues, huh? You all scare me when you act like that. Goodbye.

Kim W5TIT

2035. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 02:27:54 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <KyKw8.99$iQ5.12485@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41353

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote

>
> The ARRL board, via the Newington crowd influence, has shown
> it is interested in anything related to sustaining or
> increasing revenues from magazine sales. As such it will
> oppose anything that does not result in more subscriptions,
> and/or more YaComWood radio sales.
>

I'll chime in to disagree with you on this point. I've served two terms as a Vice Director, and I understand who the BoD is and how it works. Without reservation I can say that I believe that _EVERY_ member of ARRL BoD is absolutely committed to furthering the cause of Amateur Radio, and none of them has ever compromised that commitment to increase QST subscriptions, or to increase sales of any supplier of amateur equipment.

Period.

Nonetheless, I think that their current petition regarding "novice refarming" is far too conservative, and absolutely lacking in any imaginative thinking regarding modernization of the Amateur Service. Jon and others may disagree, but I still believe that the "soul of souls" of amateur radio still has a high proportion of tinkerers and experimenters, and that this valuable part of our Amateur Service must be spot-lighted and encouraged. "Refarming" may our last best hope of putting filament voltage on that spotlight. (How's that for mixing metaphors?!?)

73, de Hans, K0HB

2036. Re: I apologize to KE3Z....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:01:48 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.21.23.01.48.695298.25705@arrl.org>
Source record: 41355

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 21:14:52 -0400, K0HB wrote:
> ....and to the rest of the rrap'ers for engaging in a public pissing
> match. He knows my proposal is wrong, and I know he is wrong, so that
> makes us both right. I'll buy him a beer at Dayton.

Handsomely said, Hans, and in turn let me assure you that it was never my intention to piss you off. I'm very sorry that was the result.

73, Jon, KE3Z

2037. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:22:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020421232200.10062.00001214@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 41357

In article <3cc300a0_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Not only that, that post is certainly *not* the only time Larry has said
>such to Ed Hare. An important distinction between Hans and Larry, though,
>is that Larry has never stated that he would "make a phone call," implying
>that he'd try overt influence to have another person lose their job. At
>least, I don't recall Larry ever doing that.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I doubt that Hans could get Jon fired for something he posted to this
newsgroup, and if it ever happened, I'd resign my ARRL membership
on the spot.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2038. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:22:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020421232200.10062.00001213@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 41358

In article <YCFw8.4095$q73.202913167@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >Welp, that's why I'm no longer with the Corp's of Engineers. You on the
>> >other hand can keep driving your bus to the bank. Verrry lucrative, HA!
>>
>> Brian:
>>
>> I drive it to banks, hospitals, Renal Care centers, doctor's offices,
>> schools, churches, etc., and, ultimately, the homes of all my clients.
>> Lucrative? It does pay very well, has great benefits, and offers just
>> about all the overtime you want.
>
>Who wants overtime?

Brian:

I'm one of the few drivers who doesn't. Most of the more senior drivers are real "overtime bandits," virtually doubling their income on OT. This job pays well enough that I can live without OT, though I do volunter a few hours every week to help out when needed. Last year I worked over 500 hrs. of OT due to not having enough seniority to get a "regular" run. Glad that's not a problem anymore.

>Like I don't have enough to do already, what with
>having to count out my AF pension every month, and storing all the excess
>cash in a foot locker.

Gee Brian, I put mine in a mutual fund. Pays better interest than a foot locker.

>> BTW, I'm on Jury Duty for the next two weeks, so why don't you
>> go ahead and make fun of that as well?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Hey pal, you're the one making fun of how much I used to make.

Hey, you were the one who raised the subject.

>BTW, you'll never make it into a court room unless you say absolutely
>nothing, hide your military background, and never let on that you've even
>heard of Rush Limbo.

I'm not going to tell them anything that they don't specifically inquire about. And I'm reasonably sure my status as a veteran, and the fact that I occasionally listen to Rush Limbaugh wouldn't really matter. If

it did, they'd have a pretty tough getting any jurors around here, in a city where 1/3 the population is military or has working ties to Dover AFB.

>73 and good luck getting picked.

Just called the recording at the court, my group doesn't have to report tomorrow. So I'll have to wait until Tuesday to see if I "get picked."

73 de Larry, K3LT

2039. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:22:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020421232201.10062.00001215@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 41356

In article <3cc300a0_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Here she be:
>>
>> > From: Larry Roll K3LT (yodoc@aol.comnospam)
>> > Subject: Re: What's a "Real Ham?" REAL EASY... K3LT's reply (long)
>> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>> > Date: 2001-05-15 01:46:00 PST
>> >
>> > Yes, Ed, I'm sure you do see it that way. However, you also are
>> > required to reflect ARRL policy without any significant diversion from
>> > same, ...
>>
>> "Required to reflect ARRL policy" seems pretty clear. Ain't google a
>bitch?
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>>
>>
>
>Not only that, that post is certainly *not* the only time Larry has said
>such to Ed Hare. An important distinction between Hans and Larry, though,
>is that Larry has never stated that he would "make a phone call," implying
>that he'd try overt influence to have another person lose their job. At
>least, I don't recall Larry ever doing that.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Your quote didn't prove your case "against" me, either. You accused
me of calling Ed an ARRL shill in "each and every post" I make in this
newsgroup. So, go ahead, prove it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2040. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:28:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC38343.C828CAEB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41359

K0HB wrote:
> I've served two terms as a Vice Director, ...

What's your favorite vice, Hans?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2041. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:42:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC386A4.B3FA8E7F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41360

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >Not only that, that post is certainly *not* the only time Larry has said
> >such to Ed Hare. An important distinction between Hans and Larry, though,
> >is that Larry has never stated that he would "make a phone call," implying
> >that he'd try overt influence to have another person lose their job. At
> >least, I don't recall Larry ever doing that.
>
> Your quote didn't prove your case "against" me, either. You accused
> me of calling Ed an ARRL shill in "each and every post" I make in this
> newsgroup. So, go ahead, prove it!

You misunderstood her posting, Larry. Here it is again:

> > Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that Ed
> > Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he (Ed) makes.

"He" refers to Ed, not you, and that makes Kim's statement very true.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2042. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:43:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421234337.15171.00005043@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41364

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/21/02 13:46 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020421134656.27628.00000685@mb-bj.aol.com

>That is in
>the public database of comments on 98-143. According to that
>creature, he is "proud" of his one-paragraph comment.

Actually, I said something quite different, having even stated it was not
a wise move. Of course you have always failed to acknowledge that.

Not that I'd expect anything else, really...

Putz.

Steve

>

2043. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:43:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guy0y1b.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41361

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 00:58:40 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>Without the license, there is no such thing as a RACES station.
There is only "amateur stations participating in RACES" at best.

That was the intent.

Remember that a RACES station license didn't require an amateur
licensed trustee and that trustee (or anyone else in the CD
organization) could operate [only] that station (unless he was also
licensed). There is a difference here.

When RACES was first formed in the 1950s, a non-amateur could
operate a RACES statsion. This went away a LONG time ago, and only
licensed amateur operators have been permitted to be the control
operator at a RACES station for several decades.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2044. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:43:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guxzhca.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41362

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 00:55:10 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>> Which are you signed up for? What do they require?
>
>I'm currently involved in neither.
>
>From 1993-1998, I was an operator on call for a federal facility
>(local VA hospital). We were only called out once - On January 16,
>1994 - for the Northridge, CA earthquake. Our facility was not hit,
>but the next one over (Sepulveda) was within 3 miles of the epicenter.
>The only "emergency" thing we did was at the direction of the VA
>police: Their radio equipment couldn't reach the Sepulveda facility
>and telco was down. Using our equipment (better than their puny 5w
>HT's), we contacted the other facility to arrange for patient
>transfer. That's it.

In the Portland metro area we have an active HEART (Hospital Emergency Amateur Radio Team) program integrated into the RACES/ARES peogram. Each hospital has in-place 2-meter voice and packet stations installed and paid for by the hospitals, provided with redundant back-up power (large industrial 12v battery charged from the hospital's emergemcy board powered by their standby diesels). Our club has a big program to get interested hospital personnel licensed as hams to be able to use the equipment if the assigned RACES/ARES operators are not on hand. I'm assigned to the local hospital with three others. I'm trying to get my assignment changed to the City Public Works Center which is two blocks from my home.....

>The primary way I give to the community is by being a volunteer examiner.

A very worthwhile contribution,
>
>Around these parts (Los Angeles), I find that most of the radio
>operators who "volunteer" for the County's DCS program are
>self-important, arrogant idiots (some of whom are suspected of having
>bought their licenses); at least the ones I know, except for two: One
>being the sheriff deputy who ran the program until 2000 (I believe he
>was rotated to another job that year), and another who works on LAPD
>radios at Piper Tech.

I see that things haven't changed since I was in the LA Sheriff's Reserve forty years ago. They put me in Firestone Station (uniform patrol 3 nights a week in the ghetto) when I really wanted to use my engineering skills either in the crime lab or communications, but that's another story. I didn't think much of the "K6CPT" crowd, and when my class load at UCLA (grad school) got really heavy I left the

SO.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2045. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:43:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guy207c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41363

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 08:11:31 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>Prior to restructuring, yes - to the organization. It was even in
<the rules that the "responsible person" (i.e. trustee) need only be
>part of the sponsoring organization or government agency - he (or she)
>need NOT hold any amateur license whatsoever. Although it also said
>that only an amateur licenseholder may be the "control operator,"
>there was NO requirement for a RACES station to HAVE a control
>operator (it's NOT in 31 CFR 97.109 - which defines station control of
>ONLY an amateur station, nor is it in 31 CFR 97.407 which defined
>RACES itself fully).

Pay attention: Section 97.407(a) of the Rules says clearly:

§97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service (RACES).

(a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a civil defense organization as registered with that organization, or it is an FCC-licensed RACES station. No person may be the control operator of a RACES station, or may be the control operator of an amateur station transmitting in RACES unless that person holds a FCC-issued amateur operator license and is certified by a civil defense organization as enrolled in that organization.

Further, Section 97.3(a)(13) defined "Control Operator" as:

(13) Control operator. An amateur operator designated by the licensee of a station to be responsible for the transmissions from that station to assure compliance with the FCC Rules.

Notice that it doesn't exclude a RACES station by saying "a station in the Amateur Radio Service" and in that regard it would be interpreted to include all stations covered by Part 97, INCLUDING RACES stations, especially since Sect. 97.407(a) makes specific reference to a "control operator" at a RACES station.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2046. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:45:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421234542.15171.00005044@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41365

>Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/21/02 13:46 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020421134655.27628.00000684@mb-bj.aol.com>

>Why would "tech-smart" folks want to work CW on HF a la 1930s?

Probably for the same reason "tech-smart" people still ahve sex a la
primitive man...it's FUN!

(I know it's a stretch for you to understand, having little if any
experience in either domain...just fake it, Lennie....)

Steve

2047. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 03:48:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020421234810.15171.00005045@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41366

>Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/21/02 21:01 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020421210152.04515.00000082@mb-fk.aol.com>

>The Tennessee Teuton didn't answer, probably didn't know. Fred
>answered for him.

Unlike you, Lennie, I have a life, and my point was made with teh "300 mile" reference. The other 96 miles (at any given moment, maybe more...maybe less...) wasn't worth fussing over.

G'nite, Your Putziness.

2048. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 04:19:08 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <0bMw8.322$iQ5.34623@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41367

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Why would "tech-smart" folks want to work CW on HF a la 1930s?
>

That's an easy question. For the very good reason that they enjoy it.
Enjoying some things that aren't "modern" doesn't make you primitive.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2049. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 04:30:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aa0u0m22vm6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 41380

Ed.... maybe we could work out a dual benefit situation here.... also have
you for a club presentation too! I will keep all informed here. I intend
to go through the required training that our local cable access station
requires even though I am fully familiar with the processes and techniques.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site
please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020418180442.06890.00004110@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >:) I agree about the grounding issue, as that could apply to many
different
> >aspects of a non-hams life. Especially when dealing with RFI from their
> >computers, home stereo's etc....
>
> If I could find someone to handle the video end of things, I do a pretty
good
> 1-hour presentation on RFI. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

2050. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 04:42:10 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aa0u0n32vm6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 41381

That would be cool.... I definitely believe amateur radio needs more positive and proactive persons to make it grow instead of just "breaking even" or worse, dwindling. Especially after the code thingy is dropped in a couple of years, there is gonna be alot of the senior citizens that make up the majority of this hobby service havin' heart attacks......

Just kiddin',

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

>
>
> Ed!!! Now, *that* would be terrific. An ARRL person doing the
> presentation! Yep, that would be really, really neat.
>
> Ryan, wish we lived in the same area. I wonder if I could drag myself up
> enough energy to undertake some of this around here. Hmmmmmm
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2051. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 04:45:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aa0u0n42vm6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 41383

Nope, neither do I... as far as the ARRL is concerned and I, it is called the 80 Meter band. Check their allocation chart. According to any SWL publication 75 Meters is referred to as a Shortwave Broadcast band. As well as that thin piece of metal sticking out of the fender of my truck is called and antenna, not an aerial.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

>
> Do you differentiate between 75M and 80M? Or is it all 80M?
>
>

2052. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 04:51:19 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aa0u0o52vm6@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 41382

In the fire service, assuming that the front of the house is the one facing the road, that part of the house at the rear is referred to the "C" side.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020421115754.24943.00000251@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3cc22298_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Hmmmm, what *is* the front of house?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> The front of a house is the side which is oriented at a 180° angle
> from the back of the house.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2053. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 05:36:21 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <3FE61452E63E4B69.254A2E430203D085.B495CE54A708C2D9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 41368

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 08:08:41 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>Maybe in *your* area that is true. In the immediate area of the City of
>Dallas/Dallas County, there are no ARES organizations at all. Here in
>Kaufman County, we are a RACES County; in Parker County emergency
>communication is provided by ARES; Denton County is ARES (I think); Tarrant
>County (Ft. Worth) is RACES; Ellis County is RACES. RACES provides the
>majority of amateur radio emergency communication here.

Collin County, which includes a bit of Dallas, (specifically, the bit
I live in) is ARES.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2054. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 09:57:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CC3DE8D.B61CA631@earthlink.net>
Source record: 41369

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CC29AC3.4032C52B@earthlink.net...
> >
> > You could have easily come right out and said as much when first asked.
> > You didn't.
> >
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> My very first response to Jim was reposted here last night. If that is not
> an answer, I don't know what is. Since 30M is a CW/digital mode band only,
> it should be obvious to any semi-intelligent baffoon that I had not be on
> 30M; and therefore had declared all HF bands in error. But, you're
> obviously far from the most intelligent baffoon.

If I run across any bafoons, I'll be sure to let you know. Once is a
typo. Twice is a word you don't know. Your response to Jim was
Clintonesque at best.
>
> I think what pisses you folks off more is that I wasn't caught by Jim's
> obvious attempt to snarl me...I have enough knowledge to realize right up
> front that 30M is set aside for digital/CW.

...but not enough knowledge to keep you from claiming to have operated
on "all HF bands".

Dave K8MN

2055. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 11:53:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422075358.07186.00004846@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41370

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> The FCC did not require a Morse code test for commercial HF access
>>*before* the other services abandoned code use.

>This is even richer. Why not?

I don't know. I was not given a code test when I took the FCC First Class
Radiotelepone license test.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2056. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 11:55:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422075521.07186.00004847@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41371

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Remember that Dick has recently said he means exactly what he says,
>no more and no less.

His typo did not change the meaning of what he said by my read.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2057. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:02:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422080249.07186.00004849@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41372

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I doubt that Hans could get Jon fired for something he posted to this
>newsgroup, and if it ever happened, I'd resign my ARRL membership
>on the spot.

Pity that Hans can't handle all those who disagree with him the same way. Sure would be an effective way to be right all of the time. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2058. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:06:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422080622.07186.00004851@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41373

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>I don't think that will be a problem on 7.100 to 7.150. The
>international SW broadcasters will take care of that, at
>least at night after the D layer collapses.

But should not such experimentation include working on modes that can communicate in the teeth of those international broadcasters? I would wager that 75% of the 7.1-7.3 MHz segment could be used for even as simple a digital mode as PSK-31 in the FEC mode.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2059. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:11:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422081134.07186.00004852@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41374

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>> One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams can
>use
>> all of the bands for such experimentation.

>That seems to be the "pat answer" out of your vicinity on this topic.

Then it is the correct answer, Hans.

>Of course, if _you_ want to try something new and novel, I'm sure K1ZZ will
>give Chris Imlay an assignment to write an STA request. Us
>plain-brown-rrap'ers don't seem to have that sort of clout.

Neither you or I need an STA to do most of the experimentation that could take place, Hans. Under the present rules, hams can invent new modes and encoding at the drop of a hat, make the encoding for those modes public by documenting them (and ARRL asked -- even on a web page is fine) then use them to their heart's content.

>Now why are you _really_ tossing cold water on the idea? How odd that you consider my commenting on one single point as "cold water," with some ARRL conspiracy to boot.

Oh, have you joined the "hidden conspiracy" crowd? I am not tossing cold water on your idea, Hans; to the contrary, I like it. I "really" was trying to make the point to hams that they do not have to wait for such a rules change in order to experiment with new modes on HF.

Rest assured, I will try to avoid conversation with you in the future if this kind of reaction will be the result.

Sorry to have troubled you by talking with you about your idea.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2060. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:14:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422081446.07186.00004853@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41375

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>> Maybe we could have a sub-band where *everything* is prohibited! :-)

>Are you saying that hams should not be encouraged to experiment with new
>ideas?

No, I was not saying that, Hans.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2061. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:17:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422081754.07186.00004854@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41376

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>The ARRL board, via the Newington crowd influence,***

ARRL HQ staff do not influence the ARRL Board of Directors. Ask you Director what his response will be if Ed Hare starts telling him what he has to do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2062. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:21:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422082107.07186.00004855@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41378

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>I know my idea is not going to be a shoo-in, but on the other hand I am sort
>of counting on the FCC being observant enough to notice that the ARRL
>petition is essentially non-responsive to 98-143, where the FCC literally
>begs the Amateur Service to make some proposals "regarding implementation of
>new technologies" for those subbands. Perhaps FCC will be inclined to look
>outside the ARRL non-proposal and consider some unconventional ideas.

Hans,

I am sure that you made your views known to your Divsion Director, but I do
hope that all those who posted their opinion about the matter do the same.

I suggested to Tom that the segment be opened up for digital experimentation of
any data rate, subject to the provision that the occupied bandwidth not exceed
the segment.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2063. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:26:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422082607.07186.00004856@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41377

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>Nope, neither do I... as far as the ARRL is concerned and I, it is called
>the 80 Meter band. Check their allocation chart.

If memory serves me correctly, the FCC regulations call the phone/image part of
the band "75 M" and the CW/digital part of the band "80 M."

It doesn't matter, other than here on rrap, hams can always figure out what
band is really being talked about just from the context. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2064. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:29:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422082936.07186.00004857@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41384

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>Ed.... maybe we could work out a dual benefit situation here.... also have
>you for a club presentation too! I will keep all informed here. I intend
>to go through the required training that our local cable access station
>requires even though I am fully familiar with the processes and techniques.

I have had a couple of people try taping my club presentations, but I use transparencies, so the taping either had me in the dark or the transparencies so bright they couldn't be read. What it will take is someone who can get me in the right light as I move about the room a bit, and then separately tape the screen, then edit it all together.

This is all on Power Point, so I am hoping to find some time and perhaps use a program like Real Presenter to couple audio to the overheads. This could then be made available for download.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2065. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:31:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422083128.07186.00004858@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41385

From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)

>From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>>I know my idea is not going to be a shoo-in, but on the other hand I am sort
>>of counting on the FCC being observant enough to notice that the ARRL
>>petition is essentially non-responsive to 98-143, where the FCC literally
>>begs the Amateur Service to make some proposals "regarding implementation of
>>new technologies" for those subbands. Perhaps FCC will be inclined to look
>>outside the ARRL non-proposal and consider some unconventional ideas.

>I am sure that you made your views known to your Divsion Director, but I do
>hope that all those who posted their opinion about the matter do the same.

Even more important, file those same views as Comments with the FCC, no matter
what side of the fence you are on.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2066. Small Project Promotion of Ham Radio Begins!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:40:25 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uc803cl0np3jc8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41379

Hello, all!

We had several hundred people show up here in Columbia
for the Astronomy Day shindig at a local High School and
many of them got a look at our display on satellite communi-
cation. The high school senior who set up next to us, and
was computer imaging through a telescope, turned out to
be a new ham, too! A friend of his, another senior, talked
to us at some length about radio and since he showed real
interest we spent quite a lot of time with him. So, all in all,
since we also heard some satellites on a home-made antenna
put together just for this event, we were pretty well pleased!

Four weeks from now we have scheduled another astro
event at the public library. This will likely debut my "antenna
bench" which will allow the interested public to push
Yagi elements around and observe the effect as they do
so. Also, the club here has most of the fixins for a true
satellite tracking system, which we might have in place for
a June date with the public! More on this later.

I've had my Technician's license three weeks exactly and
I have to say it's been fun!

Oh, I almost forgot to mention, we'll be using the Yagis of
the "antenna bench" to, among other things, let kids send
and receive the dreaded Morse Code!

Val Germann
KC0MUB

**

2067. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 12:56:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC40884.A59797AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41386

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Remember that Dick has recently said he means exactly what he says,
> >no more and no less.
>
> His typo did not change the meaning of what he said by my read.

But Ed, now you are doing exactly what Dick accused you of. You are
interpreting what he posted instead of accepting it literally. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2068. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 13:00:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC4095D.CE3346EF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41387

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> >I don't think that will be a problem on 7.100 to 7.150. The
> >international SW broadcasters will take care of that, at
> >least at night after the D layer collapses.
>
> But should not such experimentation include working on modes that can
> communicate in the teeth of those international broadcasters? I would wager
> that 75% of the 7.1-7.3 MHz segment could be used for even as simple a digital
> mode as PSK-31 in the FEC mode.

According to Larsen E. Rapp, all it would take is back-to-back limiters to
perform amplitude discrimination. (Late 50's April QST)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2069. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 13:15:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BED369B.64AEB8CD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41388

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> You have proved yourself incapable of reading plaing language English.
>
> >My advice to you, Dick, is to avoid 'plaing English' from now on.
> >Where the heck did you learn 'plaing English' anyway?
>
> Isn't going after what is pretty clearly a fumble-finger typo pretty petty?

That's our boy.

2070. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 14:47:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BED3B0D.F37CDC76@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41389

W1RFI wrote:

> From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>
> >From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>
> >>I know my idea is not going to be a shoo-in, but on the other hand I am sort
> >>of counting on the FCC being observant enough to notice that the ARRL
> >>petition is essentially non-responsive to 98-143, where the FCC literally
> >>begs the Amateur Service to make some proposals "regarding implementation of
> >>new technologies" for those subbands. Perhaps FCC will be inclined to look
> >>outside the ARRL non-proposal and consider some unconventional ideas.
>
> >I am sure that you made your views known to your Divsion Director, but I do
> >hope that all those who posted their opinion about the matter do the same.
>
> Even more important, file those same views as Comments with the FCC, no matter
> what side of the fence you are on.

It hasn't dawned yet on lots of posters and others that the FCC in the person of Bill Cross is playing to Carl and his cadre for the purpose of making sure that he (Bill) doesn't come under fire as a flaming Luddite for *not* pushing (nay, shoving) "the latest technologies" to be mandated in ham radio.
There will always (at least until they get ran off by all the CBers) be those hams who experiment with whatever technology interests them. And as usual, the big majority of hams will just be hams who want to get on the air and "ham" using their favorite mode. Most become attracted to new things over time and most adopt them over more time. That's the nature of ham radio. Change that and you change the basis for its existence.

When Carl and his cadre finally turn ham radio into a glorified trunked cell phone service I and a whole lot more hams will just abandon ship. I already have a cellphone. It's very useful but not very interesting.

2071. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 14:47:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BED4439.A5D811E4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41390

N2EY wrote:

>
> Sounds like Kim is angry, Dave.

Maybe she got her W5TIT in the wringer....

2072. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 14:47:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BED4646.BED2672B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41391

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3CC171D7.3FA20244@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> 1) Phone bands stay as they are.
> >> 2) Existing Novices and Tech Pluses get access to all the non-phone
> >non-Extra
> >> HF/MF amateur spectrum with the same power as today (nobody loses)
> >> 3) The 80, 40 and 15 meter "Novice" bands become the "digital" subbands.
> >All
> >> modes allowed except analog voice and image. The current bandwidth/data
> >> rate/symbol rate regs do not apply in those subbands. Want to develop
> >"PSK10"
> >> or "Pactor 3" or digital voice? Have at it!
> >
> >Sounds good to me.
>
> ohmygawsh, we agree on something. Betcha Carl, Ed and a whole bunch of others
> would sign on to the above too. Maybe even Hans?

Write it up and send it in. I'll even sign on.

2073. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 14:47:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BED4B6B.2CF66D4B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41392

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.guvvdj4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:
>
> >>Why would you want to be involved in RACES anyway? If you are
> >>truly interested in local ham radio emergency communications service,
> >>ARES is where the action should be.
> >
> > Don't know how it is in other parts of the country, but here in
> > Oregon RACES and ARES are one organization. To get into it you
> > have to meet its requirements of both.
>
> Phil:
>
> That's pretty weird.

Not at all, Larry, in fact it's pretty practical. Why have parallel ham radio emergency structures? That's why they don't issue RACES licenses any longer.

2074. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 15:09:34 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <OIVw8.1456$iM5.114693@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41393

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> I am sure that you made your views known to your Divsion Director, but I
do
> hope that all those who posted their opinion about the matter do the same.
>

Yes, I did that.

But unfortunately he is prohibited by ARRL Bylaws from sending in comments on an ARRL petition. I guess it's up to you and me to push the idea with FCC. Last I looked, your comments haven't been posted at the FCC site.

Hopefully FCC isn't just taking a head count on this one..... of 35 responses to the ARRL petition, I tally:

21 in favor of ARRL's boundary shuffle
14 opposed

Of the 14 opposed:

10 say leave things like they are
3 say set up an experimenters reservation (thanks KT4ST and KE4MOB)
1 says decrease the phone bands and add more CW.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2075. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 15:17:50 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <yQVw8.1470$iM5.115811@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41394

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
> What's your favorite vice, Hans?
>

Stizostedion vitreum in cold water.

73, Hans, K0HB

2076. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 15:25:31 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <LXVw8.1479$iM5.116751@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41395

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

> >I doubt that Hans could get Jon fired for something he posted to this
> >newsgroup, and if it ever happened, I'd resign my ARRL membership
> >on the spot.
>
> Pity that Hans can't handle all those who disagree with him the same way.
Sure
> would be an effective way to be right all of the time. :-)

Are saying that it's a pity I haven't resigned my ARRL membership?

73, Hans, K0HB

2077. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 15:31:19 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <b1Ww8.1490$iM5.116322@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41396

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020422081134.07186.00004852@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>
> >> One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams
can
> >use
> >> all of the bands for such experimentation.
>
> >That seems to be the "pat answer" out of your vicinity on this topic.
>
> Then it is the correct answer, Hans.
>

Obviously it not the correct answer, or our club wouldn't be forced to
request an STA for one of our PBI's (Partially Baked Idea).

73, de Hans, K0HB

2078. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 16:18:01 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ZIWw8.1584$iM5.123121@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41397

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

>
> It hasn't dawned yet on lots of posters and others that the FCC in the
person of
> Bill Cross is playing to Carl and his cadre for the purpose of making sure
that he
> (Bill) doesn't come under fire as a flaming Luddite for *not* pushing
(nay,
> shoving) "the latest technologies" to be mandated in ham radio.

The beauty of my proposal is that it doesn't mandate that any ham need adopt
any technology at all. It simply sets up a few slivers of spectrum as a
"showcase" for those so inclined.

> There will always (at least until they get ran off by all the CBers) be
those
> hams who experiment with whatever technology interests them. And as usual,
the big
> majority of hams will just be hams who want to get on the air and "ham"
using
> their favorite mode. Most become attracted to new things over time and
most adopt
> them over more time. That's the nature of ham radio. Change that and you
change
> the basis for its existence.

I agree absolutely.

73, Hans, K0HB

2079. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 17:24:07 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CC44737.F165F039@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41398

N2EY wrote:

> 3) The 80, 40 and 15 meter "Novice" bands become the "digital" subbands. All
> modes allowed except analog voice and image. The current bandwidth/data
> rate/symbol rate regs do not apply in those subbands. Want to develop "PSK10"
> or "Pactor 3" or digital voice? Have at it!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

A reason that SSB and CW have lasted as long as they have is that
they do a pretty good job of getting through compared to say FM (ignoring
that FM is not allowed on most of HF). What we would want from
a new mode is to establish a QSO in conditions where the legacy modes
would fail. Digitize and compress your voice, transmit it via the new
mode, and the other ham receive and decode it to hear it on his
shack's speaker. After all, why go to all the trouble of developing
a new mode if it doesn't do the job better than the equivalent legacy
mode?

Why didn't that variant of SSB succeed? ACSB IIRC, idea was to
send your voice through a narrower bandwidth than regular SSB.

AS I understand it, when SSB came out it blew away AM for
DX work and such. No more heterodyne whistles on pileups, and
no more carrier to waste 2/3 of your 1KW linear power on.
The rare DX station could kludge his AM receiver to receive
SSB by making the IF strip go into oscillation, thus providing
a carrier for the envelope detector to work with. And hams
in the USA can still hear his AM transmitter with an SSB
receiver (or switch to AM mode).
Thus "Backwards compatibility" of sorts. A new mode
should be easy (via say a computer program, sound card, and an existing
transceiver) to rig up for the average ham so we have enough hams to
talk to.

Also a new mode should have lasting ability. Packet was fun 15 years
ago, but 1200 baud is really slow by today's standards and as such
"been there, done that" I haven't done packet for years.

2080. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 17:44:48 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <k_Xw8.1702$iM5.137434@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41399

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> After all, why go to all the trouble of developing
> a new mode if it doesn't do the job better than
> the equivalent legacy mode?

To paraphrase the guy who climbed the mountain....

"Because we can."

It has to do with the spirit of tinkering and trying new stuff. Certainly not all of us will do it, but it would be nice to have a gathering place in the ether for such foolishness.

73, Hans, K0HB

2081. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 18:08:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422140818.13688.00000947@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 41400

In article <L2Kw8.21$iQ5.6675@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>> Now just allow all non-analog-voice modes and the thing will fly.
>
>I think that would pull the heart right out of the idea.

I don't.

>How can I propose
>a "Experimentation Reservation" and then tolerate the use of decades-old
>technology on that reservation?

Several reasons:

1) It simplifies the rules (no need to decide and specify what is allowed and what is not). That's a BIG deal to the FCC

2) It does not push away anyone who is currently there.

3) It will be supported by far more hams. (Political reality being what it is, an idea that gathers lots of support has a better chance than one that has almost no support).

4) It will allow coordination of on-air experiments by the use of old modes. This is very important - how do I figure out where the problem is if I am forced to use ONLY the new, experimental mode if the new mode doesn't work right away?

5) It sets a bad precedent by banning certain widely-used modes from some spectrum where they are currently legal today.
Not a good idea.

6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned unless there is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).

--

A simple question:

Do you think the presence of a few amateur signals using "decades old technology" will be a problem for those hams who want to try out new modes in the subbands?

I don't.

Anybody else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2082. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 18:12:05 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC45276.BC28DB74@psu.edu>
Source record: 41301

Robert Casey wrote:

> A reason that SSB and CW have lasted as long as they have is that
> they do a pretty good job of getting through compared to say FM (ignoring
> that FM is not allowed on most of HF). What we would want from
> a new mode is to establish a QSO in conditions where the legacy modes
> would fail. Digitize and compress your voice, transmit it via the new
> mode, and the other ham receive and decode it to hear it on his
> shack's speaker. After all, why go to all the trouble of developing
> a new mode if it doesn't do the job better than the equivalent legacy
> mode?

I guess it depends on what you want to do. A digital SSTV mode would be
pretty nice to have, but it isn't going to replace SSB or CW.

I understand what you are saying, but I think you are limiting yourself
to a narrow idea of why a new mode is developed. Sometimes they can be
developed just for the fun of it.

- mike KB3EIA -

2083. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 18:26:42 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <CBYw8.1763$iM5.139808@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41302

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote
>
> Hopefully FCC isn't just taking a head count on this one..... of 35
> responses to the ARRL petition, I tally:
>
> 21 in favor of ARRL's boundary shuffle
> 14 opposed
>
> Of the 14 opposed:
>
> 10 say leave things like they are
> 3 say set up an experimenters reservation (thanks KT4ST and KE4MOB)
> 1 says decrease the phone bands and add more CW.

Maybe the tide is turning! Since my earlier tally (above) there have been
23 new comments at the FCC web site.

Among those 23 --

10 are in favor of the ARRL proposal
13 are opposed

Of those 13 opposed:

8 say leave things like they are
3 say set up an experimenters reservation (thanks WA2ISE, W8QT, KC7RAD)
1 says leave CW alone, trim back SSB, and devote some room to AM.
1 I didn't understand.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2084. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 18:49:41 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <9XYw8.1814$iM5.146641@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41303

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CC44737.F165F039@ix.netcom.com...

> A reason that SSB and CW have lasted as long as they have is that
> they do a pretty good job of getting through compared to say FM (ignoring
> that FM is not allowed on most of HF). What we would want from
> a new mode is to establish a QSO in conditions where the legacy modes
> would fail.

Bob,

It was flattering to see your support for my idea at the FCC web site.
Thanks!!!!!!!

73, Hans, K0HB

2085. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 18:54:14 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204221850360.24038-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41304

On Mon, 22 Apr 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 08:11:31 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>>Prior to restructuring, yes - to the organization. It was even in
><the rules that the "responsible person" (i.e. trustee) need only be
>>part of the sponsoring organization or government agency - he (or she)
>>need NOT hold any amateur license whatsoever. Although it also said
>>that only an amateur licenseholder may be the "control operator,"
>>there was NO requirement for a RACES station to HAVE a control
>>operator (it's NOT in 31 CFR 97.109 - which defines station control of
>>ONLY an amateur station, nor is it in 31 CFR 97.407 which defined
>>RACES itself fully).
>
> Pay attention: Section 97.407(a) of the Rules says clearly:
>
> §97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service (RACES).
>
> (a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed
> primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified
> by a civil defense organization as registered with that
> organization, or it is an FCC-licensed RACES station. No person
> may be the control operator of a RACES station, or may be the
> control operator of an amateur station transmitting in RACES unless
> that person holds a FCC-issued amateur operator license and is
> certified by a civil defense organization as enrolled in that
> organization.
>
> Further, Section 97.3(a)(13) defined "Control Operator" as:
>
> (13) Control operator. An amateur operator designated by the
> licensee of a station to be responsible for the transmissions from
> that station to assure compliance with the FCC Rules.
>
> Notice that it doesn't exclude a RACES station by saying "a station
> in the Amateur Radio Service" and in that regard it would be
> interpreted to include all stations covered by Part 97, INCLUDING
> RACES stations, especially since Sect. 97.407(a) makes specific
> reference to a "control operator" at a RACES station.

According to that definition (and notwithstanding any other part of the CFR),
an amateur operator could be the control operator of a broadcast station,
looking at only part 97 by itself! That conclusion is obviously nonsense, so
it is clear that the term "control operator" refers ONLY to the amateur
service. That means that the definition doesn't define what constitutes a
control operator for any other service, including RACES, so just how did you

conclude that it does?

2086. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 19:06:26 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <SaZw8.1858$iM5.149025@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41305

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote

> That conclusion is obviously nonsense, so
> it is clear that the term "control operator" refers
> ONLY to the amateur service. That means that
> the definition doesn't define what constitutes a
> control operator for any other service, including
> RACES, so just how did you conclude that it does?

From 97.3(a)(37) which states that the RACES
service uses "amateur stations".

73, de Hans, K0HB

2087. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 19:19:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC46233.B8A4E4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41306

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > Sounds like Kim is angry, Dave.
>
> Maybe she got her W5TIT in the wringer....

Too bad you don't support The Amateur's Code, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2088. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 19:33:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204221133.357cc78d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41307

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<FcKw8.45$iQ5.9098@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > And to get your subband idea going in the face of the inevitable ARRL
> > BoD opposition, you need a wide consensus of support.
>
> I know my idea is not going to be a shoo-in, but on the other hand I am sort
> of counting on the FCC being observant enough to notice that the ARRL
> petition is essentially non-responsive to 98-143, where the FCC literally
> begs the Amateur Service to make some proposals "regarding implementation of
> new technologies" for those subbands. Perhaps FCC will be inclined to look
> outside the ARRL non-proposal and consider some unconventional ideas.

Sure - but only if it doesn't make life more complex for the FCC.

The key selling point of your idea is that it eliminates the paperwork
and inflexibility of the STA process. Having all sorts of restrictions
and regulations on what constitutes a new digital mode and what
doesn't complicates the issue and creates unwanted work for the FCC.

My read on 98-143 is that FCC wants simple regs that are easily
enforced and widely supported. The only part of your revised proposal
that is complex is the definition of what constitutes a new,
experimental mode and what doesn't. Eliminate that part and it becomes
a shoo-in.

> I am also of the mind that 98-143 signaled amateurs that ARRL BoD enjoys but
> a single vote in their deliberations, just like every other amateur and
> amateur organization.

I don't see that at all. NPRMs and their comments are not strictly
voting/majority issues. If they were, we'd still have at least two
code test speeds.

The way to sell this thing is on what it will let hams do, not what it
will prevent them from doing. And the rules gotta be simple and
straightforward, making life easier for the FCC.

--

Historic note:

Part of ARRL's restructuring proposal was to give full General
privileges to Novices and Tech Pluses. FCC said no.

Soon after restructuring, AH0A petitioned to give Novices and Tech Pluses the use of CW on the General class non-voice parts of 80, 40 and 15. FCC said no.

Think win-win.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2089. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 19:46:31 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <rMZw8.1973$iM5.154460@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41308

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> The key selling point of your idea is that it eliminates the paperwork
> and inflexibility of the STA process. Having all sorts of restrictions
> and regulations on what constitutes a new digital mode and what
> doesn't complicates the issue and creates unwanted work for the FCC.

Leave the word digital off the table! New modes need _necessarily_ be
digital, do they? (I'll admit to not having an example of something new AND
non-digital, but let's not rule it out.)

> My read on 98-143 is that FCC wants simple regs that are easily
> enforced and widely supported. The only part of your revised proposal
> that is complex is the definition of what constitutes a new,
> experimental mode and what doesn't. Eliminate that part and it becomes
> a shoo-in.

OK, let me work on that, without hatching a new sub-band "open to everything
except spark and AM voice".

73, de Hans, K0HB

2090. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 19:54:02 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204221948130.24093-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41309

On Mon, 22 Apr 2002, K0HB wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote
>> That conclusion is obviously nonsense, so
>> it is clear that the term "control operator" refers
>> ONLY to the amateur service. That means that
>> the definition doesn't define what constitutes a
>> control operator for any other service, including
>> RACES, so just how did you conclude that it does?
>
>From 97.3(a)(37) which states that the RACES
>service uses "amateur stations".

No. It may use amateur OPERATORS and amateur stations (which are required to have a control operator) may participate, but a RACES station can also communicate (within the restriction of the rules) with other non-amateur, non-RACES stations.

The scope of the definition of "control operator" is to the ARS (as previously demonstrated), and RACES covers a different scope (with some overlap, but it's still a DIFFERENT service).

I believe that the problem is that the FCC has changed the rules to the point where there are now inconsistencies in the surviving rules that cannot be reconciled.

2091. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 19:56:12 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <wVZw8.2001$iM5.155903@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41310

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Historic note:
>
> Part of ARRL's restructuring proposal was to give full General
> privileges to Novices and Tech Pluses. FCC said no.
>
> Soon after restructuring, AH0A petitioned to give Novices and Tech
> Pluses the use of CW on the General class non-voice parts of 80, 40
> and 15. FCC said no.

And the current ARRL petition is an unimaginative "more of the same", with the attachment of several of pages of statistical tables. How can FCC do anything more that say "Strike Three"!

I count Chris Imlay as a friend of mine, but his persuasive talents are not evident in this yawner. In fairness, I suppose he has no choice but to work within the tasking document given him. A pity.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2092. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 20:20:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422162023.14735.00000967@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 41311

In article <20020421234542.15171.00005044@mb-fy.aol.com>, a primitive barbarian wrote in my comment to another:

>>Why would "tech-smart" folks want to work CW on HF a la 1930s?
>
> Probably for the same reason "tech-smart" people still ahve sex a la
>primitive man...it's FUN!

The subject was AMATEUR RADIO not primal urges.

Some DO seem to equate SEX = CW and those are to be pitied.

> (I know it's a stretch for you to understand, having little if any
>experience in either domain...just fake it, Lennie....)

I have NO reason to "fake anything" in regards to either sex or HF radio transmission, having done both for the first time in the 1950s. Coincindentally, the quoted writer wasn't born until the mid-1950s.

That coincidence is simply one of chronology and implies no transfer of DNA. Some writers in here come by their bastardy quite naturally.

2093. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 20:20:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422162023.14735.00000966@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 41314

In article <3CC45276.BC28DB74@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Robert Casey wrote:
>
>> A reason that SSB and CW have lasted as long as they have is that
>> they do a pretty good job of getting through compared to say FM (ignoring
>> that FM is not allowed on most of HF). What we would want from
>> a new mode is to establish a QSO in conditions where the legacy modes
>> would fail. Digitize and compress your voice, transmit it via the new
>> mode, and the other ham receive and decode it to hear it on his
>> shack's speaker. After all, why go to all the trouble of developing
>> a new mode if it doesn't do the job better than the equivalent legacy
>> mode?
>
> I guess it depends on what you want to do. A digital SSTV mode would be
>pretty nice to have, but it isn't going to replace SSB or CW.
>
> I understand what you are saying, but I think you are limiting yourself
>to a narrow idea of why a new mode is developed. Sometimes they can be
>developed just for the fun of it.
>
> - mike KB3EIA -

Some new things have already been worked out and air tested on
HF. I refer to the "digital AM" trials that have been underway in the
labs since 1996, on HF since 1999, all in the HF BC radio service.
Same bandwidth as HF AM which carries a fair amount of music.
The bandwidth can be reduced for just voice transmission. Details
of standards, air trials, even sound clips comparing conventional
AM with digital AM can be found at:

www.drm.org

The "drm" stands for Digital Radio Mondial, a consortium of
broadcasters and manufacturers.

2094. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 20:20:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422162024.14735.00000968@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 41313

In article <0bMw8.322$iQ5.34623@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Why would "tech-smart" folks want to work CW on HF a la 1930s?
>
>That's an easy question.

I disagree, it was simply a question and it received no answer.

>For the very good reason that they enjoy it.
>Enjoying some things that aren't "modern" doesn't make you primitive.

Seventy years ago is not "primitive." At that time radio was 30 to 40 years old. On the other hand, manual telegraphy is over 150 years old as a mode of communications (158 for the first long working circuit of the Morse-Vail system begun in 1844).

"Working CW" with a modern, DSP-equipped, solid-state architecture transceiver having a built-in microprocessor, LCD displays, and perhaps an automatic antenna tuner seems an odd mixture of old and new.

In this part of the country one can also drive a modern motor vehicle on good concrete roads to a Renaissance Pleasure Faire and "enjoy middle ages life" for a day. (be sure to carry a cell phone along for emergency assistance communications)

There's no harm at all in enjoying whatever "primitive" pursuits turn another on. There seems to be a great deal of harm in MANDATING PRIMITIVE SKILL ACCOMPLISHMENTS to obtain a federal license that permits transmitting on amateur radio band frequencies using that modern solid-state transceiver with LCD displays and built-in microprocessor and DSP.

Let's all hear it for non-advancement of personal states of the radio art so that all can "enjoy the primitive" as Hans suggests...

2095. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 20:20:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422162025.14735.00000969@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 41312

In article <LXVw8.1479$iM5.116751@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
>> >I doubt that Hans could get Jon fired for something he posted to this
>> >newsgroup, and if it ever happened, I'd resign my ARRL membership
>> >on the spot.
>>
>> Pity that Hans can't handle all those who disagree with him the same way.
>> Sure would be an effective way to be right all of the time. :-)
>
>Are saying that it's a pity I haven't resigned my ARRL membership?

Ed wrote: "Pity that Hans can't handle all those who disagree with
him the same way. Sure would be an effective way to be right all
the time. :-)"

Nowhere in those two sentences was there anything implying,
hinting at, or even any indication of "resigning membership" in
anything.

"Gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable." - HB

As a corollary, gentlemen can disagree without one of them
coming unglued at the other disagreeing with his noble, pure,
and whatever statements...

2096. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 20:31:33 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Fq_w8.2096$iM5.161001@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41315

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Let's all hear it for non-advancement of personal states of the
> radio art so that all can "enjoy the primitive" as Hans suggests...
>

Of course I didn't (and don't) endorse "non-advancement", but you already knew that.

I simply suggested that one can enjoy primitive things without being a Luddite, but you already knew that too.

Let's all hear it for Len's unsuccessful attempt at gaining message points. Nice try!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2097. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 22:14:03 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <LW%w8.2357$iM5.178057@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41316

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote

>
> There is such a segment of the spectrum. It's called the ham bands. People
> have been using it for years to meet for extended test, debug, and
> prove-in of ideas.
>

Pretend for the moment that you don't work at 225 Main Street with all their bulletins and QST editors at your disposal.

Without the massive power to inform of ARRL, the typical tinkerer is a solitary fellow or gal, perhaps working with some small group of acquaintances at some unknown frequency(ies). I'd find it impossible to "hook up" with such experimenters in this segment you call "the ham bands".

On the other hand, if they were concentrated in some small known "showcase" segments, it would be an easy matter for ANYONE inclined to tinker to just dial them in.

73, Hans, K0HB

2098. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 22:26:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CC48E1B.AD66232A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41317

K0HB wrote:

> Pretend for the moment that you don't work at 225 Main Street with all their
> bulletins and QST editors at your disposal.
>
> Without the massive power to inform of ARRL, the typical tinkerer is a
> solitary fellow or gal, perhaps working with some small group of
> acquaintances at some unknown frequency(ies). I'd find it impossible to
> "hook up" with such experimenters in this segment you call "the ham bands".
>

Well, there is the internet newsgroup rec.radio.amateur.homebrew
or a similar group could be created. And people could set up
web pages to publish results and have software that would be
downloadable say for mod-demod via your PC and soundcard
if the new mode lends itself to such. If the new mode is really
good, word will spread....

2099. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 23:09:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.guzjyle.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41318

On Mon, 22 Apr 2002 18:54:14 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>> Further, Section 97.3(a)(13) defined "Control Operator" as:
>>
>> (13) Control operator. An amateur operator designated by the
>> licensee of a station to be responsible for the transmissions from
>> that station to assure compliance with the FCC Rules.
>>
>> Notice that it doesn't exclude a RACES station by saying "a station
>> in the Amateur Radio Service" and in that regard it would be
>> interpreted to include all stations covered by Part 97, INCLUDING
>> RACES stations, especially since Sect. 97.407(a) makes specific
>> reference to a "control operator" at a RACES station.
>

>According to that definition (and notwithstanding any other part of
>the CFR), an amateur operator could be the control operator of a
>broadcast station,

Most certainly because for the last 15 years or so Part 73 of the
Rules (Governing Stations in the Broadcast Services) no longer
requires the operator "on duty and in control of" any broadcast
station (or doing maintenanace and adjustment of such stations) to
hold ANY type of FCC license. See Sect. 73.1350 of the Rules/

>looking at only part 97 by itself! That conclusion is obviously
>nonsense, so it is clear that the term "control operator" refers ONLY
>to the amateur service.

The definition applies to all stations regulated under Part 97.
RACES stations are included in that group.

>That means that the definition doesn't define
>what constitutes a control operator for any other service, including
>RACES, so just how did you conclude that it does? >

For regulatory purposes, RACES stations always have been considered
as another "flavor" of amateur station, not as a public safety or
governmental radio station, and subject to all amateur rules unless
expressly waived or modified by eules contained in the RACES
subsection of Part 97.

That's how regulatory enforcement is done in this field.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2100. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 23:43:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422194307.00676.00004617@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 41319

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>> After all, why go to all the trouble of developing
>> a new mode if it doesn't do the job better than
>> the equivalent legacy mode?

>To paraphrase the guy who climbed the mountain....

> "Because we can."

I agree, Hans, and every single operating mode I know of offers an advantage over the others under some circumstances. Why, even those legacy modes are ideal under some conditions. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2101. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 23:50:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422195044.00676.00004619@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 41320

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>According to Larsen E. Rapp, all it would take is back-to-back limiters to
>perform amplitude discrimination. (Late 50's April QST)

Ah, the old "FM" never hears interference urban legend. :-)

Unfortunately for Mr Rapp, it doesn't work that way.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2102. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 23:57:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422195724.00676.00004622@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 41321

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>> Pity that Hans can't handle all those who disagree with him the same way.
>Sure
>> would be an effective way to be right all of the time. :-)

>Are saying that it's a pity I haven't resigned my ARRL membership?

Not at all.

Is that what you meant when you said that you would "make a phone call" in
response to Jon disagreeing with something you posted?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2103. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-22 23:57:57 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <9s1x8.2136$iQ5.192296@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41322

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
> According to Larsen E. Rapp, all it would take is back-to-back limiters to
> perform amplitude discrimination. (Late 50's April QST)
>

Be careful with your trust of articles from an April QST.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2104. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 00:03:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422200308.00676.00004625@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 41323

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>But unfortunately he is prohibited by ARRL Bylaws from sending in comments
>on an ARRL petition. I guess it's up to you and me to push the idea with
>FCC. Last I looked, your comments haven't been posted at the FCC site.

I have never tested the waters about my sending in comments that are different
that ARRL's. I do not intend to do so.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2105. Re: Just renewed my license via ULS.. NOW its a TECH not a TECH PLUS?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 00:08:35 UTC
From: eccraigjr@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020422200835.20766.00004593@mb-mm.news.cs.com>
Source record: 41324

>>how will this differentiate me from other TECHS w/o Tech plus privlidges?
>>DO I still have TECH plus privledges? I had to take 5wpm code back in 1989
>>to get my license.
>>
>>HOW do I prove this.. cj

If you look up your callsign on the ARRL website, it'll show your previous
class of license.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2106. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 00:10:39 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <3E1x8.2160$iQ5.195371@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41325

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> I have never tested the waters about my sending in comments that are
different
> that ARRL's. I do not intend to do so.
>

When I was Dakota Division Vice Director, K0CKB sent some very cogent comments to the FCC on various matters related to amateur radio, some of which were not necessarily congruent with ARRL 'official' views. Of course I was happy to give her my personal assistance in forming her thoughts. Do you know any citizens who might need similar help in expressing themselves?

73, de Hans, K0HB

2107. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 00:18:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422201847.27399.00000735@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41329

In article <3CC44737.F165F039@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> 3) The 80, 40 and 15 meter "Novice" bands become the "digital" subbands.
>All
>> modes allowed except analog voice and image. The current bandwidth/data
>> rate/symbol rate regs do not apply in those subbands. Want to develop
>"PSK10"
>> or "Pactor 3" or digital voice? Have at it!
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>A reason that SSB and CW have lasted as long as they have is that
>they do a pretty good job of getting through compared to say FM (ignoring
>that FM is not allowed on most of HF).

Actually, narrowband FM was fairly popular on HF in the late '40s and early
'50s.
Its main drawback was that the modulation index allowed was so low that it was
no better than full carrier double sideband AM, and it required an FM-capable
receiver to be that good.

>What we would want from
>a new mode is to establish a QSO in conditions where the legacy modes
>would fail.

That's one reason. But there are lots of others:

- we could develop modes that hams don't use today, like simultaneous
digital voice, data/image.

- we could develop specialized modes that handle certain types of conditions
very well, at the expense of poor performance in other areas.

- we could develop modes that are easy to implement using minimal extra
equipment

- we could do it just for the heck of it. The real test of any equipment or
mode is how it
performs on the air. Something can look good in the lab but be a real pain to
use.
(Anybody remember the B&W 6100?)

> Digitize and compress your voice, transmit it via the new
>mode, and the other ham receive and decode it to hear it on his

>shack's speaker.

Yup.

> After all, why go to all the trouble of developing
>a new mode if it doesn't do the job better than the equivalent legacy
>mode?
>
The trick is to be able to develop it in the first place without lots of red
STA tape.

>Why didn't that variant of SSB succeed? ACSB IIRC, idea was to
>send your voice through a narrower bandwidth than regular SSB.

I think you are confusing ACSSB with NBVM (narrow band voice modulation).

NBVM was a way of processing speech so that it took up less bandwidth for
transmission, then reprocessing it at the other end. It took advantage of the
fact that most voices have a"gap" in the audio spectrum that can be removed
without impairing intelligibility too much.

As I recall (1977-79 era), it fit a voice signal into a little more than half
the usual spectrum. But you needed an expensive encoder/decoder and a rig with
narrower filters to get the advantages. Apparently not enough bang for the
bucks.

ACSSB was completely different.

>AS I understand it, when SSB came out it blew away AM for
>DX work and such. No more heterodyne whistles on pileups, and
>no more carrier to waste 2/3 of your 1KW linear power on.

Yup. It effectively doubled the width of the 'phone bands.

But it took a while for SSB to displace AM. Hams first used SSB in the early
'30s, but it really took off in ham radio in the late '40s. Yet even in the
early-1960s there were many AM signals on the ham bands and some manufacturers
still made AM gear.

>The rare DX station could kludge his AM receiver to receive
>SSB by making the IF strip go into oscillation, thus providing
>a carrier for the envelope detector to work with.

They had BFOs.

>And hams
>in the USA can still hear his AM transmitter with an SSB
>receiver (or switch to AM mode).
>Thus "Backwards compatibility" of sorts. A new mode
>should be easy (via say a computer program, sound card, and an existing
>transceiver) to rig up for the average ham so we have enough hams to
>talk to.

Most new modes will do the soundcard trick. What's really needed is a good
homebrewable HF amateur SDR (software defined radio).

>
>Also a new mode should have lasting ability. Packet was fun 15 years
>ago, but 1200 baud is really slow by today's standards and as such
>"been there, done that" I haven't done packet for years.

No new mode is going to have much lasting ability unless it has some really special properties. Remember when a 14.4K modem was the cat's meow? Wasn't that long ago.

By using the soundcard method, and eventually SDRs, new mode implementation won't require a new rig or a new "box".

All that Hans is proposing is to set up a place where such development can flourish.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2108. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 00:18:48 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <IL1x8.2183$iQ5.197005@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41326

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> "Gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable." - HB
>

Sometimes I'm not a gentleman.

My apology was publicly posted.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2109. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 00:18:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422201848.27399.00000736@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41327

In article <wVZw8.2001$iM5.155903@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Historic note:
>>
>> Part of ARRL's restructuring proposal was to give full General
>> privileges to Novices and Tech Pluses. FCC said no.
>>
>> Soon after restructuring, AH0A petitioned to give Novices and Tech
>> Pluses the use of CW on the General class non-voice parts of 80, 40
>> and 15. FCC said no.
>
>And the current ARRL petition is an unimaginative "more of the same", with
>the attachment of several of pages of statistical tables. How can FCC do
>anything more that say "Strike Three"!

Exactly.
>
>I count Chris Imlay as a friend of mine, but his persuasive talents are not
>evident in this yawner. In fairness, I suppose he has no choice but to work
>within the tasking document given him. A pity.

Seems to me the real question is one Carl and I discussed some time back.
Should spectrum be allocated by popularity (in which case most of the HF bands
would be SSB) or should other considerations such as spectrum efficiency and
incentives have a role?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2110. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 00:18:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422201849.27399.00000737@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41328

In article <rMZw8.1973$iM5.154460@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> The key selling point of your idea is that it eliminates the paperwork
>> and inflexibility of the STA process. Having all sorts of restrictions
>> and regulations on what constitutes a new digital mode and what
>> doesn't complicates the issue and creates unwanted work for the FCC.
>
>Leave the word digital off the table!

OK! Amend the above to read:

Having all sorts of restrictions and regulations on what constitutes a new or experimental mode and what doesn't complicates the issue and creates unwanted work for the FCC

? New modes need _necessarily_ be
>digital, do they? (I'll admit to not having an example of something new AND
>non-digital, but let's not rule it out.)

Actually, most practical radio signals are "analog" in the sense that they are bunches of sine waves.
The digital part is in how modulation and coding are done.

>> My read on 98-143 is that FCC wants simple regs that are easily
>> enforced and widely supported. The only part of your revised proposal
>> that is complex is the definition of what constitutes a new,
>> experimental mode and what doesn't. Eliminate that part and it becomes
>> a shoo-in.
>
>OK, let me work on that, without hatching a new sub-band "open to everything
>except spark and AM voice".

Maybe we're missing the obvious.

The rules today prohibit US hams from using "analog voice modes" (full carrier DSB AM, DSB suppressed carrier, SSB, and all flavors of FM) from the subbands in question. Spark was prohibited in 1927 (although a Canadian ham actually got permission to put a special event spark rig on the air for the 100th anniversary of Marconi's transatlantic S).

Just leave those rules in place as they are today.

The really big change is 3), below.

All that needs to be done is:

1) Allow all hams who have passed a code test to use CW/Morse on all MF/HF amateur frequencies now allowed to Generals, using no more than 200 W.

2) Power limit of all rigs in the subbands to be 200 W if automatic power control is employed, 50 W without power control.

3) The limitations on data/symbol rate and occupied bandwidth of data modes used by hams on HF do not apply in those subbands, except that signals not in compliance with those rules must stay entirely inside the subbands. The encoding and modulation schemes must be publicly available, same as today. "Data modes" include digitized voice and image.

That's all. Simple and easy to implement. Nobody loses. The STA hassle is eliminated - just send the FCC an email and publish your latest PBI on a website.

--

While the proposed regulations would not require it, hams trying out new modes would be well-advised to include an auto ID in Morse or some other easily recognized and copied mode so that "tuners-by" could determine who they are hearing, and look up how to decode the weird-sounding noises. But this is in the realm of gentleman's agreement, not the rules.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2111. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 01:11:25 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC4B49E.C0B679C7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41330

W1RFI wrote:
>
> Clay wrote:
>
> >I don't think that will be a problem on 7.100 to 7.150. The
> >international SW broadcasters will take care of that, at
> >least at night after the D layer collapses.
>
> But should not such experimentation include working on modes that can
> communicate in the teeth of those international broadcasters? I would wager
> that 75% of the 7.1-7.3 MHz segment could be used for even as simple a digital
> mode as PSK-31 in the FEC mode.
>

I do agree. In fact, this idea of communicating "in the
teeth" is one of the reasons I would like to modify Hans'
"experimental reservation" to include all modes in the
refarmed Novice subbands.

73,
Clay N4AOX

2112. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 01:26:10 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC4B812.9C8BD65E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41331

K0HB wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > The key selling point of your idea is that it eliminates the paperwork
> > and inflexibility of the STA process. Having all sorts of restrictions
> > and regulations on what constitutes a new digital mode and what
> > doesn't complicates the issue and creates unwanted work for the FCC.
>
> Leave the word digital off the table! New modes need _necessarily_ be
> digital, do they? (I'll admit to not having an example of something new AND
> non-digital, but let's not rule it out.)
>

Right on! I am tired of hearing the concatenation of "new"
and "digital". If it is new it is digital; If it is
digital it is new?? Not so!

73,
Clay N4AOX

2113. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 01:36:54 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC4BA97.7BED52CD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41332

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> >
> > The ARRL board, via the Newington crowd influence, has shown
> > it is interested in anything related to sustaining or
> > increasing revenues from magazine sales. As such it will
> > oppose anything that does not result in more subscriptions,
> > and/or more YaComWood radio sales.
> >
>
> I'll chime in to disagree with you on this point. I've served two terms as
> a Vice Director, and I understand who the BoD is and how it works.

While I respect the benefit of your experience in these
matters, how else does one explain the recent BoD attention
to minutia to eliminate publishing Moved and Seconded and
Section News in QST because the small black and white print
takes up 0.58% of the pages? Perhaps the personality of the
BoD has changed.

73,
Clay N4AOX

2114. Re: I apologize to KE3Z....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 01:38:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020422213842.07832.00002063@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 41333

In article <3cc371f6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> I also want to apologize to twits everywhere for calling W5TIT a twit.
>>
>>
>
>I guess since you consider me a twit, that must be as close to an apology as
>I'll get--and I accept it as one for Jon Bloom.

Kim:

You obviously didn't get it, so let me draw you the picture: By calling
you a twit, Hans realized that he had deeply insulted all other twits
by comparing them to you. Therefore, you are obviously far worse
than a twit. I won't venture a guess as to what you truly are, as I am
trying my best to maintain a civil strain on the newsgroup.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2115. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 01:38:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020422213842.07832.00002064@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 41334

In article <3CC386A4.B3FA8E7F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Your quote didn't prove your case "against" me, either. You accused
>> me of calling Ed an ARRL shill in "each and every post" I make in this
>> newsgroup. So, go ahead, prove it!
>
>You misunderstood her posting, Larry. Here it is again:
>
>> > Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that Ed
>> > Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he (Ed)
>makes.
>
>"He" refers to Ed, not you, and that makes Kim's statement very true.

Cecil:

That parenthetical (Ed) was not part of Kim's original post -- you obviously doctored the quote. You lose. End of Story.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2116. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 01:53:06 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <683x8.2365$iQ5.215835@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41335

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote

>
> While I respect the benefit of your experience in these
> matters, how else does one explain the recent BoD attention
> to minutia to eliminate publishing Moved and Seconded and
> Section News in QST because the small black and white print
> takes up 0.58% of the pages?
>

The rationale was to cut the cost of producing QST by moving those items to the 'web', and in the case of Section News, greatly expanding the content above the few column inches available to each SM in the back of QST. I'd put it under the heading of 'saving membership dollars' or 'avoiding raising dues'.

73, Hans, K0HB

2117. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 01:53:57 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC4BE94.669D8C43@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41336

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>
> >> One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams can
> >use
> >> all of the bands for such experimentation.
>
> >That seems to be the "pat answer" out of your vicinity on this topic.
>
> Then it is the correct answer, Hans.
>
> Neither you or I need an STA to do most of the experimentation that could take
> place, Hans. Under the present rules, hams can invent new modes and encoding
> at the drop of a hat, make the encoding for those modes public by documenting
> them (and ARRL asked -- even on a web page is fine) then use them to their
> heart's content.
>

It may not be the poster's intent, but it seems he is
defining his ideas about how the "experimental reservations"
or incubation bands should be used eg. "invent new modes and
encoding", "change data rates". I would hope there would be
more to be considered than this. Also there appears to be
more of the "new is digital" and "digital is new" philosophy
appearing here.

73,
Clay N4AOX

2118. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 01:57:45 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC4BF7B.4DB78D81@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41337

CAM wrote:
>
>
> According to Larsen E. Rapp, all it would take is back-to-back limiters to
> perform amplitude discrimination. (Late 50's April QST)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I never trusted ol' L.E. after he said that!

73,
Clay N4AOX

2119. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:14:29 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC4C365.FE667E89@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41338

K0HB wrote:
>
>
> OK, let me work on that, without hatching a new sub-band "open to everything
> except spark and AM voice".
>
>

There should be indirect ways to sanction spark and AM voice
through regulating power vs. bandwidth. How about a bath
tub shaped power vs. bandwidth (freq) curve, asymtotic at 0
hz., a big sag down to approx. 0 power at 10 KHz, and back
up again at the SS extremities?

73,
Clay N4AOX

2120. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:16:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Mt3x8.9300$BW1.260383209@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41339

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC2CBDC.5879E844@IEEE.org...
> Bob Brock wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > >Then perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".
> >
> > Gee, can I use that kind of a concept for WAS? It sure would help a
> > lot!
>
> I know a ham who got the WAS award without working Alaska and Hawaii. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

That was probably in 1957.
```

2121. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:17:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zu3x8.9302$v32.260672893@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41340

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3cc2da2c$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> news:7bm5cukfqe6qvgohujgv15749n4jqvhpjd@4ax.com...
> > On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 09:25:32 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Bob Brock wrote:
> > >>
> > >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > >> >Then perhaps Kim was using "all" in the sense of "I'm all ears".
> > >>
> > >> Gee, can I use that kind of a concept for WAS? It sure would help a
> > >> lot!
> > >
> > >I know a ham who got the WAS award without working Alaska and Hawaii.
:-)
> >
> > Dang, I was hoping that perhaps a little over half would do it. ;-)
>
> Just state it on the air, duplicate the certificate, fake some QSL cards,
> beat some envelopes up to make them look good...hmmmm, much easier to get
on
> the air, wouldn't it be? ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT

Cecil will eventually tell us.

2122. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:20:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Rx3x8.9315$J32.260687289@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41341

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3BED4439.A5D811E4@worldnet.att.net...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > Sounds like Kim is angry, Dave.
>
> Maybe she got her W5TIT in the wringer....

How's come I can't read what Dave said? Its gone from the server.

2123. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:28:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422222809.20725.00004944@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 41342

>Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/22/02 16:20 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020422162024.14735.00000968@mb-fr.aol.com>

>I disagree, it was simply a question and it received no answer.

Coming from the >>alleged<< radio professional who at first asserts that
some radio services are created for "strictly recreational" purposes and then
cannot answer WHICH radio services are so charted, this is funny!

As always,

Steve

2124. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:31:35 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bl3x8.9332$C_1.260511131@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41343

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020422075358.07186.00004846@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> The FCC did not require a Morse code test for commercial HF access
> >>*before* the other services abandoned code use.
>
> >This is even richer. Why not?
>
> I don't know. I was not given a code test when I took the FCC First Class
> Radiotelepone license test.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

This is so friggin stupid. Title 47 in Polish notation. Gimme a Texas Instruments calculator.

So in the Amateur service, you need to take a code test even if you're not going to use code, but in the commercial service, you never needed to take the test. Then little Dick, Val Galileo, and chromosone challenged Bruce come on here demanding that we keep the code test because why???

I'm sending NCI another donation.

73, Brian

2125. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:36:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422223631.20725.00004945@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 41344

>Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/22/02 16:20 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020422162023.14735.00000967@mb-fr.aol.com>

>> Probably for the same reason "tech-smart" people still ahve sex a la
>>primitive man...it's FUN!
>
>The subject was AMATEUR RADIO not primal urges.

Oh?

>Some DO seem to equate SEX = CW and those are to be pitied.

And those are...???

>I have NO reason to "fake anything" in regards to either sex or
>HF radio transmission,...

Sure you do. You have presented NO evidence of being proficient or
current in either in THIS forum.

> having done both for the first time in the
>1950s.

And from your lack of awareness of CURRENT Amateur policy and practice, it
would appear that was the LAST time you probably did either.

>Coincindentally, the quoted writer wasn't born until the
>mid-1950s.

True...but I'll bet you the last time I had sex and the last time I was on
the air (with anything other than a CB or garage door opener) was a lot more
recent than the mid 50's!

>That coincidence is simply one of chronology and implies no
>transfer of DNA. Some writers in here come by their bastardy
>quite naturally.

Perhaps, but that is through no fault of thier own. Another question I
know you won't answer is WHAT is YOUR excuse?

ROTFLMAO at Lennie!

SR

2126. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:38:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7P3x8.9341$3x2.261599679@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41345

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020421232200.10062.00001213@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <YCFw8.4095$q73.202913167@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >Welp, that's why I'm no longer with the Corp's of Engineers. You on
the
> >> >other hand can keep driving your bus to the bank. Verrry lucrative,
HA!
> >>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> I drive it to banks, hospitals, Renal Care centers, doctor's offices,
> >> schools, churches, etc., and, ultimately, the homes of all my clients.
> >> Lucrative? It does pay very well, has great benefits, and offers just
> >> about all the overtime you want.
> >
> >Who wants overtime?
>
> Brian:
>
> I'm one of the few drivers who doesn't. Most of the more senior
> drivers are real "overtime bandits," virtually doubling their income
> on OT. This job pays well enough that I can live without OT, though
> I do volunter a few hours every week to help out when needed. Last
> year I worked over 500 hrs. of OT due to not having enough
> seniority to get a "regular" run. Glad that's not a problem anymore.

We had a prison Nurse who earned more in overtime than the Governor did in
salary. BTW, people are being laid off in Ohio because of a "bad economy."

> >Like I don't have enough to do already, what with
> >having to count out my AF pension every month, and storing all the excess
> >cash in a foot locker.
>
> Gee Brian, I put mine in a mutual fund. Pays better interest than
> a foot locker.

Name it. Mutual Funds pay dividends and capital gains, not interest.

> >> BTW, I'm on Jury Duty for the next two weeks, so why don't you
> >> go ahead and make fun of that as well?
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >

> >Hey pal, you're the one making fun of how much I used to make.
>
> Hey, you were the one who raised the subject.

Backtrack and see who asked what.

> >BTW, you'll never make it into a court room unless you say absolutely
> >nothing, hide your military background, and never let on that you've even
> >heard of Rush Limbo.
>
> I'm not going to tell them anything that they don't specifically inquire
> about. And I'm reasonably sure my status as a veteran, and the fact
> that I occasionally listen to Rush Limbaugh wouldn't really matter.

It will. Just keep silent on the matter.

> If
> it did, they'd have a pretty tough getting any jurors around here, in a
> city where 1/3 the population is military or has working ties to Dover
> AFB.

Air Force officers fit their bill. Biggest bunch of Libs since the
temperance union.

> >73 and good luck getting picked.
>
> Just called the recording at the court, my group doesn't have to
> report tomorrow. So I'll have to wait until Tuesday to see if I
> "get picked."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I'm keeping my fingers crossed for you.

73, Brian

2127. Re: Congratulations to KC0MUB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:41:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <JR3x8.9348$ud2.261002267@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41346

"Jimick" <jimick1@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:tyHw8.46032$WV1.15152290@typhoon.ne.ipsvc.net...
> Did you know about the Happy Hooker and the Dolphin at Patrick Air Force
> Base, Florida?
>
> I been out fishin' on both of em.... O'course that was back in the late
> 70's.
>
> jimi

I flew a hop into Patrick in 1981 for a fishing charter after returning to America. I went commercial and didn't know about the MWR boats then. I've heard Langley has a nice little fleet.

Brian

2128. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 02:58:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <054x8.9359$YX2.262520245@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41347

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:0bMw8.322$iQ5.34623@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Why would "tech-smart" folks want to work CW on HF a la 1930s?
> >
>
>
> That's an easy question. For the very good reason that they enjoy it.
> Enjoying some things that aren't "modern" doesn't make you primitive.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Steve said "primitive."

2129. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:05:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ec4x8.9363$k83.262976822@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41348

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020421232201.10062.00001215@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3cc300a0_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Here she be:
> >>
> >> > From: Larry Roll K3LT (yodoc@aol.comnospam)
> >> > Subject: Re: What's a "Real Ham?" REAL EASY... K3LT's reply (long)
> >> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> >> > Date: 2001-05-15 01:46:00 PST
> >> >
> >> > Yes, Ed, I'm sure you do see it that way. However, you also are
> >> > required to reflect ARRL policy without any significant diversion
from
> >> > same, ...
> >>
> >> "Required to reflect ARRL policy" seems pretty clear. Ain't google a
> >bitch?
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Not only that, that post is certainly *not* the only time Larry has said
> >such to Ed Hare. An important distinction between Hans and Larry,
though,
> >is that Larry has never stated that he would "make a phone call,"
implying
> >that he'd try overt influence to have another person lose their job. At
> >least, I don't recall Larry ever doing that.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Your quote didn't prove your case "against" me, either. You accused
> me of calling Ed an ARRL shill in "each and every post" I make in this
> newsgroup. So, go ahead, prove it!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, its taken for granted that in every post you think Ed an ARRL schill.
Disprove it.

2130. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:08:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ze4x8.9368$Va3.263075243@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41349

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020422213842.07832.00002064@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3CC386A4.B3FA8E7F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >> Your quote didn't prove your case "against" me, either. You accused
> >> me of calling Ed an ARRL shill in "each and every post" I make in this
> >> newsgroup. So, go ahead, prove it!
> >
> >You misunderstood her posting, Larry. Here it is again:
> >
> >> > Yeah, and the lesson is that you act exactly like Larry claiming that
Ed
> >> > Hare is here on behalf of the ARRL with each and every post he (Ed)
> >makes.
> >
> >"He" refers to Ed, not you, and that makes Kim's statement very true.
>
> Cecil:
>
> That parenthetical (Ed) was not part of Kim's original post -- you
obviously
> doctored the quote. You lose. End of Story.

Actually Larry, you lose. You have a "profile" and its just as Kim says.
You have to undo it, not her.

73, Brian

2131. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:12:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Ti4x8.9373$wk3.263397653@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41350

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3CC4BE94.669D8C43@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
> >
> > >> One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams
can
> > >use
> > >> all of the bands for such experimentation.
> >
> > >That seems to be the "pat answer" out of your vicinity on this topic.
> >
> > Then it is the correct answer, Hans.
> >
> > Neither you or I need an STA to do most of the experimentation that
could take
> > place, Hans. Under the present rules, hams can invent new modes and
encoding
> > at the drop of a hat, make the encoding for those modes public by
documenting
> > them (and ARRL asked -- even on a web page is fine) then use them to
their
> > heart's content.
> >
>
> It may not be the poster's intent, but it seems he is
> defining his ideas about how the "experimental reservations"
> or incubation bands should be used eg. "invent new modes and
> encoding", "change data rates". I would hope there would be
> more to be considered than this. Also there appears to be
> more of the "new is digital" and "digital is new" philosophy
> appearing here.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

Hmmm, must be why the PCTA insist that the mashing of a spring loaded,
silver plated contact is digital. Jumping on the bandwagon.

2132. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:16:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qm4x8.9377$Yn3.263509114@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41451

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:KyKw8.99$iQ5.12485@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> >
> > The ARRL board, via the Newington crowd influence, has shown
> > it is interested in anything related to sustaining or
> > increasing revenues from magazine sales. As such it will
> > oppose anything that does not result in more subscriptions,
> > and/or more YaComWood radio sales.
> >
>
> I'll chime in to disagree with you on this point. I've served two terms
as
> a Vice Director, and I understand who the BoD is and how it works.
Without
> reservation I can say that I believe that _EVERY_ member of ARRL BoD is
> absolutely committed to furthering the cause of Amateur Radio,

Amateur radio as it existed in the 30's and 50's.

and none of
> them has ever compromised that commitment to increase QST subscriptions,
or
> to increase sales of any supplier of amateur equipment.
>
> Period.
>
> Nonetheless, I think that their current petition regarding "novice
> refarming" is far too conservative, and absolutely lacking in any
> imaginative thinking regarding modernization of the Amateur Service.

Yes.

> Jon
> and others may disagree, but I still believe that the "soul of souls" of
> amateur radio still has a high proportion of tinkerers and experimenters,
> and that this valuable part of our Amateur Service must be spot-lighted
and
> encouraged. "Refarming" may our last best hope of putting filament
voltage
> on that spotlight. (How's that for mixing metaphors?!?)
>
...You could even say it glows (borrowed from the raindeer song).

2133. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:24:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <yt4x8.9385$Lg3.263272540@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41452

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3BED3B0D.F37CDC76@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> >
> > >From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
> >
> > >>I know my idea is not going to be a shoo-in, but on the other hand I
am sort
> > >>of counting on the FCC being observant enough to notice that the ARRL
> > >>petition is essentially non-responsive to 98-143, where the FCC
literally
> > >>begs the Amateur Service to make some proposals "regarding
implementation of
> > >>new technologies" for those subbands. Perhaps FCC will be inclined to
look
> > >>outside the ARRL non-proposal and consider some unconventional ideas.
> >
> > >I am sure that you made your views known to your Divsion Director, but
I do
> > >hope that all those who posted their opinion about the matter do the
same.
> >
> > Even more important, file those same views as Comments with the FCC, no
matter
> > what side of the fence you are on.
>
> It hasn't dawned yet on lots of posters and others that the FCC in the
person of
> Bill Cross is playing to Carl and his cadre for the purpose of making sure
that he
> (Bill) doesn't come under fire as a flaming Luddite for *not* pushing
(nay,
> shoving) "the latest technologies" to be mandated in ham radio.

Cool, Carl is getting our message across.

> There will always (at least until they get ran off by all the CBers) be
those
> hams who experiment with whatever technology interests them. And as usual,
the big
> majority of hams will just be hams who want to get on the air and "ham"
using
> their favorite mode.

Nope, there will be those denied access because they don't favor your
favorite mode.

> Most become attracted to new things over time and most adopt
> them over more time.

Like you and Bruce?

> That's the nature of ham radio.

That's not the nature of ham radio. Think "Omega."

> Change that and you change the basis for its existence.

Saying it doesn't make it so.

> When Carl and his cadre finally turn ham radio into a glorified trunked
cell
> phone service I and a whole lot more hams will just abandon ship. I
already have a
> cellphone. It's very useful but not very interesting.

Welp, some nutcase is using a bank of cellphones to make a symphony. Go
experiment.

2134. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:26:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Qv4x8.9387$RE3.264077587@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41453

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:3E1x8.2160$iQ5.195371@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
>
> >
> > I have never tested the waters about my sending in comments that are
> different
> > that ARRL's. I do not intend to do so.
> >
>
> When I was Dakota Division Vice Director, K0CKB sent some very cogent
> comments to the FCC on various matters related to amateur radio, some of
> which were not necessarily congruent with ARRL 'official' views. Of
course
> I was happy to give her my personal assistance in forming her thoughts.
Do
> you know any citizens who might need similar help in expressing
themselves?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Give Len a ring.

2135. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:32:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mB4x8.9393$MN3.264370609@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41454

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:rMZw8.1973$iM5.154460@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > The key selling point of your idea is that it eliminates the paperwork
> > and inflexibility of the STA process. Having all sorts of restrictions
> > and regulations on what constitutes a new digital mode and what
> > doesn't complicates the issue and creates unwanted work for the FCC.
>
> Leave the word digital off the table! New modes need _necessarily_ be
> digital, do they? (I'll admit to not having an example of something new
AND
> non-digital, but let's not rule it out.)

OK, lets have a new analog mode. Dick was suggesting a "Banana Boat" mode
about a year ago. It's neither Morse nor Farnsworth. It was an incestuous
relationship of dits and dahs, and dueling banjos.

Anyway, I'm sure it can be run through an A/D converter and called
"innovative."

> > My read on 98-143 is that FCC wants simple regs that are easily
> > enforced and widely supported. The only part of your revised proposal
> > that is complex is the definition of what constitutes a new,
> > experimental mode and what doesn't. Eliminate that part and it becomes
> > a shoo-in.
>
> OK, let me work on that, without hatching a new sub-band "open to
everything
> except spark and AM voice".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

You can send in a clarification to your initial comments. Brian

2136. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:44:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <9M4x8.9400$H04.264850726@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41455

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020421234810.15171.00005045@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 04/21/02 21:01 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020421210152.04515.00000082@mb-fk.aol.com>
>
> >The Tennessee Teuton didn't answer, probably didn't know. Fred
> >answered for him.
>
> Unlike you, Lennie, I have a life, and my point was made with teh
"300
> mile" reference. The other 96 miles (at any given moment, maybe
more...maybe
> less...) wasn't worth fussing over.

You fuss over everyting else... especially the stuff not worth fussing over.

2137. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:49:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422234958.14735.00000985@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 41456

In article <3E1x8.2160$iQ5.195371@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
>> I have never tested the waters about my sending in comments that are different
>> that ARRL's. I do not intend to do so.
>
>When I was Dakota Division Vice Director, K0CKB sent some very cogent
>comments to the FCC on various matters related to amateur radio, some of
>which were not necessarily congruent with ARRL 'official' views. Of course
>I was happy to give her my personal assistance in forming her thoughts. Do
>you know any citizens who might need similar help in expressing themselves?

K0CKB is Colleen K. Brakob, same current address as old Black Silver aka Hard Body hisself. The above seems a perfect example of nepotism effected to get around some guide/ruling/whatever to comment "personally." Rather transparent, I'd say.

2138. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:50:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422235000.14735.00000986@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 41457

In article <20020422222809.20725.00004944@mb-mw.aol.com>, the
Tennessee Teuton writes:

> Coming from the >>alleged<< radio professional who at first asserts that
>some radio services are created for "strictly recreational" purposes and then
>cannot answer WHICH radio services are so charted, this is funny!

I'm not an "alleged" radio professional. I *AM* a radio-electronics
professional. The US federal government (IRS, FCC, FBI, DCAS,
even the CIA!), the states of Illinois and California (franchise tax
boards), at least three Counties in California and one in Washington,
and several large corporations in the USA all agree that I am a
professional.

A two-bit twerp with a one-by-two amateur callsign keeps trying
for an "insult" mode by "challenging" the professionalism. He
hasn't come close to doing what I have done, yet he claims
"superiority" in everything because his poor little ego is bruised.
Poor baby.

Those recreational radio services were all mentioned in here. The
reasons for their creation are found mostly in the Reading Room of
the FCC office building. See all of Part 95, Title 47 CFR. Then see
which radio service within that Part was not stated for "recreational"
(there is one).

The following is an expansion of what was originally said, given for
the benefit of some in the southeast who do not have enough
neurons to connect thoughts given to them in plain English.

The FCC simply did not state outright that, for example, radio control
is to be used "only" by hobbyists. It simply stated that certain
frequencies with their maximum emissions are to be used for tele-
command (remote control by radio). That avoids ambiguities and
creates a haven for idiot barracks lawyers who wish to quibble over
the absolute sine qua non meaning of words. It should be immensely
obvious to even the near-braindead that the "R/C Channels" and all
regulations thereto are for HOBBYISTS. Hobbyists do their hobby
thing for recreation. That R/C part within Part 95 was created for
recreation, remains for recreation, and is not intended for anything
else but recreation.

Are there exceptions for the barracks lawyers (amateur variety) to
ply their idiot arguments? Yes, a couple of exceptions to "strict
recreation" are found in old issues of American Cinematographer
magazine. It should be obvious to all that larger "popular" newsstands

have at least three different monthly periodicals that cover the HOBBY aspect of radio control. There are more retail stores for the model-hobby industry than there are amateur radio specialty stores in the USA...think about that if there are any spare neurons left.

Amateur radio could be recast in print and the media as an enjoyable HOBBY with several side benefits. No, the perception is instead that any prospective amateur MUST enter into some sort of "service" of rank, title, status with clearly-defined boundaries of what MUST be done (jargon, terms, strict obediance to legacy modes, tradition) and the long-timers in this "service" MUST be given the respect they think they deserve even though they are yutzes to all those they think are "inferior." The rationalizations abound in all the descriptive patriotic bunting erected for this "service," unswerving "devotion to duty" and all the other bovine merde spread to keep the myth growing. We must salute and genuflect to these noble "leaders" who did not come close to making amateur radio what it is...but they seem hell-bent on keeping exactly to their liking.

Everyone must acknowledge that working DX on HF with CW is the Best That Hams Can Be...a "service" motto. :-)

2139. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:50:28 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aa3h1f11lo7@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 41483

Sweet.... let me know what you come up with. We are always looking for positive and quality presentations, and would definitely welcome you to our area. I know for sure the other adjoining counties' clubs would make attendance to that meeting if we could get ya to come!!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020422082936.07186.00004857@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >Ed.... maybe we could work out a dual benefit situation here.... also have
> >you for a club presentation too! I will keep all informed here. I intend
> >to go through the required training that our local cable access station
> >requires even though I am fully familiar with the processes and techniques.
>
> I have had a couple of people try taping my club presentations, but I use
> transparencies, so the taping either had me in the dark or the transparencies
> so bright they couldn't be read. What it will take is someone who can get me
> in the right light as I move about the room a bit, and then separately tape the
> screen, then edit it all together.
>
> This is all on Power Point, so I am hoping to find some time and perhaps use a
> program like Real Presenter to couple audio to the overheads. This could then
> be made available for download.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

2140. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:54:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3W4x8.9410$jh4.265402758@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41458

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020421220838.08742.00000503@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <a9ur1k$m45$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

> >I fully agree that we need proactive
> >power limiting functionality.
>
> oh mama - PPLF. Kewl!

I've already got that. My power supply limits my activities.

2141. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:56:28 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aa3h1g21lo7@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 41484

Even though a few idiots would not care, I believe you will be missed. Take some time to cool off before ya make a rash decision.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:3cc3758a_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> A recent outburst here has evoked in me a rash of thoughts to consider all
> day. I download this newsgroup, for whatever reason, each evening and know
> full well there is nothing of any substance on it, certainly nothing that
> interests me.
>
> I allow myself to be engaged by reprehensible thoughts from reprehensible
> people. I allow myself to get caught up in petty meandering about what was
> meant to be said; and know full well the main defense is simply against
> another for their challenge only through their dislike of something I said,
> and not necessarily that what I said was all that important; or wrong. I
> allow myself the anger that I have always been able to ignore or overcome,
> simply. I get extremely angry at injustices and choose to get wrapped up in
> how wrong someone is while I, myself, am just as wrong for the way in which
> I respond to them.
>
> I will no longer participate in this newsgroup and am actually seriously
> considering dropping ham radio altogether. While this newsgroup is
> insignificant in terms of being representative of ham radio, I have no
> passion for a hobby in which people enjoy nothing but constant challenges
> with each other--and it seems to be that more than anything else lately.
> Perhaps the FCC is a governmental business, but the people have decided that
> the ARS is a proving ground for how much more important one is than the
> other; rather than the supposed "fraternity" to which many endear the hobby.
> If a fraternity means constant hazing, then leave me out.

>
> This is my last post, my last time to logon to the newsgroup. So, any
> responses will truly not be seen by me. If you plan to make them for my
> benefit, then you may as well not bother. You brothers have probably been
> at it for years, and you'll probably be at it for many more.
>
> This recent exchange, and the fact that tempers can flare so very much as
to
> threaten each other personally really concerns me. I hope you will all
> fight your strongest fights, blare your loudest words, but leave out
> personal affronts and assaults toward personal lives...that is way, way
too
> much folks. And, trade the semantics for real issues, huh? You all scare
> me when you act like that. Goodbye.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>

2142. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 03:59:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020422235914.21592.00000751@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 41459

In article <Qv4x8.9387$RE3.264077587@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> I was happy to give her my personal assistance in forming her thoughts. Do
>> you know any citizens who might need similar help in expressing themselves?
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>Give Len a ring.

Sorry, but I'm happily married and a heterosexual. None of this polygamous swinging for me! He'll have to look for partners elsewhere...

2143. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 04:02:00 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc4dc9f.2571975@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41460

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 02:58:24 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>
>"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:3cc1fbaf.48160607@news.montanavision.net...
>> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 22:59:59 GMT, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >That may be your rule, but it's not an FCC rule.
>> >
>> >I hold 3 stations licenses for K0HB, K0RT, and W0EF. It is routine for
>all
>> >three stations to be on the air at the same time during contests, etc.,
>and
>> >I need not be present at any of them. Nothing in the FCC rules requires
>me
>> >to be at any of those stations so long as the operator at the controls is
>> >operating within the bounds of his own operator license.
>>
>> Actually, it's within the bounds of the station license. As an
>> example, if I volunteered to fill in one hour on a "Novice station"
>> during Field Day, I can't operate in the Extra class part of the band,
>> because I would jeopardize the station license for which that Novice
>> class station is permitted to operate. With an Extra class license I
>> could, if I used my callsign, but it's not the callsign designated as
>> the "Novice Station" license.
>>
>> You can bend the rules all you want, you can interpret them any way
>> you like, but there's no gray matter when it comes to the explicit FCC
>> Part 97 rulebook.
>>
>> Stacey, AA7YA
>
>Stacey, do you pay "repeater dues?"

Yep, lifetime member of the club actually.

2144. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 04:05:31 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <f45x8.9416$ox4.265898416@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41461

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020422140818.13688.00000947@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <L2Kw8.21$iQ5.6675@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

> >How can I propose
> >a "Experimentation Reservation" and then tolerate the use of decades-old
> >technology on that reservation?
>
> Several reasons:
>
> 1) It simplifies the rules (no need to decide and specify what is allowed
and
> what is not). That's a BIG deal to the FCC
>
> 2) It does not push away anyone who is currently there.

That's what this is all about.. There's not currently anyone there. They
abandoned it 15 years ago, at least.

> 3) It will be supported by far more hams. (Political reality being what it
is,
> an idea that gathers lots of support has a better chance than one that has
> almost no support).

The ARRL tried the "poll" route. Works for Bill Clinton, doesn't work for
them. They need to lead, not follow or take another poll. Or just get out
of the way.

> 4) It will allow coordination of on-air experiments by the use of old
modes.
> This is very important - how do I figure out where the problem is if I am
> forced to use ONLY the new, experimental mode if the new mode doesn't work
> right away?

Hey, good point. Is this anything like a State Department wire order CW
line?

> 5) It sets a bad precedent by banning certain widely-used modes from some
> spectrum where they are currently legal today.
> Not a good idea.

If we're talking about CW, why not just say so.

> 6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned unless
there
> is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).

Planned obsolescense?

> A simple question:
>
> Do you think the presence of a few amateur signals using "decades old
> technology" will be a problem for those hams who want to try out new modes
in
> the subbands?
>
> I don't.
>
> Anybody else?

Limit the decades old modes to Part 15 power levels.

73, Brian

2145. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 04:07:12 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc4dd0f.2684374@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41462

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 21:58:24 -0500, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

>So, now staring at stars brings about some kind of negative connotation, eh?
>Wow, you'll fit right into the newsgroup. There are only very opinionated
>people here. By the way, it'll piss Jim of to no end for me to tell you
>that...no, I didn't "space out" on the 30M question. More, that I realized
>the band is set aside for digital modes only and so I must never have been
>on that band; as I don't use digital modes. The thing that probably really
>pisses Jim and others off--more than anything--is that they couldn't dupe me
>into some stupid answer out of ignorance of the 30M set aside. As soon as I
>saw the question, I recognized it for the trap it was. That's what they're
>pissed at...

Wasn't a trap at all... These are types of questions that are on the
test material. LOL

If you knew what mode is on 30 meters, you would have said so in the
first place, rather than going circles around the question almost 2
weeks.

Obviously your not made for newsgroups, if little things offend you.

AA7YA

2146. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 04:09:46 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc4de19.2950135@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41463

On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 02:51:42 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>Stacey, what are "all bands?"

Depends on what bands your talking about, an "all band HF" antenna
isn't cut for operating the "GHz stuff".

>Do you differentiate between 75M and 80M? Or is it all 80M?

Yes, I differentiate between 75M and 80M, I work SSB in the 75M
segment and CW in the 80M segment.

2147. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 04:12:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <la5x8.5356$_A5.263998898@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41464

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc4dc9f.2571975@news.montanavision.net...
> On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 02:58:24 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> >
> >"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >news:3cc1fbaf.48160607@news.montanavision.net...
> >> On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 22:59:59 GMT, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >That may be your rule, but it's not an FCC rule.
> >> >
> >> >I hold 3 stations licenses for K0HB, K0RT, and W0EF. It is routine
for
> >all
> >> >three stations to be on the air at the same time during contests,
etc.,
> >and
> >> >I need not be present at any of them. Nothing in the FCC rules
requires
> >me
> >> >to be at any of those stations so long as the operator at the controls
is
> >> >operating within the bounds of his own operator license.
> >>
> >> Actually, it's within the bounds of the station license. As an
> >> example, if I volunteered to fill in one hour on a "Novice station"
> >> during Field Day, I can't operate in the Extra class part of the band,
> >> because I would jeopardize the station license for which that Novice
> >> class station is permitted to operate. With an Extra class license I
> >> could, if I used my callsign, but it's not the callsign designated as
> >> the "Novice Station" license.
> >>
> >> You can bend the rules all you want, you can interpret them any way
> >> you like, but there's no gray matter when it comes to the explicit FCC
> >> Part 97 rulebook.
> >>
> >> Stacey, AA7YA
> >
> >Stacey, do you pay "repeater dues?"
>
> Yep, lifetime member of the club actually.

Do you consider paying repeater dues as paying to have your emissions retransmitted by another station?

2148. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 04:12:33 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Ra5x8.2635$iQ5.248156@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41465

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> K0CKB is Colleen K. Brakob, same current address as old Black
> Silver aka Hard Body hisself. The above seems a perfect example
> of nepotism effected to get around some guide/ruling/whatever to
> comment "personally." Rather transparent, I'd say.
>

Are you suggesting that K0CKB, a citizen of the US, should not comment personally on FCC matters regarding the Amateur Radio service, or that her comments constitute "nepotism" (government patronage towards relatives)? Shame on you!

With all kind wishes,
de Hans, K0HB

2149. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 04:18:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <sg5x8.5362$1N6.267308286@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41466

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc4de19.2950135@news.montanavision.net...
> On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 02:51:42 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> >Stacey, what are "all bands?"
>
> Depends on what bands your talking about, an "all band HF" antenna
> isn't cut for operating the "GHz stuff".

I've operated VHF on an HF antenna. I could probably operate HF on a VHF antenna. But that wasn't my question.

Can you name all of the bands? Do you know all of the emissions allowed for each one?

> >Do you differentiate between 75M and 80M? Or is it all 80M?
>
> Yes, I differentiate between 75M and 80M, I work SSB in the 75M
> segment and CW in the 80M segment.

Hustler (antenna coils) are the only ones I've seen that actually make the distinction. If the FCC in Part 97 doesn't make the distinction, why would you?

Brian

2150. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 04:24:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ZI5x8.5367$kA6.266758485@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41467

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020422234958.14735.00000985@mb-fr.aol.com...
> In article <3E1x8.2160$iQ5.195371@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> I have never tested the waters about my sending in comments that are
> different
> >> that ARRL's. I do not intend to do so.
> >
> >When I was Dakota Division Vice Director, K0CKB sent some very cogent
> >comments to the FCC on various matters related to amateur radio, some of
> >which were not necessarily congruent with ARRL 'official' views. Of
course
> >I was happy to give her my personal assistance in forming her thoughts.
Do
> >you know any citizens who might need similar help in expressing
themselves?
>
> K0CKB is Colleen K. Brakob, same current address as old Black
> Silver aka Hard Body hisself. The above seems a perfect example
> of nepotism effected to get around some guide/ruling/whatever to
> comment "personally." Rather transparent, I'd say.

I'd have figured Steve for a mamma's boy, but Hans? Must be a typo in the
database.

2151. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 04:27:31 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <To5x8.2670$iQ5.251854@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41468

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> The above seems a perfect example of nepotism effected to
> get around some guide/ruling/whatever to comment "personally."
> Rather transparent, I'd say.
>

Dear Old Sir,

You protested mightily with all kinds of self-righteous rhetoric when your organ-monkey challenged your comments to FCC, but you would disparage another interested citizen exercising her right to make comments to the same government agency?

My, my, my! Rather transparent, I'd say!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2152. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 05:24:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE50717.13460238@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41469

K0HB wrote:

> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote
>
> >
> > There is such a segment of the spectrum. It's called the ham bands. People
> > have been using it for years to meet for extended test, debug, and
> > prove-in of ideas.
> >
>
> Pretend for the moment that you don't work at 225 Main Street with all their
> bulletins and QST editors at your disposal.
>
> Without the massive power to inform of ARRL, the typical tinkerer is a
> solitary fellow or gal, perhaps working with some small group of
> acquaintances at some unknown frequency(ies). I'd find it impossible to
> "hook up" with such experimenters in this segment you call "the ham bands".
>
> On the other hand, if they were concentrated in some small known "showcase"
> segments, it would be an easy matter for ANYONE inclined to tinker to just
> dial them in.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Hans, I've been mulling your proposal for experimental reservations and I just can't get past the "reservation" part. I guess it's the Cherokee blood in me. To restrict all operation to strictly new modes is in the first place impractical, given as someone said, the need to coordinate among testing stations using reliable proven modes, and the requirement to ID in a commonly understood mode. The thrust of your plan is noble, but the details are devilish to the point of negating the whole thing.
Then I can't get past the fact that you're the guy who wanted FCC to do no more than tell us "Here are your bands. Have a nice day." Quite a change, that. Why the huge shift of position?
I think Jim N2EY refined it enough in his last post that most anyone should be able to support it. I hope you do.

2153. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 05:46:39 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.23.01.46.39.291860.27084@arrl.org>
Source record: 41470

On Mon, 22 Apr 2002 18:14:03 -0400, K0HB wrote:
>>
> Pretend for the moment that you don't work at 225 Main Street with all
> their bulletins and QST editors at your disposal.

I'm not sure how either of those would assist me more than they assist anyone else. You all see the same bulletins and the same QST articles I do.

> Without the massive power to inform of ARRL, the typical tinkerer is a
> solitary fellow or gal, perhaps working with some small group of
> acquaintances at some unknown frequency(ies). I'd find it impossible to
> "hook up" with such experimenters in this segment you call "the ham
> bands".

I had no trouble hooking up with fellow packet tinkerers when packet was in its infancy, well before I was employed at ARRL HQ. (And before the Internet was widespread.) The history of ham radio is well stocked with examples of people doing experimental work, including in cooperative groups, without needing dedicated subband allocations with which to do it.

> On the other hand, if they were concentrated in some small known
> "showcase" segments, it would be an easy matter for ANYONE inclined to
> tinker to just dial them in.

But if the experimenters therein were doing something really new, just dialing them in wouldn't be too useful because their transmissions would likely be uncopyable. The listener would need to communicate with them using old-fashioned means in order to learn enough about what they are tinkering with to join them. I still don't see how dedicated subbands make that any easier. The initial intercommunication and sharing of ideas, and the spreading of the word, occurs on existing media and modes, not principally on the mode under development.

In fact, as Jim points out, under your proposal not only would I have to switch to another mode to talk to my fellow tinkerers about why the latest tweak isn't working correctly, I'd have to switch to another frequency so as not to use a disallowed old-fashioned mode in the experimental reservation.

It seems to me that the root of this proposal is that experimentation being desirable, dedicating spectrum to it must be a good thing. But I don't think the working model has been fully thought out. Or it hasn't been well explained.

I'm all for encouraging experimentation. (I'll gladly stand on my record on that score.) Please don't misinterpret our disagreement as to method as

being disagreement about the goal. I don't envision much benefit coming from your proposal, although I don't think it would do any great harm, either. I do object, though, to promoting it on the basis that experimentation is not possible under the present system.

Jon

2154. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 05:50:39 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.23.01.50.39.263366.27084@arrl.org>
Source record: 41471

On Mon, 22 Apr 2002 20:18:47 -0400, N2EY wrote:
> Most new modes will do the soundcard trick. What's really needed is a good
> homebrewable HF amateur SDR (software defined radio).

Have you seen this:
http://www.gnu.org/software/gnuradio/
In its infancy, to be sure, but very promising.

Jon

2155. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 06:08:41 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc4fa19.10118619@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41472

On Tue, 23 Apr 2002 04:12:01 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>Do you consider paying repeater dues as paying to have your emissions
>retransmitted by another station?

Nope, I consider my repeater dues as part of a membership, much like
the lifetime membership into ARRL. If a non-member wants to transmit
on the club's open repeater, they are within their rights to do so, so
long as they have the license privileges granted to them to do so.

2156. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 06:12:22 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3cc4fad9.10310591@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 41473

On Tue, 23 Apr 2002 04:18:32 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>
>I've operated VHF on an HF antenna. I could probably operate HF on a VHF
>antenna. But that wasn't my question.

As have others... As have I.

>
>Can you name all of the bands? Do you know all of the emissions allowed for
>each one?

Of course.

>Hustler (antenna coils) are the only ones I've seen that actually make the
>distinction. If the FCC in Part 97 doesn't make the distinction, why would
>you?

So you believe the Hustler's distinction, and not the FCC's? Fine.

AA7YA

2157. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 06:17:58 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.23.02.17.57.829855.5416@arrl.org>
Source record: 41474

On Mon, 22 Apr 2002 20:18:49 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>
> 2) Power limit of all rigs in the subbands to be 200 W if automatic power
> control is employed, 50 W without power control.

A 6-dB difference doesn't seem like much of a threshold. From the point
of view of the experimenter, would APC even be worth bothering with for 6
dB of S/N? And from the point of view of other occupants of the spectrum,
6 dB of protection isn't much.

> 3) The limitations on data/symbol rate and occupied bandwidth of data modes
> used by hams on HF do not apply in those subbands, except that signals not in
> compliance with those rules must stay entirely inside the subbands. The
> encoding and modulation schemes must be publicly available, same as today.
> "Data modes" include digitized voice and image.

The idea of Darwinian competition between modes has been proposed before,
and I've always thought it was a bit too draconian a solution for a whole
band. But there is something intriguing about the concept when applied to
a limited subband! I suppose Hans will view this as an unacceptable
watering down of his original proposal, and Carl would rather have the
whole band to work with but, hey, nobody gets everything they want!

Jon

2158. Re: I apologize to KE3Z....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 10:30:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423063059.07210.00004290@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41475

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> I won't venture a guess as to what you truly are, as I am
>trying my best to maintain a civil strain on the newsgroup.

I don't think that calling someone worse than a twit is being civil. Obviously
you are not trying hard enough to be civil to succeed at it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2159. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 10:45:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423064517.07210.00004291@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41476

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>> One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams can
>use
>> all of the bands for such experimentation.

>The current rules (97.305(b)) contain the restriction that such
>experimentation be only "brief periods". Would you design and
>implement a new modulation scheme if you were restricted to
>"brief periods" of test emission?

PSK-31 was such a new scheme and it is not limited by 97.305(b). I believe that 97.305(b) is intended to cover brief signals sent for test purposes, not unspecified digital codes that are permitted, subject to a few conditions, under other rules.

Basically, the rules for unspecified digital codes require that the modulation mode be legal on the frequency involved, the encoding method be public and the symbol rate be under the maximum symbol rates permitted by the rules.

>I wouldn't either, but I sure would be a lot more inclined to do the
>design if I knew there was a small segment of the spectrum
>where I and other tinkerers could meet for extended test, debug,
>and prove-in of our ideas.

There are such segments of spectrum, Hans; they are called the Amateur bands. Hams can do most of what you are proposing right now, and there is no deep secret reason for my saying so other than I don't want anyone to be confused and think that they cannot.

One of the reasons for the "public" requirement in the rules permitting unspecified digital codes is that the FCC wants to ensure that the content of amateur communications continues to be public. I don't want to see that change, because it would then be impossible to differentiate between legitimate amateur communication and commercial intrusion.

One of the ARRL staff asked the FCC if publishing the necessary information on a web site was sufficient, and the FCC said yes. So for most of what you propose, STAs are not necessary and such experimentation can take place right now.

I personally think that the limits of modulation mode and symbol rate limitations are somewhat limiting on the Amateur Radio Service, however. The first is completely unnecessary and the latter exists mainly to prevent one signal from occupying a significant part of the band.

If I had my druthers, the old Novice segments would be declared open territory, with any mode allowed at any time, with the sole requirement that the modulation method and encoding scheme be public and that the bandwidth of the signal be limited to the width of the segment.

For the rest of the digital sub-band, if the modulation mode and encoding method is made public, hams should be have carte blanche to experiment, with a bandwidth limitation making more sense than a symbol-rate limitation.

We have 90% of this right now, IMHO. It is really unfortunate that more hams are not inventing new modes under the unspecified digital code provisions of the current rules.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2160. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 10:47:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423064730.07210.00004292@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41477

From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.org

>The history of ham radio is well stocked with
>examples of people doing experimental work, including in cooperative
>groups, without needing dedicated subband allocations with which to do it.

Nor do they require ARRL to act as an intermediary to their cooperation with
each other. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2161. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 10:49:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423064931.07210.00004293@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41478

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>> Then it is the correct answer, Hans.

>Obviously it not the correct answer, or our club wouldn't be forced to
>request an STA for one of our PBI's (Partially Baked Idea).

If the PBI uses a modulation mode legal on the band in question, the encoding method is public and the symbol rate is acceptable for the band involved, an STA is not, IMHO, required.

What are you looking to do?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2162. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 10:51:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423065108.07210.00004294@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 41479

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Hmmm, must be why the PCTA insist that the mashing of a spring loaded,
>silver plated contact is digital. Jumping on the bandwagon.

OOK CW has been a digital mode long before the bandwagon came into town.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2163. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 11:12:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423071230.13101.00000901@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 41482

All right, how about this - shamelessly derived from Hans' comments. Not sent to the FCC yet, however.

--

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's)
RM-10413 Amateur Service Rules Governing)
Operating Privileges)
)

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF JAMES MICCOLIS, N2EY

OVERVIEW

These comments are in response to the ARRL proposal for "refarming" the existing HF "Novice sub-bands" on the 80, 40 and 15 meter bands.

I. Discussion:

The ARRL petition does not address the implementation of new technologies by radio amateurs as repeatedly requested by the Commission in WT Docket 98-143. It simply proposes the elimination of the Novice subbands and their reallocation to existing modes, primarily analog voice and image. The ARRL polling method did not address any spectrum allocation alternatives other than possible changes to the existing subband structure.

I propose that the Commission take this opportunity to provide the Amateur Radio
Service with a new incentive to concentrate on paragraph 97.1(b) of the Commission's Rules.

97.1(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute
to the advancement of the radio art.

Advances in technology, changes in the license structure and test requirements have eliminated the need for special subbands for Novice and Technician Plus licensees. The "Novice subbands" have outlived their regulatory purpose, so I propose they be converted to a new purpose which will ensure the future Amateur Radio service continues our "proven ability to contribute to the advancement".

II Proposal:

A. To "de-populate" the current Novice segments, I propose that all Novice (and Technician with code credit) licensees be authorized to use Morse code in all of the MF/HF spectrum now authorized for General class licensees, using the
current power output level restriction of 200 watts.

B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be reallocated for non-traditional and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized image, high speed
data, and other "forward looking" communications methods. Modes currently allowed in these segments would continue to be allowed.

C. I propose that the current power output level restriction of 200 watts be retained for those subbands, and additionally propose that transmitters in those segments must be equipped with auto-adaptive circuitry to reduce output
to the lowest level consistent with reliable communications if power output in excess of 50 watts is used.

D. I propose that Commission grant broad discretion to amateurs in the technical
aspects of mode use in these subbands as to modulation and coding schemes, non-traditional technologies, and data/symbol rates. Specifically, the current
limitations on occupied bandwidth and data/symbol rates would not apply to amateurs using experimental modes in these subbands.

Respectfully submitted,

James Miccolis, N2EY
136 Morningside Circle
Wayne, PA 19087

2164. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 11:12:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423071231.13101.00000902@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 41481

In article <3CC4C365.FE667E89@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
<wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>There should be indirect ways to sanction spark and AM voice
>through regulating power vs. bandwidth. How about a bath
>tub shaped power vs. bandwidth (freq) curve, asymtotic at 0
>hz., a big sag down to approx. 0 power at 10 KHz, and back
>up again at the SS extremities?
>
No need. Spark is already banned (since 1927). AM and SSB are currently not
allowed in the "Novice" bands - just leave it that way.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2165. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 11:12:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423071232.13101.00000903@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 41480

In article <pan.2002.04.23.02.17.57.829855.5416@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Mon, 22 Apr 2002 20:18:49 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> 2) Power limit of all rigs in the subbands to be 200 W if automatic power
>> control is employed, 50 W without power control.
>
>A 6-dB difference doesn't seem like much of a threshold. From the point
>of view of the experimenter, would APC even be worth bothering with for 6
>dB of S/N? And from the point of view of other occupants of the spectrum,
>6 dB of protection isn't much.

All right - make it 1500 W with APC and 200 W without.
>
>> 3) The limitations on data/symbol rate and occupied bandwidth of data modes
>> used by hams on HF do not apply in those subbands, except that signals not
>in
>> compliance with those rules must stay entirely inside the subbands. The
>> encoding and modulation schemes must be publicly available, same as today.
>> "Data modes" include digitized voice and image.
>
>The idea of Darwinian competition between modes has been proposed before,
>and I've always thought it was a bit too draconian a solution for a whole
>band. But there is something intriguing about the concept when applied to
>a limited subband!

That's the key point. Try it and see what happens.

>I suppose Hans will view this as an unacceptable
>watering down of his original proposal, and Carl would rather have the
>whole band to work with but, hey, nobody gets everything they want!

I don't think many non-experimenters will move into those subbands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2166. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 12:30:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC553D5.EA2E60E1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41486

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > I know a ham who got the WAS award without working Alaska and Hawaii. :-)
>
> That was probably in 1957.

Pretty close. Does it still count?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2167. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 12:33:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC554AF.69C014B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41487

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
> > I don't know. I was not given a code test when I took the FCC First Class
> > Radiotelepone license test.
> >
> So in the Amateur service, you need to take a code test even if you're not
> going to use code, but in the commercial service, you never needed to take
> the test.

There was also the FCC First Class Radiotelegraph license test which did
require Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2168. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 12:35:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC55526.F31D6F25@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41485

Brian P Burke wrote:
> Mutual Funds pay dividends and capital gains, not interest.

Aren't money market accounts considered to be mutual funds?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2169. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 13:02:39 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.23.09.02.38.793544.26393@arrl.org>
Source record: 41488

On Tue, 23 Apr 2002 07:12:32 -0400, N2EY wrote:
>
> I don't think many non-experimenters will move into those subbands.

If there isn't much experimental activity there, I think
non-experimenters will move into the "dead zone" in droves. And, I'm
sorry to say, I think there's a significant chance that will be the case.

Jon

2170. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 13:03:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 41489

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>I don't think many non-experimenters will move into those subbands.

If the band is open to SSB, SSB will move in pretty quickly. The real question is whether digital signals can coexist with them and vice versa.

Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by using the entire sub-band.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2171. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 13:19:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423091903.13136.00006132@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 41490

>Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/22/02 23:50 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020422235000.14735.00000986@mb-fr.aol.com

>I'm not an "alleged" radio professional. I *AM* a radio-electronics
>professional. The US federal government (IRS, FCC, FBI, DCAS,
>even the CIA!),...(SNIP)

Oh geeze...Now he's James Bond.

Do THEY have an allocation for "strictly recreational" communicaitons too,
Lennie?

>A two-bit twerp with a one-by-two amateur callsign keeps trying
>for an "insult" mode by "challenging" the professionalism.

No, Lennie....YOU keep making stupid mistakes that even relatively new
radio hobbyists know are dumb.

>He
>hasn't come close to doing what I have done, yet he claims
>"superiority" in everything because his poor little ego is bruised.

I have NEVER claimed "superiority", Lennie. Not in electronics. And I
have stated before that you do know more about what's in the box. The problem
has been and continues to be your insistence that you know anything about
Amateur Radio beyond electronics theory.

>Poor baby.

Yes, Lennie, you are. Read what you write...Read HOW you write about it.
Some "professional".

>That avoids ambiguities and
>creates a haven for idiot barracks lawyers who wish to quibble over
>the absolute sine qua non meaning of words.

Lennie, YOU are the one who argues over "absolute meaning" of words in
here...Have for years. THEN you make GLARING mistakes about the purpose of
various radio services, insisting that they are "STRICTLY" for recreational
purposes.

They are not. NONE of them are for "strictly" recreational purposes.

You alledge to be a professional, Lennie. Then BE professional. Get your
definitions right. DON'T try to skate away from YOUR foolish mistakes telling
us how the FCC alledgedly wrote laws in such a way as to make it APPEAR as

though a service was for "other" purposes although they "meant" for it to be "strictly" recreational. If that IS what they meant, they would have said it.

>It should be immensely
>obvious to even the near-braindead that the "R/C Channels" and all
>regulations thereto are for HOBBYISTS. Hobbyists do their hobby
>thing for recreation. That R/C part within Part 95 was created for
>recreation, remains for recreation, and is not intended for anything
>else but recreation.

Yes, Lennie...I said a few days ago that that IS the purpose for which thye are intended. YOU, however, keep trying to insist that that is the ONLY application for which they may be used. You are wrong.

>Are there exceptions for the barracks lawyers (amateur variety) to
>ply their idiot arguments? Yes, a couple of exceptions to "strict
>recreation" are found in old issues of American Cinematographer
>magazine....(SNIP)

And of course "American Cinematographer" is now the milestone by which we determine the applicability of any given paragraph or chapter of FCC rules and regulations?

Lennie...Simply say "I was wrong. There is NO radio service that is "strictly" recreational". If you want to tap dance, take Mrs. Lennie out tonight...you look silly doing it here.

> No, the perception is instead that
>any prospective amateur MUST enter into some sort of "service" ...(SNIP)

Your relapse into another "But I don't wanna play nice..." rant duly noted. We've heard it before, Lennie.

>Everyone must acknowledge that working DX on HF with CW is
>the Best That Hams Can Be...a "service" motto.

Only if they want to Lennie. The rest of us (those of us LICENSED, anyway) can make it what we want it. Just like we do already and have for almost 100 yers.

Now go back to bed, it's nap time, Your Geezerness.

Steve

2172. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 14:30:04 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Mdex8.615$il5.35796@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41491

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote

> I'm not sure how either of those would assist me more than they assist
> anyone else. You all see the same bulletins and the same QST articles I
> do.

I meant it from the viewpoint of "getting the word out" that I was looking
for partners to participate, if *I* start playing with a new idea.

> It seems to me that the root of this proposal is that experimentation
> being desirable, dedicating spectrum to it must be a good thing. But I
> don't think the working model has been fully thought out. Or it hasn't
> been well explained.

Well of course it hasn't been fully thought out! It's a work in progress
(PBI)!

> I do object, though, to promoting it on the basis that
> experimentation is not possible under the present system.

Never said that experimentation isn't possible! Just said that this would
give it a more visible environment in which to flourish.

73, Hans, K0HB

2173. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 14:37:07 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <nkex8.636$il5.36693@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41492

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Hans, I've been mulling your proposal for experimental reservations and I
just
> can't get past the "reservation" part. I guess it's the Cherokee blood in
me.

I guess I never thought of that connotation, even though I'm 1/16th Cherokee
and a member of the Ojibwe tribe.

> To restrict all operation to strictly new modes is in the first place
impractical,
> given as someone said, the need to coordinate among testing stations using
> reliable proven modes, and the requirement to ID in a commonly understood
> mode.

I'm getting convinced I'll need to back off that stance .....

> Then I can't get past the fact that you're the guy who wanted FCC to do no
> more than tell us "Here are your bands. Have a nice day." Quite a
change,
> that. Why the huge shift of position?

Actually, it's that thinking ("Here are your bands. Have a nice day.") which
got this idea going in my mind. Think of this as a few little "mini bands"
where we didn't have to worry about the conservative old emission rules and
could just "have a nice day" with whatever wild new idea crossed our minds.

73, Hans, K0HB

2174. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 15:21:09 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.23.11.21.09.277634.10375@arrl.org>
Source record: 41493

On Tue, 23 Apr 2002 10:30:04 -0400, K0HB wrote:
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote
>
>> I'm not sure how either of those would assist me more than they assist
>> anyone else. You all see the same bulletins and the same QST articles I
>> do.
>
> I meant it from the viewpoint of "getting the word out" that I was
> looking for partners to participate, if *I* start playing with a new
> idea.

Okay, but I have little advantage there, either. If there's real experimental work being done, I have little doubt that the QST and QEX editors will find space to cover it. And I do think that to spread the word effectively you need to do so using media (print, Internet etc) other than via the experimental mode.

Jon, KE3Z

2175. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 15:30:21 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <1uuacukp0661rmb9tqc0bgk5ainm48hqsa@4ax.com>
Source record: 41494

On Mon, 22 Apr 2002 23:56:28 -0400, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:

>Even though a few idiots would not care, I believe you will be missed. Take
>some time to cool off before ya make a rash decision.

I think that she is better suited to be a "Repeater Police" and make
sure that the content of all discussions meets her criteria for proper
content. Who knows, someone could have been talking about the weather
or God forbid the traffic and she could have missed her chance to
correct the error of their ways.

Oh yeah, that's right, she said that she was monitoring simplex
frequencies too. She would be a hard one to get away from. It does
remind me of why most of the talking that I do on 2M is on sideband
unless it's an emergency.

I do miss her though. In a ng, where she can't really dictate what
people say by beating them over the head with misinterpreted FCC
rules, she was quite funny.

2176. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 15:32:42 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <u8fx8.789$il5.44519@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41495

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote

> >Hustler (antenna coils) are the only ones I've seen that actually make
the
> >distinction. If the FCC in Part 97 doesn't make the distinction, why
would
> >you?
>
> So you believe the Hustler's distinction, and not the FCC's? Fine.

Actually the FCC *does* make the distinction. In 97.301(b), 97.301(c),
97.301(d), 97.301(e) and 97.305(c) the two bands (75M and 80M) are each
treated as a band separate from the other.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2177. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 16:21:42 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <qSfx8.922$iI5.51099@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41496

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> There are such segments of spectrum, Hans; they are called the Amateur
bands.
> Hams can do most of what you are proposing right now, and there is no deep
> secret reason for my saying so other than I don't want anyone to be
confused
> and think that they cannot.
>

I don't want to keep beating this point to death, but......

I KNOW WE CAN EXPERIMENT IN THE HAM BANDS TODAY. I'VE NEVER SAID WE
COULDN'T! WHO COULD BE CONFUSED!

My PBI seeks to raise visibility of experimenters, to encourage more of it,
and to provide official FCC sanction to stepping outside the traditional.

73, Hans, K0HB

2178. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 17:27:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204230927.4e91e233@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41497

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >I don't think many non-experimenters will move into those subbands.
>
> If the band is open to SSB, SSB will move in pretty quickly.

Which is why both Hans' and my proposals disallow analog voice modes.
Specifically, my proposal is that all modes now allowed in those
subbands would still be allowed, plus any new or experimental modes.
The common analog voice modes are neither new nor experimental.

It could probably be sorted out by the use of the standard mode
designators.

> The real question
> is whether digital signals can coexist with them and vice versa.

Interesting point. Maybe it should be a true free-for-all. One wonders
how many SSB users would move into a subband with a 50 watt power
limit and a bunch of weird sounding signals.

> Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by using the
> entire sub-band.

Would there be any advantage considering how little spreading would
actually take place?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2179. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 18:08:32 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Aqhx8.1263$il5.62939@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41498

I've submitted the following amendment of my original proposal to the FCC.

After discussion of my proposal with other amateurs, I've
been persuaded to make two changes. Please substitute the
following new paragraphs B. and C. to my original comments
here.

B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be set aside
as a new "Experimental Reservation" for non-traditional
and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized
image, and other "forward looking" communications methods.
Traditional modulation methods would be allowed in these
segments only for brief coordination discussion during
the testing of an experimental mode.

C. I propose that the normal power output level of 1500W
be allowed for those segments, but transmitters which are
adjusted and capable of more than 50W must include auto-
adaptive circuitry to reduce power to the minimum level
needed to maintain reliable communications.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2180. Re: Small Project Promotion of Ham Radio Begins!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 18:30:40 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <kLhx8.882$607.75623@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41499

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

>
> We had several hundred people show up here in Columbia
> for the Astronomy Day shindig at a local High School and
> many of them got a look at our display on satellite communi-
> cation.
>

Great work. Here's another angle you might wish to incorporate.

http://seti1.setileague.org/tunein/nq1r.htm

73, de Hans, K0HB

2181. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 18:49:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC5ACB2.5740D8EE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41500

K0HB wrote:
> C. I propose that the normal power output level of 1500W
> be allowed for those segments, but transmitters which are
> adjusted and capable of more than 50W must include auto-
> adaptive circuitry to reduce power to the minimum level
> needed to maintain reliable communications.

Hans, is the FCC going to raid ham stations looking for auto-adaptive circuitry or is compliance going to be completely voluntary? What do you do about homebrew auto-adaptive circuits that don't work right? How do you propose to enforce such a regulation? Any regulation that increases the FCC's workload is probably not going to be adopted.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2182. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 19:06:31 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Xgix8.974$607.79998@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41501

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> Hans, is the FCC going to raid ham stations looking for auto-adaptive
> circuitry or is compliance going to be completely voluntary?

Does the FCC currently come raiding to look for compliance with the current auto-adaptive rule in 97.311(d)? I'll presume that hams will voluntarily follow this rule, just as they have mostly been doing for Amateur Radio regulations since 1912.

> What do you do about homebrew auto-adaptive
> circuits that don't work right?

What would you do about it? If it were mine, I suppose I'd fix it, just like any other malfunction of my equipment.

> How do you propose to enforce such a regulation?

The same way 97.311(d) is enforced.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2183. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 19:36:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423153622.22569.00001073@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 41505

In article <To5x8.2670$iQ5.251854@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> The above seems a perfect example of nepotism effected to
>> get around some guide/ruling/whatever to comment "personally."
>> Rather transparent, I'd say.

>You protested mightily with all kinds of self-righteous rhetoric when your
>organ-monkey challenged your comments to FCC, but you would disparage
>another interested citizen exercising her right to make comments to the same
>government agency?
>
>My, my, my! Rather transparent, I'd say!

It doesn't seem to be any more transparent than the righteous fury exhibited by yourself requiring TWO responses to the same message.

The "other interested citizen" is your WIFE, isn't she? If you are still on good terms, etc., in your marriage, then it would seem quite normal that you two share the same thoughts on many things, come to agreement on many things. That's hardly comparable to another "citizen" who is not a family member.

NB: I am still objecting to your proposal in re the "ring." Don't get your hopes up...

2184. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 19:36:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423153623.22569.00001074@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 41506

In article <Ra5x8.2635$iQ5.248156@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>>
>> K0CKB is Colleen K. Brakob, same current address as old Black
>> Silver aka Hard Body hisself. The above seems a perfect example
>> of nepotism effected to get around some guide/ruling/whatever to
>> comment "personally." Rather transparent, I'd say.
>
>Are you suggesting that K0CKB, a citizen of the US, should not comment
>personally on FCC matters regarding the Amateur Radio service, or that her
>comments constitute "nepotism" (government patronage towards relatives)?

No on several counts. I merely pointed out something, mainly that Colleen K. Brakob is a close personal family member. You had referred to your wife in a modified "third-person" form, that of only giving her call letters.

"Nepotism" is not restricted to government according to two different dictionaries. It is generally just "favoritism toward relatives."

In other words, you submitted comments to the FCC through your wife in an effort to avoid any possible disputes with the ARRL while an ARRL official. That was the "transparent" part.

Is there anything else you want cleared up? Or are you going to "suppose" other hidden double meanings in everything to avoid answering challenges directly?

2185. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 19:36:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423153624.22569.00001076@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 41502

In article <20020423065108.07210.00004294@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>Hmmm, must be why the PCTA insist that the mashing of a spring loaded,
>>silver plated contact is digital. Jumping on the bandwagon.
>
>OOK CW has been a digital mode long before the bandwagon came into town.

OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."

If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.

2186. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 19:36:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423153624.22569.00001075@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 41503

In article <3CC554AF.69C014B3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>> > I don't know. I was not given a code test when I took the FCC First Class
>> > Radiotelepone license test.
>> >
>> So in the Amateur service, you need to take a code test even if you're not
>> going to use code, but in the commercial service, you never needed to take
>> the test.
>
>There was also the FCC First Class Radiotelegraph license test which did
>require Morse code.

There still is a "First Telegraph" but it is called a "certificate," not an operator's license. A "T1" (new familiar term) is only useful for being the chief radio operator on a US passenger ship. Morsemanship requires both 20 and 25 WPM tests (25 may be copied on typewriter, automatic keyer on send, all speeds slower than 25 WPM must be manual).

The FCC website has all the information. According to them, an amateur extra license is credit toward passing all telegraphy test elements. [they may not have corrected the rules or web page for that?]

What were "operator licenses" before are now either "certificates" or "permits" with the exception of General Radiotelephone Operator, GMDSS Operator or GMDSS Maintainer licenses.

The question pools are fully open for all commercial operator licenses, including answers. There are 10 firms in the USA who are listed as COLE (Commercial Operator License Examination) Managers. Much higher fees for exams than for amateurs although the number of questions in the exams are roughly comparable.

2187. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 19:36:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423153625.22569.00001077@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 41504

In article <20020423064517.07210.00004291@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>
>>> One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams can
use
>>> all of the bands for such experimentation.
>
>>The current rules (97.305(b)) contain the restriction that such
>>experimentation be only "brief periods". Would you design and
>>implement a new modulation scheme if you were restricted to
>>"brief periods" of test emission?
>
>PSK-31 was such a new scheme and it is not limited by 97.305(b). I believe
>that 97.305(b) is intended to cover brief signals sent for test purposes, not
>unspecified digital codes that are permitted, subject to a few conditions,
>under other rules.

PSK31 was developed and tested in Europe, specifically the UK, by
its innovator, Peter Martinez, G3PLX.

Implying that it was "under FCC rules" is not good phrasing. PSK31
wasn't "limited" by anything other than UK amateur radio regulations
in its beginning.

>I personally think that the limits of modulation mode and symbol rate
>limitations are somewhat limiting on the Amateur Radio Service, however. The
>first is completely unnecessary and the latter exists mainly to prevent one
>signal from occupying a significant part of the band.

I don't understand why any amateur organization hasn't asked for
more spectrum space in the MF-HF region...or even below MF.
The UK got a "lowfer" band, below the US' 160-190 KHz open
territory for unlicensed emitters.

It's been over 6 years since the last NTIA HF spectrum survey
(with the ARRL given some footnote space) with the clear words
and numbers of "amateurs requesting more spectrum space."

Haven't seen word one on such requests. The number of HF users
are down from twenty years ago. There's "open room" there to
satisfy requests of up to 2 MHz more bandspace.

Instead of squabbling over sub-dividing the already sub-divided
narrow bands on HF, why not just propose a whole new band
for nothing but experimentation IN ADDITION to the narrow bands

already in place?

>We have 90% of this right now, IMHO. It is really unfortunate that more hams
>are not inventing new modes under the unspecified digital code provisions of
>the current rules.

I get the feeling that everyone must pay homage (and time-tithe)
to the grande old legacy mode of OOK CW...so much so that it
has become a negative incentive to experimentation.

2188. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 19:50:24 UTC
From: K0CKB <k0ckb@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <4Wix8.1068$607.85083@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41507

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> The "other interested citizen" is your WIFE, isn't she?

Yes, I am.

> If you are still on good terms, etc., in your marriage, then
> it would seem quite normal that you two share the same
> thoughts on many things, come to agreement on many
> things.

Then I'll take the liberty of submitting my thoughts to the
FCC, with HB's (Heavenly Body) collaboration.

> That's hardly comparable to another "citizen" who
> is not a family member.

Your point?

HB is far too polite to you!

CKB

2189. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 20:18:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc5c19c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41508

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020422140818.13688.00000947@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <L2Kw8.21$iQ5.6675@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >> Now just allow all non-analog-voice modes and the thing will fly.
> >
> >I think that would pull the heart right out of the idea.
>
> I don't.

Hans ... unless I misread Jim, he said all NON-analog-voice modes.
I read that as disallowing conventional SSB/AM/FM, but allowing
new digital voice modes ...

I think you guys may actually be on the same page, at least partially.

> >How can I propose
> >a "Experimentation Reservation" and then tolerate the use of decades-old
> >technology on that reservation?
>
> Several reasons:
>
> 1) It simplifies the rules (no need to decide and specify what is allowed
and
> what is not). That's a BIG deal to the FCC
>
> 2) It does not push away anyone who is currently there.
>
> 3) It will be supported by far more hams. (Political reality being what it
is,
> an idea that gathers lots of support has a better chance than one that has
> almost no support).
>
> 4) It will allow coordination of on-air experiments by the use of old
modes.
> This is very important - how do I figure out where the problem is if I am
> forced to use ONLY the new, experimental mode if the new mode doesn't work
> right away?

Good point to some extent ...

> 5) It sets a bad precedent by banning certain widely-used modes from some
> spectrum where they are currently legal today.

> Not a good idea.
>
> 6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned unless
there
> is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).
>
> --
>
> A simple question:
>
> Do you think the presence of a few amateur signals using "decades old
> technology" will be a problem for those hams who want to try out new modes
in
> the subbands?
>
> I don't.
>
> Anybody else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I think that in the small sub-bands we're talking about, it may well be
that,
with elimination of unnecessary data rate/bandwidth restrictions, some
mode may use the entire sub-band ... having a few amateur signals using
"legacy" modes in the sub-band could serve as a handy source of
interference to prove robustness ... perhaps they should be allowed, but
not afforded ANY claim to protection from interference from experimental
modes? (just a thought, looking for a way forward ...)

Carl - wk3c

2190. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 20:19:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc5c1f7_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41509

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:b1Ww8.1490$iM5.116322@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020422081134.07186.00004852@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
> >
> > >> One other point -- right now, other than data rate limitations, hams
> can
> > >use
> > >> all of the bands for such experimentation.
> >
> > >That seems to be the "pat answer" out of your vicinity on this topic.
> >
> > Then it is the correct answer, Hans.
> >
>
> Obviously it not the correct answer, or our club wouldn't be forced to
> request an STA for one of our PBI's (Partially Baked Idea).
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

If you'd be willing to share your PBI with me via e-mail, I'd be
curious as to what you're up to ... maybe even interested in
collaborating or providing a distant station to test with ...

Carl - wk3c

2191. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 20:29:10 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc5c436_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41510

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:Aqhx8.1263$iI5.62939@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> I've submitted the following amendment of my original proposal to the FCC.
>
>
> After discussion of my proposal with other amateurs, I've
> been persuaded to make two changes. Please substitute the
> following new paragraphs B. and C. to my original comments
> here.
>
> B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be set aside
> as a new "Experimental Reservation" for non-traditional
> and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized
> image, and other "forward looking" communications methods.
> Traditional modulation methods would be allowed in these
> segments only for brief coordination discussion during
> the testing of an experimental mode.
>
> C. I propose that the normal power output level of 1500W

How'd we get up to 1500W from 200W???

> be allowed for those segments, but transmitters which are
> adjusted and capable of more than 50W must include auto-
> adaptive circuitry to reduce power to the minimum level
> needed to maintain reliable communications.

Will need to define "maintain reliable communications" ... could
be in terms of Eb/No, BER, etc.

Carl - wk3c

2192. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 20:41:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc5c700_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41511

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3BED3B0D.F37CDC76@worldnet.att.net...
>
> It hasn't dawned yet on lots of posters and others that the FCC in the
person of
> Bill Cross is playing to Carl and his cadre for the purpose of making sure
that he
> (Bill) doesn't come under fire as a flaming Luddite for *not* pushing
(nay,
> shoving) "the latest technologies" to be mandated in ham radio.

Dick,

Why do you insist on taking opportunities for unwarranted, gratuitous
shots at Bill Cross?

Frankly, I haven't had a chance or a reason to talk to Bill in a while
now. And I certainly haven't spoken to him on this subject ... NOR
have I been "played to" by him ...

As Hans pointed out, the FCC was pretty direct in its message
to start using newer technologies ... in the R&O ... and I haven't
had anyone from the FCC contact me about "When are you guys
going to get on with it?" since the R&O came out.

The ball is in OUR court now. What's expected has been laid out
for us ... if we don't meet the challenge, I fear that there will be a
price to pay.

> When Carl and his cadre finally turn ham radio into a glorified
> trunked cell phone service

First, you clearly don't understand ANY of what I've suggested in the
past ... (but that doesn't surprise me at all).

> I and a whole lot more hams will just abandon ship. I already have a
> cellphone. It's very useful but not very interesting.

Secondly, it's abundantly clear that you are TOTALLY lacking in any
vision for the future that extends beyond what you're comfortable with
from the past ...

Why don't you just get out of the way and let the rest of the world
move forward?

Carl - wk3c

2193. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 20:44:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc5c7b2$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41512

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:OIVw8.1456$iM5.114693@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
>
> >
> > I am sure that you made your views known to your Divsion Director, but I
> do
> > hope that all those who posted their opinion about the matter do the
same.
> >
>
> Yes, I did that.
>
> But unfortunately he is prohibited by ARRL Bylaws from sending in comments
> on an ARRL petition. I guess it's up to you and me to push the idea with
> FCC. Last I looked, your comments haven't been posted at the FCC site.
>
> Hopefully FCC isn't just taking a head count on this one..... of 35
> responses to the ARRL petition, I tally:
>
> 21 in favor of ARRL's boundary shuffle
> 14 opposed
>
> Of the 14 opposed:
>
> 10 say leave things like they are
> 3 say set up an experimenters reservation (thanks KT4ST and KE4MOB)
> 1 says decrease the phone bands and add more CW.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2194. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 20:47:35 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <HLjx8.1647$il5.85977@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41513

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote

>
> If you'd be willing to share your PBI with me via e-mail, I'd be
> curious as to what you're up to ... maybe even interested in
> collaborating or providing a distant station to test with ...
>

Give us a couple of weeks. Because this is an "employee" radio club we've
had to hold up the STA request while the lawyers bless us on patent grounds.
(We don't expect a patent problem, but our Chief Scientist is a member of
the team, and he needs to cover his butt.)

73, Hans, K0HB

2195. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 21:03:50 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <W_jx8.1674$iI5.88299@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41514

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote

>
> How'd we get up to 1500W from 200W???
>

I've become persuaded that FCC will be more likely bless proposals which "deviate the least" from the norms of the surrounding band space. I think the 50W limit on uncontrolled xmtrs will make the issue moot.

> Will need to define "maintain reliable communications" ... could
> be in terms of Eb/No, BER, etc.

97.311(d) might be a good model to work from, but I avoided cranking it into the proposal to avoid getting bogged down in detail.

73, Hans, K0HB

2196. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 21:35:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc5d3b1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41515

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020422201849.27399.00000737@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <rMZw8.1973$iM5.154460@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> Actually, most practical radio signals are "analog" in the sense that they
are
> bunches of sine waves.
> The digital part is in how modulation and coding are done.

True for the most part ...

> >> My read on 98-143 is that FCC wants simple regs that are easily
> >> enforced and widely supported.

True ...

> >>The only part of your revised proposal
> >> that is complex is the definition of what constitutes a new,
> >> experimental mode and what doesn't.

Also generally true, but there are some issues that need
a bit more meat on the bones in order to avoid "unintended
consequences" sorts of problems ...

> >> Eliminate that part and it becomes a shoo-in.

I'm not sure I'd go THAT far, but I think it does have promise,
if presented to the Commission properly.

> Maybe we're missing the obvious.
>
> The rules today prohibit US hams from using "analog voice modes" (full
carrier
> DSB AM, DSB suppressed carrier, SSB, and all flavors of FM) from the
subbands
> in question. Spark was prohibited in 1927 (although a Canadian ham
actually got
> permission to put a special event spark rig on the air for the 100th
> anniversary of Marconi's transatlantic S).
>
> Just leave those rules in place as they are today.
>
> The really big change is 3), below.
>
> All that needs to be done is:

>
> 1) Allow all hams who have passed a code test to use CW/Morse on all MF/HF
> amateur frequencies now allowed to Generals, using no more than 200 W.

At least until after WRC-03 ... then we can drop the code test part :-)

> 2) Power limit of all rigs in the subbands to be 200 W if automatic power
> control is employed, 50 W without power control.

The numbers may be considered arbitrary without some justification. Don't
get me wrong ... I *like* the idea of automatically inforcing the minimum
power
rule ... however, consider that the max limit for SS in 70 cm and up is
100W,
but for over 1W you must use APC ... that's a big difference from 50 W.

> 3) The limitations on data/symbol rate and occupied bandwidth of data
modes
> used by hams on HF do not apply in those subbands, except that signals not
in
> compliance with those rules must stay entirely inside the subbands.

To what extent? (Need to specify how many dB down at sub-band
edges, or something similar ...)

>The
> encoding and modulation schemes must be publicly available, same as today.
> "Data modes" include digitized voice and image.
>
> That's all. Simple and easy to implement. Nobody loses. The STA hassle is
> eliminated - just send the FCC an email and publish your latest PBI on a
> website.
>
> --
>
> While the proposed regulations would not require it, hams trying out new
modes
> would be well-advised to include an auto ID in Morse or some other easily
> recognized and copied mode so that "tuners-by" could determine who they
are
> hearing, and look up how to decode the weird-sounding noises. But this is
in
> the realm of gentleman's agreement, not the rules.

There are other ways of IDing as well ... I would not limit it to Morse.
(In general, I would venture that any "tuner-by" sufficiently technically
inclined to want to get involved could recognize and decode other
methods of IDing ... such as PSK31 or whatever ...

Carl - wk3c

2197. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 21:36:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC5D3D5.A6C94E89@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41516

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > What do you do about homebrew auto-adaptive
> > circuits that don't work right?
>
> What would you do about it? If it were mine, I suppose I'd fix it, just
> like any other malfunction of my equipment.

What if you don't know it's not working right? Who's gonna tell you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2198. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 21:38:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC5D446.A9D43F0E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41517

Len Over 21 wrote:
> OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
> fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
>
> If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.

Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2199. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 21:43:27 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <3Akx8.1740$il5.94310@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41518

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote

> Hans ... unless I misread Jim, he said all NON-analog-voice modes.
> I read that as disallowing conventional SSB/AM/FM, but allowing
> new digital voice modes ...
>
> I think you guys may actually be on the same page, at least partially.

I think you're right, and I thank Jim for being patient with me (sometimes I catch on rather slow!).

As an aside, I see evidence that us rrap'ers may be fit for polite company after all. Other than my early petulant interchange with the guys at W1INF (I apologize again) we're having a productive exchange which includes players from all sides of the NCTA/PCTA frontiers. Congratulations to us!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2200. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 21:55:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BLkx8.10318$3T6.287897840@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41519

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc4fad9.10310591@news.montanavision.net...
> On Tue, 23 Apr 2002 04:18:32 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> >
> >I've operated VHF on an HF antenna. I could probably operate HF on a VHF
> >antenna. But that wasn't my question.
>
> As have others... As have I.
>
> >
> >Can you name all of the bands? Do you know all of the emissions allowed
for
> >each one?
>
> Of course.
>
> >Hustler (antenna coils) are the only ones I've seen that actually make
the
> >distinction. If the FCC in Part 97 doesn't make the distinction, why
would
> >you?
>
> So you believe the Hustler's distinction, and not the FCC's? Fine.
>
> AA7YA

We're just picking nits here. Sounds like you're done.

2201. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 22:01:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kRkx8.10334$x27.288135275@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41520

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:u8fx8.789$iI5.44519@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote
>
> > >Hustler (antenna coils) are the only ones I've seen that actually make
> the
> > >distinction. If the FCC in Part 97 doesn't make the distinction, why
> would
> > >you?
> >
> > So you believe the Hustler's distinction, and not the FCC's? Fine.
>
> Actually the FCC *does* make the distinction. In 97.301(b), 97.301(c),
> 97.301(d), 97.301(e) and 97.305(c) the two bands (75M and 80M) are each
> treated as a band separate from the other.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Thanks Hans, I needed that. I was just resting on my laurels like the other 40+ year licensed hams ocassionally do.

So if CW is good in the 80M band and CW is good in the 75M band, why the distinction?

And why don't we have the 10M band and the 9.5M band? There's a whole lot more spectrum up there and it would appear to make at least as much sense as the 80/75M division. Plus the FM portion could be a third "band." My old SB-101 even divided it into 4 bands.

2202. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 22:03:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NSkx8.10338$D47.288199002@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41521

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC553D5.EA2E60E1@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > I know a ham who got the WAS award without working Alaska and Hawaii.
:-)
> >
> > That was probably in 1957.
>
> Pretty close. Does it still count?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

How many stars were on the flag when the wallpaper was issued? Brian

2203. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 22:09:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <IYkx8.10342$3b6.286850181@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41522

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC55526.F31D6F25@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > Mutual Funds pay dividends and capital gains, not interest.
>
> Aren't money market accounts considered to be mutual funds?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Dividends.

2204. Re: FCC Requires Positioning Coordinates?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 22:14:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <L0lx8.10345$iS6.287872065@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41523

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3cc188d1.18749802@news.montanavision.net...
> On Wed, 10 Apr 2002 07:57:35 GMT, "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I don't know how many of you go to www.QRZ.com, but when you lookup a
> >callsign in their database, it indicates coordinates of the location.
Does
> >anyone know how they figure what these coordinates are and how accurate.
> >I'm wondering if the FCC requires or mandates it, or if QRZ just adds it
> >based on the address of the applicant.
> >
> >Lars
> >
> >
>
> QRZ adds it based on the address of the applicant. Although, if you
> did a search on my callsign, it puts you smack dab in the middle of
> the town where my post office box is, and not over the physical QTH.
>
> Stacey, AA7YA

Yep. Its much faster and requires a less extensive database to geocode to a
zip than a street address. Don't have to worry about topology either. And
as much time as I spend in line at the PO, it might as well be my actual
address. Them and Wal-Mart.

Brian

2205. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 22:17:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <e4lx8.10348$iS6.287872065@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41524

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020423091903.13136.00006132@mb-ct.aol.com...

> No, Lennie....YOU keep making stupid mistakes that even relatively new
> radio hobbyists know are dumb.

How could he? He's never been on an amateur band that you are aware of.

2206. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 22:24:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Jalx8.10353$si7.288478248@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41525

Kim, it is a big waste. Come on back to the group when the actuarial tables have done their work. See you in 2027. Goodbye.

73, Brian

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:3cc3758a_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> A recent outburst here has evoked in me a rash of thoughts to consider all
> day. I download this newsgroup, for whatever reason, each evening and know
> full well there is nothing of any substance on it, certainly nothing that
> interests me.
>
> I allow myself to be engaged by reprehensible thoughts from reprehensible
> people. I allow myself to get caught up in petty meandering about what was
> meant to be said; and know full well the main defense is simply against
> another for their challenge only through their dislike of something I said,
> and not necessarily that what I said was all that important; or wrong. I
> allow myself the anger that I have always been able to ignore or overcome,
> simply. I get extremely angry at injustices and choose to get wrapped up in
> how wrong someone is while I, myself, am just as wrong for the way in which
> I respond to them.
>
> I will no longer participate in this newsgroup and am actually seriously
> considering dropping ham radio altogether. While this newsgroup is
> insignificant in terms of being representative of ham radio, I have no
> passion for a hobby in which people enjoy nothing but constant challenges
> with each other--and it seems to be that more than anything else lately.
> Perhaps the FCC is a governmental business, but the people have decided that
> the ARS is a proving ground for how much more important one is than the
> other; rather than the supposed "fraternity" to which many endear the hobby.
> If a fraternity means constant hazing, then leave me out.
>
> This is my last post, my last time to logon to the newsgroup. So, any
> responses will truly not be seen by me. If you plan to make them for my
> benefit, then you may as well not bother. You brothers have probably been
> at it for years, and you'll probably be at it for many more.
>
> This recent exchange, and the fact that tempers can flare so very much as

to
> threaten each other personally really concerns me. I hope you will all
> fight your strongest fights, blare your loudest words, but leave out
> personal affronts and assaults toward personal lives...that is way, way
too
> much folks. And, trade the semantics for real issues, huh? You all scare
> me when you act like that. Goodbye.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>

2207. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 22:29:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xflx8.10354$ey7.288862330@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41526

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020423065108.07210.00004294@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Hmmm, must be why the PCTA insist that the mashing of a spring loaded,
> >silver plated contact is digital. Jumping on the bandwagon.
>
> OOK CW has been a digital mode long before the bandwagon came into town.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Its so digital that a computer won't handle it. Sounds like it needs an A/D converter.

2208. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 22:30:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <sglx8.10355$Kv7.288796708@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41527

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC5D446.A9D43F0E@IEEE.org...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
> > fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
> >
> > If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
>
> Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Microphones turn on and off.

2209. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-23 22:43:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aslx8.5905$5H6.298020090@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41528

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:3Akx8.1740$iI5.94310@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote
>
> > Hans ... unless I misread Jim, he said all NON-analog-voice modes.
> > I read that as disallowing conventional SSB/AM/FM, but allowing
> > new digital voice modes ...
> >
> > I think you guys may actually be on the same page, at least partially.
>
> I think you're right, and I thank Jim for being patient with me (sometimes
I
> catch on rather slow!).
>
> As an aside, I see evidence that us rrap'ers may be fit for polite company
> after all. Other than my early petulant interchange with the guys at
W1INF
> (I apologize again) we're having a productive exchange which includes
> players from all sides of the NCTA/PCTA frontiers. Congratulations to us!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans, when the patent is filed, put an .wav file of what it sounds like so
we can listen for it.

2210. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 00:06:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423200614.01955.00005179@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 41529

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>> Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by using the
>> entire sub-band.

>Would there be any advantage considering how little spreading would
>actually take place?

That is why I specified a slow data rate, to give a reasonable amount of
process gain.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2211. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 00:08:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423200814.01955.00005180@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 41530

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>I meant it from the viewpoint of "getting the word out" that I was looking
>for partners to participate, if *I* start playing with a new idea.

Hans, if you decide to start playing with a new idea, I will personally use all of the resources at my disposal to get the word out just as if I were doing it myself.

>Well of course it hasn't been fully thought out! It's a work in progress
>(PBI)!

I haven't looked, but if it is a work in progress, I hope you did not yet file it with the FCC.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2212. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 00:12:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423201212.01955.00005181@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 41531

From: "K0HB" KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>Does the FCC currently come raiding to look for compliance with the current
>auto-adaptive rule in 97.311(d)?

Unfortunately, to my knowledge, they don't have to. I don't know of any SS
work being done at power levels greater than 1 watt.

The net effect of the auto-adaptive rule for SS is that hams don't design the
systems to use it. It is a limiting factor in the use and growth of SS, IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2213. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 00:18:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020423201813.01968.00004711@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 41532

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> OOK CW has been a digital mode long before the bandwagon came into town.

>Its so digital that a computer won't handle it. Sounds like it needs an A/D
>converter.

Why would a computer not handle OOK CW?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2214. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 00:32:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc5fd32_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41533

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020423071232.13101.00000903@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <pan.2002.04.23.02.17.57.829855.5416@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >On Mon, 22 Apr 2002 20:18:49 -0400, N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> 2) Power limit of all rigs in the subbands to be 200 W if automatic
power
> >> control is employed, 50 W without power control.
> >
> >A 6-dB difference doesn't seem like much of a threshold. From the point
> >of view of the experimenter, would APC even be worth bothering with for 6
> >dB of S/N? And from the point of view of other occupants of the spectrum,
> >6 dB of protection isn't much.
>
> All right - make it 1500 W with APC and 200 W without.

Whoa ... going in the wrong direction again ... how about like SS
100W max, anything over 1W requires APC ???

Carl - wk3c

2215. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 00:33:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc5fd79$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41534

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204230927.4e91e233@posting.google.com...
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >I don't think many non-experimenters will move into those subbands.
> >
> > If the band is open to SSB, SSB will move in pretty quickly.
>
> Which is why both Hans' and my proposals disallow analog voice modes.
> Specifically, my proposal is that all modes now allowed in those
> subbands would still be allowed, plus any new or experimental modes.
> The common analog voice modes are neither new nor experimental.
>
> It could probably be sorted out by the use of the standard mode
> designators.
>
> > The real question
> > is whether digital signals can coexist with them and vice versa.
>
> Interesting point. Maybe it should be a true free-for-all. One wonders
> how many SSB users would move into a subband with a 50 watt power
> limit and a bunch of weird sounding signals.
>
> > Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by using
the
> > entire sub-band.
>
> Would there be any advantage considering how little spreading would
> actually take place?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2216. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 00:50:29 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc60174$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41535

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204230927.4e91e233@posting.google.com...
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com>...
>
> > Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by using
the
> > entire sub-band.
>
> Would there be any advantage considering how little spreading would
> actually take place?

If the data rates were REALLY low, you could still get some reasonable
processing gain. If you used a 12.5 kHz spreading sequence, the bw
(clock null to clock null) would be 25 kHz ... if you only wanted 1 bps
data rate, the process gain would be about 44 dB ... with implementation
losses of 2 dB and a S/N requirement of, say 14 dB for a decent BER, you
could get a theoretical jamming margin of 28 dB ... in other words, the
system
could tolerate an on-channel jammer as much as 28 dB stronger than the
desired
signal.

On the other hand, if you wanted 10 bps data rate, the processing gain would
be
10 dB lower and you'd "only" have 18 dB of jamming margin.

Assuming ASCII at 10 bits/character, just for the sake of argument, that
would be
60 characters minute, or about 12 wpm ...

How many people can copy a CW signal at 12 wpm with another signal 18 dB
stronger right on top of it??? (And with that much process gain, you could
have
more than one signal operating in the same spectrum using CDMA separation,
as long as the spreading sequences were good in terms of correlation
properties.)

Carl - wk3c

2217. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 00:56:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc602e1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41536

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:W_jx8.1674$iI5.88299@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote
>
> >
> > How'd we get up to 1500W from 200W???
> >
>
> I've become persuaded that FCC will be more likely bless proposals which
> "deviate the least" from the norms of the surrounding band space. I think
> the 50W limit on uncontrolled xmtrs will make the issue moot.
>
> > Will need to define "maintain reliable communications" ... could
> > be in terms of Eb/No, BER, etc.
>
> 97.311(d) might be a good model to work from, but I avoided cranking it
into
> the proposal to avoid getting bogged down in detail.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

An Eb/(No+Io) of 23 dB will let you use some pretty interesting
waveforms (in terms of heavy symbol overloading).

Carl - wk3c

2218. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 01:33:26 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC60B45.DDF7907A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41537

N2EY wrote:
>
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >I don't think many non-experimenters will move into those subbands.
> >
> > If the band is open to SSB, SSB will move in pretty quickly.
>
> Which is why both Hans' and my proposals disallow analog voice modes.

I rather like the idea of "here are your subbands, have a
nice day", with some indirect sanctions on QRO SSB and AM,
by way of severe limits on power in the 2 to 10 KHz range.
Fencing out SSB as a mode by definition is not the
libertarian thing to do and could be regarded as elitist
(how about some help here Cecil?).

> It could probably be sorted out by the use of the standard mode
> designators.
>
> > The real question
> > is whether digital signals can coexist with them and vice versa.
>
> Interesting point. Maybe it should be a true free-for-all. One wonders
> how many SSB users would move into a subband with a 50 watt power
> limit and a bunch of weird sounding signals.
>
> > Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by > > using the
> > entire sub-band.

I would think that SS would be allowed to hop 80-40-15M. I
hope the idea is not to fashion the mode to fit the
YaComWood SSB gear just to accommodate or sell more of them.

>
> Would there be any advantage considering how little spreading would
> actually take place?

73,
Clay N4AOX

2219. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 02:54:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020423225435.01774.00001924@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41538

In article <1uuacukp0661rmb9tqc0bgk5ainm48hqsa@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>I do miss her though. In a ng, where she can't really dictate what
>people say by beating them over the head with misinterpreted FCC
>rules, she was quite funny.

Bob:

Yeah, Kim did cause a lot of guffaws! Now Brian will have to pull
double-duty.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2220. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 02:54:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020423225435.01774.00001923@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41539

In article <aa3h1g21lo7@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>
>Even though a few idiots would not care, I believe you will be missed. Take
>some time to cool off before ya make a rash decision.
>--
>Ryan, KC8PMX
>FF/MFR

Ryan:

This is at least the third time Kim has "left" the newsgroup with
essentially the same complaints. Trust me, she'll be back.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2221. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 02:54:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020423225436.01774.00001925@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41544

In article <3cc3758a_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

[Kim's tiresome whine mercifully deleted]

>I will no longer participate in this newsgroup and am actually seriously
>considering dropping ham radio altogether.

Kim:

We've all heard THAT before!

>While this newsgroup is
>insignificant in terms of being representative of ham radio,

Don't look now, Kim (oh, yeah, you said you wouldn't -- riiiiiight), but
this newsgroup is NOT ham radio -- it's just ABOUT ham radio.

>I have no
>passion for a hobby in which people enjoy nothing but constant challenges
>with each other--and it seems to be that more than anything else lately.

You have just provided a very accurate and realistic definition of one of the
many functions of a Usenet newsgroup. It just so happens that this
newsgroup serves the "constant challenge" function much better than most.

>Perhaps the FCC is a governmental business,

Perhaps?

>but the people have decided that
>the ARS is a proving ground for how much more important one is than the
>other; rather than the supposed "fraternity" to which many endear the hobby.
>If a fraternity means constant hazing, then leave me out.

Fine, you're left out, then -- but that's YOUR choice. Nobody here is
pushing you out the door, but I will, at the end of this message, give you
my standard warning about said door!

>This is my last post, my last time to logon to the newsgroup.

Uh Hunh. Right. I see. I've got to remember to save this for two years
from now, when the "…one step closer to extinction" thread is once
again dominating the newsgroup headers!

>So, any
>responses will truly not be seen by me.

Except for all the ones you look at.

>If you plan to make them for my
>benefit, then you may as well not bother. You brothers have probably been
>at it for years, and you'll probably be at it for many more.

That's right. We'll be "at it" as long as we like -- and people like you
will continue to come and go. Life goes on with or without you, Kim,
particularly in rrap.

>This recent exchange, and the fact that tempers can flare so very much as to
>threaten each other personally really concerns me.

Who "threatened" anyone personally, Kim?

>I hope you will all
>fight your strongest fights, blare your loudest words, but leave out
>personal affronts and assaults toward personal lives...that is way, way too
>much folks. And, trade the semantics for real issues, huh? You all scare
>me when you act like that.

We "scare" you when we discuss real issues, Kim? My, you scare
way too easily!

> Goodbye.

See ya. Wouldn't wanna be ya.

And, BTW, Kim: Don't let the door hit you in the ass on your way out!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2222. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 02:54:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020423225437.01774.00001926@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41543

In article <7P3x8.9341$3x2.261599679@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> I'm one of the few drivers who doesn't. Most of the more senior
>> drivers are real "overtime bandits," virtually doubling their income
>> on OT. This job pays well enough that I can live without OT, though
>> I do volunter a few hours every week to help out when needed. Last
>> year I worked over 500 hrs. of OT due to not having enough
>> seniority to get a "regular" run. Glad that's not a problem anymore.
>
>We had a prison Nurse who earned more in overtime than the Governor did in
>salary. BTW, people are being laid off in Ohio because of a "bad economy."
>
>> >Like I don't have enough to do already, what with
>> >having to count out my AF pension every month, and storing all the excess
>> >cash in a foot locker.
>>
>> Gee Brian, I put mine in a mutual fund. Pays better interest than
>> a foot locker.
>
>Name it. Mutual Funds pay dividends and capital gains, not interest.

Brian:

Right -- which is why I'm about to give up on doing my own taxes.

>> >> BTW, I'm on Jury Duty for the next two weeks, so why don't you
>> >> go ahead and make fun of that as well?
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> >
>> >Hey pal, you're the one making fun of how much I used to make.
>>
>> Hey, you were the one who raised the subject.
>
>Backtrack and see who asked what.

I never do that. Let someone else Google me if they want to waste
their time.

>> >BTW, you'll never make it into a court room unless you say absolutely
>> >nothing, hide your military background, and never let on that you've even
>> >heard of Rush Limbo.
>>

>> I'm not going to tell them anything that they don't specifically inquire
>> about. And I'm reasonably sure my status as a veteran, and the fact
>> that I occasionally listen to Rush Limbaugh wouldn't really matter.
>
>It will. Just keep silent on the matter.

As it turns out, the court has dismissed my Jury Group for the rest
of the week. Tomorrow it's back to being a Special Passenger Lift-
Adapted Transit Omnibus Operator.

>> If
>> it did, they'd have a pretty tough getting any jurors around here, in a
>> city where 1/3 the population is military or has working ties to Dover
>> AFB.
>
>Air Force officers fit their bill. Biggest bunch of Libs since the
>temperance union.

Air Force "officers" were notably absent from my Jury group. Out
of at least 40 of us, I was only one of two who bothered to show up
wearing a coat and tie! The rest looked like something the cat
dragged in -- definitely not "officer" material.

>> >73 and good luck getting picked.
>>
>> Just called the recording at the court, my group doesn't have to
>> report tomorrow. So I'll have to wait until Tuesday to see if I
>> "get picked."
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>I'm keeping my fingers crossed for you.

Well, don't uncross them until Friday at 4 PM EDT. My group has
been excused for the rest of the week, and that's when I'll know about
next Monday.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2223. Re: I apologize to KE3Z....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 02:54:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020423225438.01774.00001927@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41540

In article <20020423063059.07210.00004290@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>> I won't venture a guess as to what you truly are, as I am
>>trying my best to maintain a civil strain on the newsgroup.
>
>I don't think that calling someone worse than a twit is being civil.
>Obviously
>you are not trying hard enough to be civil to succeed at it.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Yes, Ed, that could be so. Guess I need to keep trying.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2224. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 02:54:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020423225438.01774.00001928@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41542

In article <ec4x8.9363$k83.262976822@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Your quote didn't prove your case "against" me, either. You accused
>> me of calling Ed an ARRL shill in "each and every post" I make in this
>> newsgroup. So, go ahead, prove it!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Larry, its taken for granted that in every post you think Ed an ARRL schill.
>Disprove it.

Brian:

There's no point in my trying to prove or disprove anything, because you'll believe exactly what you want to believe. You always look to see the worst in me, because you've decided you're going to occupy the popular, politically-correct side of any argument WRT the dumbing-down of the ARS -- mainly because this dumbing-down benefits you, personally. You're a classic sycophant, Brian, and I have absolutely nothing to "prove" to you, Kim, or anyone like either of you. If the things I post here are causing you heartburn, then they are having the desired effect. Thanks for the validation.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2225. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 02:54:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020423225439.01774.00001929@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41541

In article <ze4x8.9368$Va3.263075243@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> That parenthetical (Ed) was not part of Kim's original post -- you
>obviously
>> doctored the quote. You lose. End of Story.
>
>Actually Larry, you lose. You have a "profile" and its just as Kim says.
>You have to undo it, not her.
>
>73, Brian

Brian:

What "profile" would that be? Oh, just because I'm not eagerly accepting of the dumbing-down process which is ruining amateur radio, and I'm not warmly, "inclusively," and politically-correctly welcoming all the newly-minted new dumbed-down hams into the ARS, you whine about my "profile." Fine. Have at it. Be a wimp. It suits you, I'm sure.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2226. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 03:25:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC625A1.A36968A1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41545

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> How many stars were on the flag when the wallpaper was issued? Brian

48 - Does his WAS still count?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2227. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 03:27:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC62633.E93A69EF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41546

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CC5D446.A9D43F0E@IEEE.org...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
> > > fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
> > >
> > > If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
> >
> > Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
>
> Microphones turn on and off.

More correctly - the microphone switch turns on and off and is
indeed digital.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2228. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 04:39:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424003916.09508.00004841@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 41547

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/23/02 15:36 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020423153625.22569.00001077@mb-fg.aol.com>

>I don't understand why any amateur organization hasn't asked for
>more spectrum space in the MF-HF region...or even below MF.
>The UK got a "lowfer" band, below the US' 160-190 KHz open
>territory for unlicensed emitters

Someone has not been paying attention...again.

>I get the feeling that everyone must pay homage (and time-tithe)
>to the grande old legacy mode of OOK CW...so much so that it
>has become a negative incentive to experimentation

You get that feeling because you don't take your laxitives like you
should. The rest of us feel fine.

Sheesh..whatta Putz.

Steve

2229. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 05:04:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE65AB6.F3145466@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41548

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> Why do you insist on taking opportunities for unwarranted, gratuitous
> shots at Bill Cross?

There's nothing gratuitous about it. It's pure realism. Cross calls the shots at FCC for the ARS. Why wouldn't you lobby him for what you want? Why would he want to expose himself to your criticism as a "backward Luddite"?

>
> Frankly, I haven't had a chance or a reason to talk to Bill in a while
> now. And I certainly haven't spoken to him on this subject ... NOR
> have I been "played to" by him ...

Of course not, the R&O has been finalized for over two years now. The damage was done long ago.

>
> As Hans pointed out, the FCC was pretty direct in its message
> to start using newer technologies

Since Cross *IS* the the FCC as far as the ARS is concerned, and you made your point up close and personal long ago, so what? You've pretty well demonstrated what he'd face under any other result.

> ... in the R&O ... and I haven't
> had anyone from the FCC contact me about "When are you guys
> going to get on with it?" since the R&O came out.

SO? His point was made, and most likely you pretty well authored it. He's intelligent enough to know what kind of a person he's dealing with. Consider how you've treated me based on my support of CW. He knows what he'd face if he chose any other route. You think he'd want you shouting at his superiors about what a Luddite he is should he even hint at keeping a code qualification? Or NOT insisting on all hams jumping onto the technology bandwagon?

Are you dense enough to believe that technology doesn't have serious positive impact on the socalled Legacy modes as well? It really might help if you spent some time on the air actually using some of them other than SSB. Technology isn't lost on all but the users of the latest modes. Wise up.

>
> The ball is in OUR court now. What's expected has been laid out
> for us ... if we don't meet the challenge, I fear that there will be a
> price to pay.

Yeah, you laid your plans pretty well, that's clear enough. The "price" will be paid, regardless. When commercial activity wants and needs amateur spectrum,

they will get it. Maybe we'll get replacement space for some of it, maybe not. Nothing new there, been that way since the days of "200 meters and down". It's just that now there is a "reason" for it that can be pointed to as "justification" when the true justification is the commercial need. The old "we told you so" routine that plays very well into your Agenda. The needs and desires of the ham radio community are thrust aside like so much chaff - By the likes of you and all whom you influence to go along.

This whole thing about "hams have GOT to move to new technologies" is ludicrous on its face. While the FCC has bent over backwards to draw into the ARS every soul with the most mild interest of any sort, largely with little or NO technical interest required, two of their ham-employees (probably the most knowledgeable of those presently there on ARS issues), seem to insist that hams abandon the modes that fit so well into what most hams enjoy doing and instead move toward systems which no one can even define in terms of how, what, who or why. The "why" may be the most important question, and the only answer forthcoming is "because commercials have abandoned the modes hams like to use". No need for relief from spectrum congestion on HF can be shown, in fact there are often wide open empty spaces in most bands. VHF and UHF are even more sparsely populated, despite the full load of (mostly very quiet) repeater pair assignments. It's all a tempest in a very cool teapot and I get the sense the only people very excited are the Carl Stevensons.

> > When Carl and his cadre finally turn ham radio into a glorified
> > trunked cell phone service
>
> First, you clearly don't understand ANY of what I've suggested in the
> past ... (but that doesn't surprise me at all).
>

Bullshit. What you want has been made abundantly clear. By you. You want nothing to do with anything less than domination of the future of the ARS. *LOTS* of us aren't buying it.

>
> > I and a whole lot more hams will just abandon ship. I already have a
> > cellphone. It's very useful but not very interesting.
>
> Secondly, it's abundantly clear that you are TOTALLY lacking in any
> vision for the future that extends beyond what you're comfortable with
> from the past ...
>

I find it very novel that you profess great digital things for the future of the ARS while engaging in a feast of HF SSB while I, the guy "living in the past", am busily working many of the new (and older) digital modes with gusto. Seems like you're another "do as I say, not as I do" sort, and justify it all predicated entirely on the fact that I believe that a ham radio operator owes it to his hobby to learn to use radiotelegraphy, radio's most basic mode. This is all really very revealing.

So what we have is more bullshit from the alleged techie who himself has a microphone stuck in his face. I challenge you to show where you've involved yourself in amateur digital modes in any meaningful way. Bullshit on rrap doesn't count. My HF digital activity goes way back, beyond the early packet days to RTTY on a mechanical model 15 followed by a Commodore Vic 20 with an AIR-1 module (the latest thing at the time), through PACTOR, CLOVER and more lately a number of sound card modes. And yours? All we've seen from you so far is "most of DXCC on SSB...."

>
> Why don't you just get out of the way and let the rest of the world
> move forward?

So far all you've moved is your mouth.

2230. Re: FCC Requires Positioning Coordinates?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 09:15:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204240115.1a300e00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41549

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:<PfSs8.2739$T_7.1192280264@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> I don't know how many of you go to www.QRZ.com, but when you lookup a
> callsign in their database, it indicates coordinates of the location. Does
> anyone know how they figure what these coordinates are and how accurate.
> I'm wondering if the FCC requires or mandates it, or if QRZ just adds it
> based on the address of the applicant.
>
> Lars
>
>
Even the $30 consumer mapping programs like MS Streets and Delorme
Streets USA will calculate the coordinates of an address right down to
the seconds plus one decimal place level of precision. Click on your
home location and then click on the mower shed in your back yard and
the coordinates change. Scary.
>
>
w3rv

2231. RRe: FCC Requires Positioning Coordinates?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 10:07:47 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Ttvx8.47806$QC1.3389563@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41550

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0204240115.1a300e00@posting.google.com...
> "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:<PfSs8.2739$T_7.1192280264@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> > I don't know how many of you go to www.QRZ.com, but when you lookup a
> > callsign in their database, it indicates coordinates of the location.
Does
> > anyone know how they figure what these coordinates are and how
accurate.
> > I'm wondering if the FCC requires or mandates it, or if QRZ just adds
it
> > based on the address of the applicant.
> >
> > Lars
> >
> >
> Even the $30 consumer mapping programs like MS Streets and Delorme
> Streets USA will calculate the coordinates of an address right down to
> the seconds plus one decimal place level of precision. Click on your
> home location and then click on the mower shed in your back yard and
> the coordinates change. Scary.
> >
> >
> w3rv

If you pull me up on QRZ, the map does an admirable job of finding the
postoffice; I am not even on the map. It's zip-based from a rather buggy
Federal file. Been there, done that many years ago and spent more time
getting parts of WI out of Lake Michigan than doing much that was useful
with it.

Big Kahuna, NBK

2232. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 10:23:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424062358.20540.00003466@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 41401

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3c@fast.net

>Whoa ... going in the wrong direction again ... how about like SS
>100W max, anything over 1W requires APC ???

The only real effect of that rule in SS has been to ensure that hams do not use more than 1 watt on SS.

I don't think that the need for automatic power control has been established. IMHO, those capable of devising modes so new that they are not covered by existing rules should have no problem at all doing what the present rules require of all amateur communications -- manually adjusting the power level to the minimum necessary to achieve the desired communication.

And the old "I desire to be loud" ploy doesn't cut it. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2233. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 10:26:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424062649.20540.00003467@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 41402

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> Be a wimp. It suits you, I'm sure.

Is this another uncivil example? I read this as personally insulting --
something considered as uncivil by most parents of small children.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2234. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 10:29:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424062920.20540.00003468@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 41403

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>There's nothing gratuitous about it. It's pure realism. Cross calls the
>shots at FCC for the ARS. Why wouldn't you lobby him for what you
>want? Why would he want to expose himself to your criticism as a
>"backward Luddite"?

Are you saying that the threat of calling FCC staffers "Luddites" is all that
is necessary for people to win their way in the regulatory arena?

If so, I disagree.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2235. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 11:20:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424072050.08742.00000575@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41406

In article <3cc5c19c_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020422140818.13688.00000947@mb-da.aol.com...
>> In article <L2Kw8.21$iQ5.6675@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
>> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>> >> Now just allow all non-analog-voice modes and the thing will fly.
>> >
>> >I think that would pull the heart right out of the idea.
>>
>> I don't.
>
>Hans ... unless I misread Jim, he said all NON-analog-voice modes.
>I read that as disallowing conventional SSB/AM/FM, but allowing
>new digital voice modes ...

Yup. It also allows modes that are both - say, a mode that permits simultaneous
digivoice and data.
>
>I think you guys may actually be on the same page, at least partially.
>
>> >How can I propose
>> >a "Experimentation Reservation" and then tolerate the use of decades-old
>> >technology on that reservation?
>>
>> Several reasons:
>>
>> 1) It simplifies the rules (no need to decide and specify what is allowed
>and
>> what is not). That's a BIG deal to the FCC
>>
>> 2) It does not push away anyone who is currently there.
>>
>> 3) It will be supported by far more hams. (Political reality being what it
>is,
>> an idea that gathers lots of support has a better chance than one that has
>> almost no support).
>>
>> 4) It will allow coordination of on-air experiments by the use of old
>modes.
>> This is very important - how do I figure out where the problem is if I am

>> forced to use ONLY the new, experimental mode if the new mode doesn't work
>> right away?
>
>Good point to some extent ...

How is it not a good point? Users of existing modes can always go outside the
subbands.
>
>> 5) It sets a bad precedent by banning certain widely-used modes from some
>> spectrum where they are currently legal today.
>> Not a good idea.
>>
>> 6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned unless
>there
>> is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).
>>
>> --
>>
>> A simple question:
>>
>> Do you think the presence of a few amateur signals using "decades old
>> technology" will be a problem for those hams who want to try out new modes
>in
>> the subbands?
>>
>> I don't.
>>
>> Anybody else?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I think that in the small sub-bands we're talking about, it may well be
>that,
>with elimination of unnecessary data rate/bandwidth restrictions, some
>mode may use the entire sub-band ... having a few amateur signals using
>"legacy" modes in the sub-band could serve as a handy source of
>interference to prove robustness ... perhaps they should be allowed, but
>not afforded ANY claim to protection from interference from experimental
>modes? (just a thought, looking for a way forward ...)

I don't know how such nonprotection could be phrased in the rules, but the
basic idea is that the subbands are meant to be a testing ground for just such
issues. The users of existing modes can always move outside the subbands, but
the experimenters can't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2236. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 11:20:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424072052.08742.00000576@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41405

In article <3cc5d3b1_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020422201849.27399.00000737@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <rMZw8.1973$iM5.154460@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"K0HB"
>> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>>
>> Actually, most practical radio signals are "analog" in the sense that they
>are
>> bunches of sine waves.
>> The digital part is in how modulation and coding are done.
>
>True for the most part ...

Even I know about convolution and superposition....;-)
>
>> >> My read on 98-143 is that FCC wants simple regs that are easily
>> >> enforced and widely supported.
>
>True ...

So we have to be careful not to load up proposals with too much detail.
>
>> >>The only part of your revised proposal
>> >> that is complex is the definition of what constitutes a new,
>> >> experimental mode and what doesn't.
>
>Also generally true, but there are some issues that need
>a bit more meat on the bones in order to avoid "unintended
>consequences" sorts of problems ...

Alright - like what?
>
>> >> Eliminate that part and it becomes a shoo-in.
>
>I'm not sure I'd go THAT far, but I think it does have promise,
>if presented to the Commission properly.

Which is why I present it here as a work in progress.
>
>> Maybe we're missing the obvious.
>>
>> The rules today prohibit US hams from using "analog voice modes" (full
>carrier

>> DSB AM, DSB suppressed carrier, SSB, and all flavors of FM) from the
>subbands
>> in question. Spark was prohibited in 1927 (although a Canadian ham
>actually got
>> permission to put a special event spark rig on the air for the 100th
>> anniversary of Marconi's transatlantic S).
>>
>> Just leave those rules in place as they are today.
>>
>> The really big change is 3), below.
>>
>> All that needs to be done is:
>>
>> 1) Allow all hams who have passed a code test to use CW/Morse on all MF/HF
>> amateur frequencies now allowed to Generals, using no more than 200 W.
>
>At least until after WRC-03 ... then we can drop the code test part :-)

I'm talking about right now. The ideas for post-WRC-2003 were presented in
another thread. We can go to that subject too, if you want.
>
>> 2) Power limit of all rigs in the subbands to be 200 W if automatic power
>> control is employed, 50 W without power control.
>
>The numbers may be considered arbitrary without some justification.

I don't really care about power levels as long as they are adequate to bust the
summer noise levels on 80 meters and the SWBC on 40 with less-than-ideal
antennas. The idea of one power level for APC rigs and another for non-APC rigs
is to allow the use of typical ham gear but also to reward the use of APC rigs.

>Don't
>get me wrong ... I *like* the idea of automatically inforcing the minimum
>power
>rule ... however, consider that the max limit for SS in 70 cm and up is
>100W,
>but for over 1W you must use APC ... that's a big difference from 50 W.

That's because SS may be overlaid on top of existing narrowband users. In the
"experimental farm", the whole purpose of the subband is experimentation with
'new' modes.
>
>> 3) The limitations on data/symbol rate and occupied bandwidth of data
>modes
>> used by hams on HF do not apply in those subbands, except that signals not
>in
>> compliance with those rules must stay entirely inside the subbands.
>
>To what extent? (Need to specify how many dB down at sub-band
>edges, or something similar ...)

To the same extent as today for other modes. Example: When operating USB on the high end of 20, or CW at the low end of 10, or anyplace near a band or subband edge, what do the regs say about keeping the sidebands completely inside the band/subband? Same rules apply in the experimental subbands.
>
>>The
>> encoding and modulation schemes must be publicly available, same as today.
>> "Data modes" include digitized voice and image.
>>
>> That's all. Simple and easy to implement. Nobody loses. The STA hassle is
>> eliminated - just send the FCC an email and publish your latest PBI on a
>> website.

I gotta play that part (less paperwork) up in the proposal.
>>
>> --
>>
>> While the proposed regulations would not require it, hams trying out new
>modes
>> would be well-advised to include an auto ID in Morse or some other easily
>> recognized and copied mode so that "tuners-by" could determine who they
>are
>> hearing, and look up how to decode the weird-sounding noises. But this is
>in
>> the realm of gentleman's agreement, not the rules.
>
>There are other ways of IDing as well ...

Which is why I wrote:

"auto ID in Morse or some other easily recognized and copied mode"

>I would not limit it to Morse.

Which is why I wrote:

"auto ID in Morse or some other easily recognized and copied mode"

>(In general, I would venture that any "tuner-by" sufficiently technically
>inclined to want to get involved could recognize and decode other
>methods of IDing ... such as PSK31 or whatever ...

Without a decoding device? ;-)

The whole point of the auto-ID (which, please note, would NOT be required by the regs at all) is to clue in tuners-by - any tuners-by, not just the technically inclined. Knowing the callsign, anyone interested could find out how to decode the rest of the signal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2237. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 11:20:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424072053.08742.00000577@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41404

In article <3cc60174$1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0204230927.4e91e233@posting.google.com...
>> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
>news:<20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com>...
>>
>> > Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by using
>the
>> > entire sub-band.
>>
>> Would there be any advantage considering how little spreading would
>> actually take place?
>
>If the data rates were REALLY low, you could still get some reasonable
>processing gain. If you used a 12.5 kHz spreading sequence, the bw
>(clock null to clock null) would be 25 kHz ... if you only wanted 1 bps
>data rate, the process gain would be about 44 dB ... with implementation
>losses of 2 dB and a S/N requirement of, say 14 dB for a decent BER, you
>could get a theoretical jamming margin of 28 dB ... in other words, the
>system
>could tolerate an on-channel jammer as much as 28 dB stronger than the
>desired
>signal.

An on-channel jammer with the same spreading sequence or an on channel jammer
that is just a carrier, or a carrier with narrow sidebands?
>
>On the other hand, if you wanted 10 bps data rate, the processing gain would
>be
>10 dB lower and you'd "only" have 18 dB of jamming margin.
>
>Assuming ASCII at 10 bits/character, just for the sake of argument, that
>would be
>60 characters minute, or about 12 wpm ...

In a band 25 kHz wide?
>
>How many people can copy a CW signal at 12 wpm with another signal 18 dB
>stronger right on top of it???

If the desired signal CW is 25 kHz wide and the 18 dB undesired signal is a
carrier, and the receiver has a notch filter, I'd say pretty much anyone who
can copy 12 wpm Morse can do it.

> (And with that much process gain, you could
>have
>more than one signal operating in the same spectrum using CDMA separation,
>as long as the spreading sequences were good in terms of correlation
>properties.)
>
Sure. Which is one of the reasons for the whole "experimental farm" idea. Give hams a place to work out PBIs without lots of regs and paperwork. Those who don't want to deal with all the strange signals merely move outside the subband.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2238. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 11:53:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE6BA7C.1880BD46@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41407

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >There's nothing gratuitous about it. It's pure realism. Cross calls the
> >shots at FCC for the ARS. Why wouldn't you lobby him for what you
> >want? Why would he want to expose himself to your criticism as a
> >"backward Luddite"?
>
> Are you saying that the threat of calling FCC staffers "Luddites" is all that
> is necessary for people to win their way in the regulatory arena?
>
> If so, I disagree.

That's your right. But if you don't believe that's a factor worthy of much consideration, it would be because you haven't seen it happen or prefer to ignore the likelihood that it might. Would YOU want Carl hounding you?
Cross is said to be a CW operator who likes DX. All the more reason why he "must be careful to avoid any appearance" of allowing his personal preferences to show up in his work.
That automatically would (in the view of one who displays such a personal aversion to Morse code) set him up for just such a charge. The result is pretty well a forgone conclusion, regardless.

Let me be very clear-the advancement of technology in ham radio is a forgone conclusion. Just as is the fact that we WILL lose portions of our spectrum as the need for it by other services grows. It's as inevitable as the rising sun, always has been. In the past FCC has done an outstanding job of providing us with the use of spectrum that was largely sitting idle for our use while it sits idle, to the point that we have become accustomed to considering all 'our' spectrum that isn't covered by international allocations to amateurs, as ours forever. It is not and never was, past the time when it is needed for other services. Many hams don't seem to understand this. Portions of the 430-450 mhz band is an example. Sure, we don't want to lose any of it, but I see it as almost inevitable. The demand by other services is too great.

One more point- the modes hams use today have evolved over time, assisted by advances in technology, to the point that most of them are very well suited to the uses that hams make of them. Some modes and systems are efficient and some are not, such as the VHF/UHF repeater allocations, and should be revised toward more efficient uses. Others, such as SSB, CW and most of the digital modes in use, do just fine. That doesn't mean that further development isn't desirable nor that it should not be continued. But so far no one has shown any valid reason why hams should be lining up to dump everything they've grown to like and that works so well for them in favor of somebody's vague notions of "the way things

should be because I know how to do it and I KNOW it should be" that way.

There are good reasons why commercial concerns have developed the methods they use. Besides the obvious financial benefits of more automatic communications which eliminate staff positions, the efficiencies involved are clear. When communications needs can be met with far less power consumption by modes that operate well in noisy environments it would be folly to NOT adopt them. Such efficiencies are not nearly as important and are not primary to ham radio operators daily activities. The lame mantra that "if we don't adopt the efficient modes the commercials have (or even develop better ones) ham radio will be falling down on its basis and purpose" is so much nonsense. That's ONE of the bases, but by no means the main reason for our existence. And this does not mean that we should not be moving in the direction of better efficiencies, nor that we are not moving in that direction. We are. There has always been a core of radio experimenters, developers, and engineer-hams who engage in that sort of activity as hams, often to the near-exclusion of all other, as that is their main interest in ham radio. Their work almost always comes into the hobby, frequently resulting in considerable changes to our modes and methods *over time*. But to say that it is inevitable that we "must" do what the commercials do, as has been so often done, borders on the idiotic.

2239. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 12:23:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204240423.6895fb11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41408

Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3CC60B45.DDF7907A@worldnet.att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> > > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > >
> > > >I don't think many non-experimenters will move into those subbands.
> > >
> > > If the band is open to SSB, SSB will move in pretty quickly.
> >
> > Which is why both Hans' and my proposals disallow analog voice modes.
>
> I rather like the idea of "here are your subbands, have a
> nice day", with some indirect sanctions on QRO SSB and AM,
> by way of severe limits on power in the 2 to 10 KHz range.

Well, that's one way to do it, but it would also put wide
data/digivoice modes at a disadvantage, which is not the idea at all.

> Fencing out SSB as a mode by definition is not the
> libertarian thing to do and could be regarded as elitist
> (how about some help here Cecil?).

Plain ol' voice AM, SSB and FM are already fenced out of those
subbands. Just leave those rules in place as they are.
>
> > It could probably be sorted out by the use of the standard mode
> > designators.
> >
> > > The real question
> > > is whether digital signals can coexist with them and vice versa.
> >
> > Interesting point. Maybe it should be a true free-for-all. One wonders
> > how many SSB users would move into a subband with a 50 watt power
> > limit and a bunch of weird sounding signals.
> >
> > > Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by > > using the
> > > entire sub-band.
>
> I would think that SS would be allowed to hop 80-40-15M.

I see no reason various flavors of FHSS and ALE stuff couldn't do that
under the proposed regs.

> I
> hope the idea is not to fashion the mode to fit the
> YaComWood SSB gear just to accommodate or sell more of them.

The simple truth is that most (not all) new modes on the ham bands
will be "soundcard and shareware" developments. That's why PSK31 leapt
to the fore so fast.

(Besides me, how many hams do you know who have designed and built
complete homebrew non-QRP HF ham stations in the past 10 years?)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2240. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 12:42:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC6A84A.4727C210@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41409

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > First, you clearly don't understand ANY of what I've suggested in the
> > past ... (but that doesn't surprise me at all).
>
> Bullshit. What you want has been made abundantly clear. By you. You want
> nothing to do with anything less than domination of the future of the ARS.
> *LOTS* of us aren't buying it.

Dick, sounds like *you* want to dominate the future of the ARS.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2241. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 12:53:08 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC6AAB6.1E19EE38@psu.edu>
Source record: 41410

Why wouldn't it?

- mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > How many stars were on the flag when the wallpaper was issued? Brian
>
> 48 - Does his WAS still count?

2242. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 13:58:49 UTC
From: "Stephen C. Robbins" <srobbinsNOSPAMDUDES@netacc.net>
Message-ID: <3cc6b9fd$1@news.netacc.net>
Source record: 41411

>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3cc3758a_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > A recent outburst here has evoked in me a rash of thoughts to consider
all
> > day. I download this newsgroup, for whatever reason, each evening and
> know
> > full well there is nothing of any substance on it, certainly nothing
that
> > interests me.
> >
> > I allow myself to be engaged by reprehensible thoughts from
reprehensible

The key words are "I allow myself"

It is like wading in a cesspool and complaining you got your shoes dirty. The morning newspaper would tick me off if I didnt just ignore most of the drivel that is on certain pages. You do not read the newspaper letter for letter, article for article, so why do the same for newsgroups???

Use your readers features and you will find the newsgroups quite enjoyable. Use ignore and kill files to rid your view of the posters who have nothing to say or behave badly. Ignore whole threads that are magnets for these types of posters. One pathetic poster always uses the same phrase to open his flames (I think he has it in his clipboard or a template to paste from) and I kill any message with this phrase in it. That also kills the thousand responses to his flames since it is always quoted in the response. What you have left is some useable and interesting reading that will not waste too much of your time.

Some other tips for newsgroup peace... I never get angry when someone flames my posts. I put out my view and opinion and leave it to the intelligent readers to accept or reject. I never reply to a flame on the group though I may send a private email to open a discussion with an individual. Amazinly, these types usually never respond because there is no public attention which they so crave to stroke their egos and massage their feelings of inadequacies and self doubt. Besides, what is so sacred about my opinions and ideas that I should get upset if someone disagrees?

Later

Steve

2243. Re: Small Project Promotion of Ham Radio Begins!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 14:40:31 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ucdfsgb1fdsoaf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41412

K0HB wrote, about SETI:

>Here's another angle you might wish to incorporate.

We just may do that!

Val Germann
KC0MUB

2244. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 14:59:26 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <iLzx8.48119$QC1.3413737@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41413

Carl R. Stevenson, wk3c, axed:

> How'd we get up to 1500W from 200W???

That was cranked in by the ALE subsystem when that
megawatt SWBC station a kilohertz away from *your*
frequency on 40 meters began their broadcast day
with the playing of their national anthem as
rendered on authentic Chinese cymbals.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2245. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 15:03:51 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <rPzx8.1363$8p3.138444@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41414

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote

>
> Carl R. Stevenson, wk3c, axed:
>
> > How'd we get up to 1500W from 200W???
>
> That was cranked in by the ALE subsystem when that
> megawatt SWBC station a kilohertz away from *your*
> frequency on 40 meters began their broadcast day
> with the playing of their national anthem as
> rendered on authentic Chinese cymbals.
>

Yeah.... what Jim said!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2246. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 15:52:36 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc6d4e7_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41415

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424072053.08742.00000577@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <3cc60174$1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:9f4bfe89.0204230927.4e91e233@posting.google.com...
> >> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
> >news:<20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> > Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by using
> >the
> >> > entire sub-band.
> >>
> >> Would there be any advantage considering how little spreading would
> >> actually take place?
> >
> >If the data rates were REALLY low, you could still get some reasonable
> >processing gain. If you used a 12.5 kHz spreading sequence, the bw
> >(clock null to clock null) would be 25 kHz ... if you only wanted 1 bps
> >data rate, the process gain would be about 44 dB ... with implementation
> >losses of 2 dB and a S/N requirement of, say 14 dB for a decent BER, you
> >could get a theoretical jamming margin of 28 dB ... in other words, the
> >system
> >could tolerate an on-channel jammer as much as 28 dB stronger than the
> >desired
> >signal.
>
> An on-channel jammer with the same spreading sequence or an on channel
jammer
> that is just a carrier, or a carrier with narrow sidebands?

A CW carrier or something close in b/w ... a CW carrier is the "best" jammer
against a DSSS system ... because it is spread the least by the despreading
in the receiver ... wider signals will be spread even more, thus less of
their
energy will fall in the despread b/w of the receiver.

> >
> >On the other hand, if you wanted 10 bps data rate, the processing gain
would
> >be
> >10 dB lower and you'd "only" have 18 dB of jamming margin.
> >

> >Assuming ASCII at 10 bits/character, just for the sake of argument, that
> >would be
> >60 characters minute, or about 12 wpm ...
>
> In a band 25 kHz wide?

That's the spread bandwith, which gives a processing gain of 34 dB and
a jamming margin of 18 dB.

Carl - wk3c

2247. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 17:07:06 UTC
From: K0CKB <k0ckb@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <_CBx8.1591$8p3.154174@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41416

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Instead of squabbling over sub-dividing the already sub-divided
> narrow bands on HF, why not just propose a whole new band
> for nothing but experimentation IN ADDITION to the narrow bands
> already in place?
>

I think HB's notion of a little slice out of each of several bands is a much
better idea.

CKB

This lecture brought to you free by K0CKB, who that hopes you
are not offended by anything you read, inferred, assumed, presumed
or otherwise guessed I might have possibly meant as demeaning -
unless of course you are personally a humorless nitwit who WANTS
to be insulted. In which case be my guest.

2248. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 17:33:18 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cc6ec80_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41417

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE65AB6.F3145466@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>
> > Why do you insist on taking opportunities for unwarranted, gratuitous
> > shots at Bill Cross?
>
> There's nothing gratuitous about it. It's pure realism. Cross calls the
shots
> at FCC for the ARS. Why wouldn't you lobby him for what you want? Why
> would he want to expose himself to your criticism as a "backward Luddite"?

I think that Bill knows that I respect him more than to make
such absurd allegations about him. Additionally, I think he
knows that I'm smarter than to insult and offend regulatory
officials who make our rules.

> > Frankly, I haven't had a chance or a reason to talk to Bill in a while
> > now. And I certainly haven't spoken to him on this subject ... NOR
> > have I been "played to" by him ...
>
> Of course not, the R&O has been finalized for over two years now. The
damage
> was done long ago.

WHAT "damage"??? Show us ONE shred of evidence of any
"damage" that has occurred as a result of the 1999 R&O ...

> > As Hans pointed out, the FCC was pretty direct in its message
> > to start using newer technologies
>
> Since Cross *IS* the the FCC as far as the ARS is concerned, and you
made
> your point up close and personal long ago, so what?

Bill is one staffer in WTB ... he has quite a few layers of
management between himself and the Commissioners, ALL
of whom need to be "sold" on any proposals before they
become rules ... in that sense it's an exaggeration to claim
that Bill "*IS*" the FCC ...

> You've pretty well
> demonstrated what he'd face under any other result.

What the hell are YOU talking about? YOU'RE the one
who keeps insulting the guy, not me ... I have nothing but
respect for him ... which is WAY more than I can say for
you.

> > ... in the R&O ... and I haven't
> > had anyone from the FCC contact me about "When are you guys
> > going to get on with it?" since the R&O came out.
>
> SO? His point was made, and most likely you pretty well authored it.

ROTFLMAO! Now you're asserting that I'm his "ghost writer"???
Now that's REALLY funny!!!!!!!!

> He's intelligent enough to know what kind of a person he's dealing with.

Yes, Dick, I figure he'd peg you as "clueless" pretty quickly ...

> > The ball is in OUR court now. What's expected has been laid out
> > for us ... if we don't meet the challenge, I fear that there will be a
> > price to pay.
>
> Yeah, you laid your plans pretty well, that's clear enough. The "price"
will
> be paid, regardless. When commercial activity wants and needs amateur
spectrum,
> they will get it. Maybe we'll get replacement space for some of it, maybe
not.

Dick, I've seen the potential threats for years and have been constantly
pushing for modernization and growth in the ARS as means to combat
those threats ... I have always said "If we stay stuck in the past, we will
lose the value that we need to protect our allocations."

> Nothing new there, been that way since the days of "200 meters and down".

Now you're carping and bitter about things that happened before you were
born??? How ridiculous.

> It's just that now there is a "reason" for it that can be pointed to as
> "justification" when the true justification is the commercial need. The
old "we
> told you so" routine that plays very well into your Agenda. The needs and
> desires of the ham radio community are thrust aside like so much chaff -
By the
> likes of you and all whom you influence to go along.

Don't blame me for the reality that I've been pointing out for years. I
didn't
create it ... I just pointed it out in an attempt to get you ostriches to
pull
your darned heads out of the sand (or wherever else you'd had them buried).

> This whole thing about "hams have GOT to move to new technologies" is
ludicrous

> on its face.

No, it's NOT ... the more backward we become, on average, the less
value we provide to society in exchange for our allocations and the
privileges they provide ... again, I don't *make* the reality ... I just
point it out in hopes that some will see it and take the necessary action
to preserve the ARS ... I have NO delusions that you will ever be a
part of the solution, rather than a part of the problem.

[snip remainder of Dick's totally unfounded tirade against the FCC]

> > > When Carl and his cadre finally turn ham radio into a glorified
> > > trunked cell phone service
> >
> > First, you clearly don't understand ANY of what I've suggested in the
> > past ... (but that doesn't surprise me at all).
> >
>
> Bullshit. What you want has been made abundantly clear. By you. You want
> nothing to do with anything less than domination of the future of the ARS.
> *LOTS* of us aren't buying it.

I repeat ... you CLEARLY don't understand ANY of what I've in the
past ... (but that doesn't surprise me at all).

> > > I and a whole lot more hams will just abandon ship. I already have a
> > > cellphone. It's very useful but not very interesting.
> >
> > Secondly, it's abundantly clear that you are TOTALLY lacking in any
> > vision for the future that extends beyond what you're comfortable with
> > from the past ...
> >
>
> I find it very novel that you profess great digital things for the
future of
> the ARS while engaging in a feast of HF SSB while I, the guy "living in
the
> past", am busily working many of the new (and older) digital modes with
gusto.

Dick, you have no means of monitoring my operating habits or my
design and development activities.

What you DO have is a large propensity for running off at the
mouth about all sorts of things that you know ABSOLUTELY
NOTHING about.

> > Why don't you just get out of the way and let the rest of the world
> > move forward?
>
> So far all you've moved is your mouth.

You know nothing, Dick ... absolutely nothing.

Carl - wk3c

2249. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 17:35:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424133537.06459.00000828@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 41423

In article <4Wix8.1068$607.85083@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0CKB"
<k0ckb@arrl.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> The "other interested citizen" is your WIFE, isn't she?
>
>Yes, I am.

Oh, oh, here we go..."outraged wife" stuff again... :-)

>> If you are still on good terms, etc., in your marriage, then
>> it would seem quite normal that you two share the same
>> thoughts on many things, come to agreement on many
>> things.
>
>Then I'll take the liberty of submitting my thoughts to the
>FCC, with HB's (Heavenly Body) collaboration.

That's repetition, not an answer.

First of all, there's NO guarantee that this particular message
sender is really Colleen K. Brakob. There are limitations on
identification despite the "arrl.org" URL. :-)

>> That's hardly comparable to another "citizen" who
>> is not a family member.
>
>Your point?

NEPOTISM is still nepotism. It cannot be disguised by
vanity callsigns.

>HB is far too polite to you!

Do you both address each other in third-party terms?

Interesting.

2250. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 17:35:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424133538.06459.00000830@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 41418

In article <20020424062649.20540.00003467@mb-mn.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>> Be a wimp. It suits you, I'm sure.
>
>Is this another uncivil example? I read this as personally insulting --
>something considered as uncivil by most parents of small children.

...that's what specialists in paratransiting do...

2251. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 17:35:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424133538.06459.00000829@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 41419

In article <e4lx8.10348$iS6.287872065@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> No, Lennie....YOU keep making stupid mistakes that even relatively new
>> radio hobbyists know are dumb.
>
>How could he? He's never been on an amateur band that you are aware of.

A more basic question is regarding "awareness." Of anything.

:-)

2252. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 17:35:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424133538.06459.00000831@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 41421

In article <3CC62633.E93A69EF@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>> news:3CC5D446.A9D43F0E@IEEE.org...
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
>> > > fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
>> > >
>> > > If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
>> >
>> > Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
>>
>> Microphones turn on and off.
>
>More correctly - the microphone switch turns on and off and is
>indeed digital.

Sorry, the "microphone switch" is MANUAL. If you want it "digital"
then you have to have automatic carrier-control circuitry there
which can be either digital or analog.

If you had VOX it would be a combination of analog and digital with
analog predominating; no manual switch needed.

Color your 1 KHz today - Sine dye.

2253. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 17:35:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424133539.06459.00000832@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 41422

In article <sglx8.10355$Kv7.288796708@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CC5D446.A9D43F0E@IEEE.org...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
>> > fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
>> >
>> > If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
>>
>> Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Microphones turn on and off.

Some brains turn on and off, too. :-)

2254. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 17:35:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424133540.06459.00000833@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 41420

In article <3CC5D446.A9D43F0E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
>> fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
>>
>> If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
>
>Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.

Gosh, yes, Cecil. I'll TELEX Bill Gates on that right away, with
a carbon copy to Gordon Moore and Jack Kilby.

It's so nice of you to tell us that an itinerant portrait painter was
working on "digital electronics" as early as 1840. Thank you.

2255. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 17:51:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424135120.22643.00000677@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 41424

In article <_CBx8.1591$8p3.154174@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0CKB"
<k0ckb@arrl.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Instead of squabbling over sub-dividing the already sub-divided
>> narrow bands on HF, why not just propose a whole new band
>> for nothing but experimentation IN ADDITION to the narrow bands
>> already in place?
>
>I think HB's notion of a little slice out of each of several bands is a much
>better idea.
>
>CKB

And just WHY would that be, "CKB."

>This lecture brought to you free by K0CKB, who that hopes you
>are not offended by anything you read, inferred, assumed, presumed
>or otherwise guessed I might have possibly meant as demeaning -
>unless of course you are personally a humorless nitwit who WANTS
>to be insulted. In which case be my guest.

"Gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable." - HB

We can change "gentlemen" to "gentlewomen" or even
"gentlebeings" but that does not change the fact that the last
paragraph is simply snide, sarcastic, and unkind.

Over three years ago there was a minor discussion in this
newsgroup concerning amateur radio bandspace in the HF
region and the NTIA's projected 10-year spectrum occupany.
That survey included the fact that over 1 MHz of additional
bandspace had been requested by amateur radio on HF
(notations indicated an ARRL staffer comment as source).

Nothing whatsoever has been done in the interim by any
amateur radio group or individual in regards to enlarging any
bandspace on HF for amateurs.

Instead, there are the usual petty little squabbles over sub-
division or no sub-division of the existing narrow bands, plus
a lot of additional squabbling and name-calling (e.b., "nitwits").

No individual or group seems to have the guts to try for more
bandspace on HF. Everyone seems happy to sit within narrow
confines of band limits and throw pillows back and forth, then

pretend it is "battling for a just cause." Pfui.

Keep up the good pillow fighting.

2256. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 18:09:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC6F4D8.AF0BD7E2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41425

mike coslo wrote:
>
> Why wouldn't it?

Well, it fits into the all-HF-band discussion. If a Worked *ALL* States award is still good without all the states, why does "all-HF-band" have to include 17m?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2257. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 18:12:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204241012.6c2581b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41426

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<f45x8.9416$ox4.265898416@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020422140818.13688.00000947@mb-da.aol.com...
> > In article <L2Kw8.21$iQ5.6675@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
> > <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

> > >How can I propose
> > >a "Experimentation Reservation" and then tolerate the use of decades-old
> > >technology on that reservation?
> >
> > Several reasons:
> >
> > 1) It simplifies the rules (no need to decide and specify what is allowed
> and
> > what is not). That's a BIG deal to the FCC
> >
> > 2) It does not push away anyone who is currently there.
>
> That's what this is all about.. There's not currently anyone there. They
> abandoned it 15 years ago, at least.

When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
Or even on one of those bands?

> > 3) It will be supported by far more hams. (Political reality being what it
> is,
> > an idea that gathers lots of support has a better chance than one that has
> > almost no support).
>
> The ARRL tried the "poll" route.

I responded to that poll. Did you?

> Works for Bill Clinton, doesn't work for
> them.

The ARRL BoD developed an idea and presented it to the FCC. Hans has
developed a different idea and has done the same. I'm in the process
of developing a modification of Hans' idea.

What have you done in this area, Brian?

> They need to lead, not follow or take another poll. Or just get out
> of the way.

The ARRL BoD thinks giving lots more privs to Tech Pluses and Novices
is lead. They also think turning the Novice subbands over to 'phone is
leading. I agree with the first part but not the second.

What do you think?
>
> > 4) It will allow coordination of on-air experiments by the use of old
> modes.
> > This is very important - how do I figure out where the problem is if I am
> > forced to use ONLY the new, experimental mode if the new mode doesn't work
> > right away?
>
> Hey, good point. Is this anything like a State Department wire order CW
> line?

Yes and no.

> > 5) It sets a bad precedent by banning certain widely-used modes from some
> > spectrum where they are currently legal today.
> > Not a good idea.
>
> If we're talking about CW, why not just say so.

We're talking about many modes, not just CW.
>
> > 6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned unless
> there
> > is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).
>
> Planned obsolescense?

Planned obsolescence is only a good reason to those trying to sell new
rigs and accessories.
>
> > A simple question:
> >
> > Do you think the presence of a few amateur signals using "decades old
> > technology" will be a problem for those hams who want to try out new modes
> in
> > the subbands?
> >
> > I don't.
> >
> > Anybody else?
>
> Limit the decades old modes to Part 15 power levels.

The "decades old modes" include AM, FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, AMTOR and
even packet.

Tell ya what, Brian, you lead the way by running Part 15 power levels
for all your HF operating.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2258. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 18:13:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC6F5D0.E6C624B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41427

Len Over 21 wrote:
> It's so nice of you to tell us that an itinerant portrait painter was
> working on "digital electronics" as early as 1840. Thank you.

Dang Len, I knew you were old but I didn't know you were *that* old.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2259. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 18:49:48 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <g7Dx8.1742$8p3.166625@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41428

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> I don't understand why any amateur organization hasn't asked for
> more spectrum space in the MF-HF region...or even below MF.
> The UK got a "lowfer" band, below the US' 160-190 KHz open
> territory for unlicensed emitters.

Obviously the Old Sir has been too busy grinding his organ to notice the
various requests for such spectrum.

http://www.arrl.org/announce/lf-pet.pdf RM-9404

http://www.arrl.org/announce/regulatory/5MHz/ RM-10209

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2260. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 19:01:50 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC70120.5681B408@psu.edu>
Source record: 41429

It depends on if the 17 meter band was considered a band at the time of working all bands. Just like the states. Of course Alaska and Hawaii were not states in 1957. Was there a 17 meter band in effect when the person in question made the claim?

"Worked all bands" *could* possibly mean working citizens band and freeband too, just to throw another log on the fire.

- mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> >
> > Why wouldn't it?
>
> Well, it fits into the all-HF-band discussion. If a Worked *ALL* States award
> is still good without all the states, why does "all-HF-band" have to include
> 17m?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2261. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 20:24:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CC71461.F7CC79A2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41430

> >
> > Of course not, the R&O has been finalized for over two years now. The
> damage
> > was done long ago.
>
> WHAT "damage"??? Show us ONE shred of evidence of any
> "damage" that has occurred as a result of the 1999 R&O ...
>

The FCC itself noted that it has observed no "damage" to the
HF bands since restructuring happened, specifically the CW
test requirement. If anything, today's code tests are tougher
than the old ones, because the Farnsworth method is used
(high speed characters spaced at 5wpm). And they didn't
change the writtens except for the routine updates to the
question pools.

The mess that was on 14.313 was caused by a few people who
did pass a 13wpm test (of course not everyone who passed
13wpm caused those problems :-)). And this trouble wasn't
the sort that newbies might inadvertly cause. A "newbie"
is someone who might make mistakes but soon learns to
avoid those mistakes, a "lid" persists in making the same
mistakes over and over.

from Dick:
> One more point- the modes hams use today have evolved over time, assisted by
>advances in technology, to the point that most of them are very well suited to
>the uses that hams make of them. Some modes and systems are efficient and some
>are not, such as the VHF/UHF repeater allocations, and should be revised toward

>more efficient uses. Others, such as SSB, CW and most of the digital modes in
>use, do just fine. That doesn't mean that further development isn't desirable
>nor that it should not be continued. But so far no one has shown any valid
reason
>why hams should be lining up to dump everything they've grown to like and that
>works so well for them in favor of somebody's vague notions of "the way things

>should be because I know how to do it and I KNOW it should be" that way.

I would agree that SSB and CW work quite well, but realize that people
like NASA's JPL don't use CW for communicating with deep space
probes. I can see a use for say high speed packet on HF for among
other things long distance health and welfare traffic from a remote
disaster site. All you need is an equipment setup, antennas and
a source of power (generator or from a car battery) and needing no

infrastructure like that needed for the internet or short distance VHF/UHF packet. We get on the internet via dial up with 56K modems, so something similar might be possible on HF that can take QSB, QRM, QRN and such you don't get usually on a phone line. We would need some subbands where the 300 baud rule is not applied.

SO a new mode should do something better than the old mode, or do something new. And how would "better" be defined? "needs minimal equipment", "Best performance with lowest power, i.e., gets through when not even CW would", "can be interfaced with existing radios to do a new mode, i.e., packet over 2m FM radios (not the best way of doing it from a spectrum efficiency viewpoint, but required a minimum of new equipment). Sure it's a tall order to make a great new mode, but we all will like it when someone does accomplish it. The DXers will be able to snag more weak DX while using stealth antennas with say 50W, etc....

2262. Check out that dial!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 20:25:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bxEx8.11398$yr7.317370638@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41431

on e-bay.

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1347444788

2263. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 20:30:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CBEx8.11401$sZ6.316765336@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41432

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC625A1.A36968A1@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > How many stars were on the flag when the wallpaper was issued? Brian
>
> 48 - Does his WAS still count?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Of course it does.

2264. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 20:30:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3CEx8.11402$lz6.316252193@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41433

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC6F4D8.AF0BD7E2@IEEE.org...
> mike coslo wrote:
> >
> > Why wouldn't it?
>
> Well, it fits into the all-HF-band discussion. If a Worked *ALL* States
award
> is still good without all the states, why does "all-HF-band" have to
include
> 17m?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

or 30M?

2265. Re: Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 20:35:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1GEx8.11405$6D7.317577482@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41434

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020423225437.01774.00001926@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <7P3x8.9341$3x2.261599679@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

> >> Gee Brian, I put mine in a mutual fund. Pays better interest than
> >> a foot locker.
> >
> >Name it. Mutual Funds pay dividends and capital gains, not interest.
>
> Brian:
>
> Right -- which is why I'm about to give up on doing my own taxes.

Lucky for me I lost money and don't have anything to claim. :(

> As it turns out, the court has dismissed my Jury Group for the rest
> of the week. Tomorrow it's back to being a Special Passenger Lift-
> Adapted Transit Omnibus Operator.

SPLATOO?

2266. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 20:38:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NIEx8.11406$JK7.317723960@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41435

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020423225435.01774.00001924@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <1uuacukp0661rmb9tqc0bgk5ainm48hqsa@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
> >I do miss her though. In a ng, where she can't really dictate what
> >people say by beating them over the head with misinterpreted FCC
> >rules, she was quite funny.
>
> Bob:
>
> Yeah, Kim did cause a lot of guffaws! Now Brian will have to pull
> double-duty.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Hell, I could run circles around Kim in the "Guffaws" department. And I
otta leave the group as well. Who'se got time for this nonsense?

2267. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 20:53:44 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <vo6ecuskdc50knecesahfjh6s0ce1f6qnq@4ax.com>
Source record: 41436

On Wed, 24 Apr 2002 20:38:05 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020423225435.01774.00001924@mb-cg.aol.com...
>> In article <1uuacukp0661rmb9tqc0bgk5ainm48hqsa@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>>
>> >I do miss her though. In a ng, where she can't really dictate what
>> >people say by beating them over the head with misinterpreted FCC
>> >rules, she was quite funny.
>>
>> Bob:
>>
>> Yeah, Kim did cause a lot of guffaws! Now Brian will have to pull
>> double-duty.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Hell, I could run circles around Kim in the "Guffaws" department. And I
>otta leave the group as well. Who'se got time for this nonsense?
>

I come and I go (for sometimes years at a time.) See you when you get
back.

2268. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 20:56:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <a_Ex8.11413$rw7.317446473@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41437

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020423225439.01774.00001929@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <ze4x8.9368$Va3.263075243@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> That parenthetical (Ed) was not part of Kim's original post -- you
> >obviously
> >> doctored the quote. You lose. End of Story.
> >>
> >Actually Larry, you lose. You have a "profile" and its just as Kim says.
> >You have to undo it, not her.
> >>
> >73, Brian
>
> Brian:
>
> What "profile" would that be? Oh, just because I'm not eagerly
> accepting of the dumbing-down process which is ruining amateur
> radio, and I'm not warmly, "inclusively," and politically-correctly
> welcoming all the newly-minted new dumbed-down hams into
> the ARS, you whine about my "profile." Fine. Have at it. Be a
> wimp. It suits you, I'm sure.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, for starters, you're a bit of a moron which is usual for the bully. You're capable of rational thought, playing well with others, and keeping your mouth shut when it's inappropriate to blurt out the first thing that comes to your mind. 20+ years in the Air Force proves that. But now you've no UCMJ constraints and you feel you must gain an audience by making outrageous (and often bigotted) statements. Works for Rush; Doesn't work for Larry.

For that you lose.

Only you can change your profile. You can work hard to contain your emotions, or remain undisciplined and give in to every toddler-like urge that you have. Or show a little maturity and say something thought provoking, not just more emotional garbage.

It's out of my hands.

Good luck to you in growing up,

and 73,
Brian

2269. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 20:58:30 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <W%Ex8.11415$S7.318073165@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41438

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424133538.06459.00000830@mb-mo.aol.com...
> In article <20020424062649.20540.00003467@mb-mn.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >
> >> Be a wimp. It suits you, I'm sure.
> >
> >Is this another uncivil example? I read this as personally insulting --
> >something considered as uncivil by most parents of small children.
>
> ...that's what specialists in paratransiting do...

Add verbal and mental abuse to what these challenged kids have to put up
with.

73, Brian

2270. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:04:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <X5Fx8.11421$ac7.317002999@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41439

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020423225438.01774.00001928@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <ec4x8.9363$k83.262976822@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Your quote didn't prove your case "against" me, either. You accused
> >> me of calling Ed an ARRL shill in "each and every post" I make in this
> >> newsgroup. So, go ahead, prove it!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Larry, its taken for granted that in every post you think Ed an ARRL
schill.
> >Disprove it.
>
> Brian:
>
> There's no point in my trying to prove or disprove anything, because
> you'll believe exactly what you want to believe. You always look to
> see the worst in me, because you've decided you're going to occupy
> the popular, politically-correct side of any argument WRT the dumbing-
> down of the ARS -- mainly because this dumbing-down benefits you,
> personally. You're a classic sycophant, Brian, and I have absolutely
> nothing to "prove" to you, Kim, or anyone like either of you. If the
> things I post here are causing you heartburn, then they are having the
> desired effect. Thanks for the validation.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, why does the FCC issue HF licenses with no Morse/CW requirement to
other services that utilize HF?

But in the Amateur Service, we have to take and pass a Morse/CW exam even if
we have no intentions of ever using CW? Why are we required to be more
"professional" than the professionals?

I've passed the code exam. I have an amateur license and a GROL. Exactly
where do I benefit in this scenario?

The radio service regulations are so full of contradictions. Lets make some
sense of it instead of just going along with it.

Brian

2271. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:07:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <58Fx8.11423$qe.318185771@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41440

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC62633.E93A69EF@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CC5D446.A9D43F0E@IEEE.org...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
> > > > fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
> > > >
> > > > If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
> > >
> > > Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
> >
> > Microphones turn on and off.
>
> More correctly - the microphone switch turns on and off and is
> indeed digital.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

The microphone switch turns on and off the exciter as does other
spring-loaded, silver-plated contacts.
```

2272. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:09:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <T9Fx8.11429$Pk.318333256@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41441

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC6F5D0.E6C624B7@IEEE.org...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > It's so nice of you to tell us that an itinerant portrait painter was
> > working on "digital electronics" as early as 1840. Thank you.
>
> Dang Len, I knew you were old but I didn't know you were *that* old.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

He also might have known that guy who used to make silencers for weapons.
Hiram somebody.

2273. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:11:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_bFx8.11434$Vq.318416963@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41442

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020423201813.01968.00004711@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> OOK CW has been a digital mode long before the bandwagon came into
town.
>
> >Its so digital that a computer won't handle it. Sounds like it needs an
A/D
> >converter.
>
> Why would a computer not handle OOK CW?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Because of the wildly varying rate and ratio of dit and dah elements and spacing, AKA the Banana Boat Swing.

See: Dick Carrol, banana boat sparkie.

2274. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:12:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8dFx8.11435$qs.318463284@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41443

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC6A84A.4727C210@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > First, you clearly don't understand ANY of what I've suggested in the
> > > past ... (but that doesn't surprise me at all).
> >
> > Bullshit. What you want has been made abundantly clear. By you. You
want
> > nothing to do with anything less than domination of the future of the
ARS.
> > *LOTS* of us aren't buying it.
>
> Dick, sounds like *you* want to dominate the future of the ARS.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

The Little General hasn't a chance.

2275. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:15:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tfFx8.11439$lu.318505244@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41444

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424133537.06459.00000828@mb-mo.aol.com...
> In article <4Wix8.1068$607.85083@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0CKB"
> <k0ckb@arrl.net> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> The "other interested citizen" is your WIFE, isn't she?
> >
> >Yes, I am.
>
> Oh, oh, here we go..."outraged wife" stuff again... :-)

Was it the guy with two first names, a boys name and a girls name, or the
Cop?

2276. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:20:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424172049.22519.00005579@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 41445

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> Why would a computer not handle OOK CW?

>Because of the wildly varying rate and ratio of dit and dah elements and
>spacing, AKA the Banana Boat Swing.

Morse is only one of an infinite ways that a CW signal can be encoded. A computer could easily handle most of them, although manually Morse encoded OOK CW is probably the hardest.

Morse encoding can be used on modes other than OOK CW. Repeater IDs are often made using Morse.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2277. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:23:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424172332.22519.00005580@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 41446

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>I've passed the code exam. I have an amateur license and a GROL. Exactly
>where do I benefit in this scenario?

Having passed the code exam, you now have HF access. That could be a benefit
to you.

>The radio service regulations are so full of contradictions. Lets make some
>sense of it instead of just going along with it.

Our making sense of the FCC regulations buys us nothing. The only way to "make
sense" of the regulations is to persuade the FCC that different regulations
better represent the public interest wrt a particular radio Service.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2278. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:30:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424173042.22519.00005582@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 41447

From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com

>If anything, today's code tests are tougher
>than the old ones, because the Farnsworth method is used
>(high speed characters spaced at 5wpm).

Actually, I believe that the Farnsworth spacing makes copying code easier, not harder. The additional time between characters gives the applicant more time to recognize the character and to write it down.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2279. Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:32:31 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204241332.64ee3f7c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41448

Somewhere in every thread on this newsgroup there will appear a mention of a particular ham operator's callsign. Why don't we just drop all the other topics in the headers and use "Single unifying thread?" After all, it's what holds us together.

kb9rvb
Carl

2280. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:34:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gxFx8.11468$IL.318888082@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41449

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204241012.6c2581b0@posting.google.com...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<f45x8.9416$ox4.265898416@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020422140818.13688.00000947@mb-da.aol.com...
> > > In article <L2Kw8.21$iQ5.6675@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> > > <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> > > >How can I propose
> > > >a "Experimentation Reservation" and then tolerate the use of
decades-old
> > > >technology on that reservation?
> > >
> > > Several reasons:
> > >
> > > 1) It simplifies the rules (no need to decide and specify what is
allowed
> > and
> > > what is not). That's a BIG deal to the FCC
> > >
> > > 2) It does not push away anyone who is currently there.
> >
> > That's what this is all about.. There's not currently anyone there.
They
> > abandoned it 15 years ago, at least.
>
> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
> Or even on one of those bands?

What's your point?

> > > 3) It will be supported by far more hams. (Political reality being
what it
> > is,
> > > an idea that gathers lots of support has a better chance than one that
has
> > > almost no support).
> >
> > The ARRL tried the "poll" route.
>
> I responded to that poll. Did you?

I wan't polled, but I did send in kind of a response. Their canned
responses did not suit my answers and I don't like to be pigeon holed by
their nonsense answers.

> > Works for Bill Clinton, doesn't work for
> > them.
>
> The ARRL BoD developed an idea and presented it to the FCC. Hans has
> developed a different idea and has done the same. I'm in the process
> of developing a modification of Hans' idea.

No original idea of your own?

> What have you done in this area, Brian?

I've printed out the arrl proposal from the FCC site. I expect to comment.

> > They need to lead, not follow or take another poll. Or just get out
> > of the way.
>
> The ARRL BoD thinks giving lots more privs to Tech Pluses and Novices
> is lead. They also think turning the Novice subbands over to 'phone is
> leading. I agree with the first part but not the second.

Putting the Novices in the General CW portion of the band 25+ years ago is
Lead. To do so in 2002 is not lead. The damage is irretrievably done, no
more novice or tech+ licenses.

Keeping the Novice power limits in the new "phone" band is not lead, if I
read here correctly, especially when the Novices are relocated and cannot
use the old authorization anyway. Help me out if I got it wrong.

> What do you think?

What do you think?

> > > 4) It will allow coordination of on-air experiments by the use of old
> > modes.
> > > This is very important - how do I figure out where the problem is if I
am
> > > forced to use ONLY the new, experimental mode if the new mode doesn't
work
> > > right away?
> >
> > Hey, good point. Is this anything like a State Department wire order CW
> > line?
>
> Yes and no.

Where's our expert?

> > > 5) It sets a bad precedent by banning certain widely-used modes from
some
> > > spectrum where they are currently legal today.
> > > Not a good idea.

> >
> > If we're talking about CW, why not just say so.
>
> We're talking about many modes, not just CW.

In America, what are the current operating priveleges in the Novice subbands? With the single exception of 10M, what is the authorized mode?

> > > 6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned unless
> > there
> > > is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).
> >
> > Planned obsolescense?
>
> Planned obsolescence is only a good reason to those trying to sell new
> rigs and accessories.

If Kenwood came out with a new mode, it would probably be fantastic.

> > > A simple question:
> > >
> > > Do you think the presence of a few amateur signals using "decades old
> > > technology" will be a problem for those hams who want to try out new
modes
> > in
> > > the subbands?
> > >
> > > I don't.
> > >
> > > Anybody else?
> >
> > Limit the decades old modes to Part 15 power levels.
>
> The "decades old modes" include AM, FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, AMTOR and
> even packet.

We don't want to interfere with bleeding edge modes, do we?

> Tell ya what, Brian, you lead the way by running Part 15 power levels
> for all your HF operating.

Might as well in the Novice subbands. No ones there and it would save on the power bill.

But why do you want me to bear all of the burden? How many times would I have to repeat myself before you stopped saying, "Say again all after CQ?"

2281. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:42:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <9FFx8.11475$i_.319193151@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41601

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424172332.22519.00005580@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >I've passed the code exam. I have an amateur license and a GROL.
Exactly
> >where do I benefit in this scenario?
>
> Having passed the code exam, you now have HF access. That could be a
benefit
> to you.
>
> >The radio service regulations are so full of contradictions. Lets make
some
> >sense of it instead of just going along with it.
>
> Our making sense of the FCC regulations buys us nothing. The only way to
"make
> sense" of the regulations is to persuade the FCC that different
regulations
> better represent the public interest wrt a particular radio Service.

Yes, I suppose I need to state the obvious to Larry.

"Where we find obvious internal contradictions and discrepancies in the Part 97 regulations, and obvious external contradictions and discrepancies between Part 97 and other Title 47 regulations, we petition our government to get their act together and make it read like one document rather than a hodge-podge of lazy bureaucratic nonsense."

How's that?

2282. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:43:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424174349.22519.00005584@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 41602

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Are you saying that the threat of calling FCC staffers "Luddites" is all
>that
>> is necessary for people to win their way in the regulatory arena?

>> If so, I disagree.

>That's your right. But if you don't believe that's a factor worthy of much
>consideration, it would be because you haven't seen it happen or prefer to
>ignore
>the likelihood that it might.

If that would work, I would do it in a heartbeat, but I don't think that ARRL will win the current 70 cm RFID spectrum battle by threatening to insult the FCC. As you say, believing that to be a factor is YOUR right, too, but you appear rather foolish in thinking that insulting the FCC is the way to win anything.

> Would YOU want Carl hounding you?

Been there; done that, Dick, and Carl and I both learned from each other.

>Cross is said to be a CW operator who likes DX. All the more reason why he
>"must be careful to avoid any appearance" of allowing his personal
>preferences to show up in his work.

What appearances. Did it ever dawn on you that it is possible that Cross actually does not allow his personal preferences to show up in his work?

> Let me be very clear-the advancement of technology in ham radio is a forgone
> conclusion.

I sure would hate to see the long tradition of Amateur Radio embracing technology come to an end.

> Just as is the fact that we WILL lose portions of our spectrum as the
>need for it by other services grows. It's as inevitable as the rising sun,
>always
>has been.

The value brought by the Amateur Radio Service will be balanced against the value brought by others who want to use the spectrum. Most of our spectrum battles of late have been vis a vis Part 15 operation, and we have not lost most of that spectrum. Part 15 has been given more access to Amateur spectrum, but as a secondary user.
>In the past FCC has done an outstanding job of providing us with the
>use of spectrum that was largely sitting idle for our use while it sits idle,

>to
>the point that we have become accustomed to considering all 'our' spectrum
>that
>isn't covered by international allocations to amateurs, as ours forever.

Back when nobody wanted spectrum above 30 MHz, it was really easy to keep it. Nowdays, virtually all spectrum is shared between users, in all sorts of sharing relationships (from co-primary to primary/secondary). Most amateur bands are shared with ISM and NTIA authorizations.

>Portions of the 430-450 mhz band is an example.
>Sure, we don't want to lose any of it, but I see it as almost inevitable.

What part of the 420-450 MHz band are we set to lose? I know of no rulemaking proposal that seeks to take it away from us.

>When
>communications needs can be met with far less power consumption by modes that
>operate well in noisy environments it would be folly to NOT adopt them. Such
>efficiencies are not nearly as important and are not primary to ham radio
>operators daily activities.

If we find ourselves sharing more and more of our bands with more and more users, spectrally efficient modes that operate well in the presence of noise will become very important to us. And even if there is no one else on the band, being able to hear and use signals that are deeper into thermal noise would be an improvement.

> The lame mantra that "if we don't adopt the efficient
>modes the commercials have (or even develop better ones) ham radio will be
>falling down on its basis and purpose" is so much nonsense. That's ONE of the
>bases, but by no means the main reason for our existence.

Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted your attitude in 1914, it would not exist today. How far behind do you think we can be and still have value to our regulators?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2283. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:46:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424174625.22519.00005585@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 41603

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>How many people can copy a CW signal at 12 wpm with another signal 18 dB
>>stronger right on top of it???

>If the desired signal CW is 25 kHz wide and the 18 dB undesired signal is a
>carrier, and the receiver has a notch filter, I'd say pretty much anyone who
>can copy 12 wpm Morse can do it.

I know of no OOK CW signal at 12 wpm that would have a necessary bandwidth of
25 kHz.
73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2284. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:46:49 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ht9ecu8uuh7fhgi18vnptplkr5mhu5c8dh@4ax.com>
Source record: 41450

On 24 Apr 2002 14:32:31 -0700, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) wrote:

>Somewhere in every thread on this newsgroup there will appear a
>mention of a particular ham operator's callsign. Why don't we just
>drop all the other topics in the headers and use "Single unifying
>thread?" After all, it's what holds us together.
>
>kb9rvb
>Carl

Huh?

2285. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 21:50:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pMFx8.11484$K61.319336730@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41604

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424172049.22519.00005579@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> Why would a computer not handle OOK CW?
>
> >Because of the wildly varying rate and ratio of dit and dah elements and
> >spacing, AKA the Banana Boat Swing.
>
> Morse is only one of an infinite ways that a CW signal can be encoded.

True, another seemingly popular encoding scheme is called Farnworth.

A
> computer could easily handle most of them, although manually Morse encoded
OOK
> CW is probably the hardest.

According to the Dixie manual, thousands of wildly varying encoding schemes
are called Morse and are all digita.

> Morse encoding can be used on modes other than OOK CW. Repeater IDs are
often
> made using Morse.

? Is that digital too?

2286. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 22:01:18 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <OWFx8.2005$iU4.180455@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41605

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com>, MotO (Master of the Obvious) wrote

> I know of no OOK CW signal at 12 wpm that would have a necessary bandwidth
of
> 25 kHz.

I suspect Jim doesn't either, but his point is still perfectly valid.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2287. Re: A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 22:07:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424180708.07448.00000964@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 41606

In article <3CC6F4D8.AF0BD7E2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Well, it fits into the all-HF-band discussion.

Nope.

>If a Worked *ALL* States award
>is still good without all the states, why does "all-HF-band" have to include
>17m?

Depends on the time of discussion. "all-HF-band" today means something
different than it did before WARC-79, just as "WAS" means something different
today than in 1957.

Kim was not licensed until after all of the current HF amateur bands were open
to US hams. Therefore, her claim to have worked all HF amateur bands lots of
times is simply not true.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2288. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 22:19:02 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204241419.d66c79f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41607

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:<3cbf844c_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
asked for comments on FCC Part 97 relative to RACES and FEMA ...

While organizing an Net Control Station Operator's training session/manual, I came across a definition of RACES on the FEMA website and that "quoted" section of Part 97 on another site and came to this conclusion:

"There is considerable debate about ARS participation during RACES activation by a local EM/EOC director. The debate is based primarily on the wording of the definition of "RACES Station" by FEMA and the FCC regulations. FEMA defines RACES Station as 'an amateur radio station licensed civil defense organization.'"

If read as "an amateur-radio-station-licensed civil defense organization" or "...licensed, civil defense organization," then only a civil defense organization with an amateur radio station license is a RACES Station. ARS stations registered with a civil defense organization are not RACES stations but are registered with RACES."

Further, Part 97, E, (c) and (d) seem to indicate that the FCC is thus distinguishing between a RACES Station ("licensed to a civil defense organization") and an ARS station "registered with a civil defense organization and operating in RACES."

The second part of your question, can "any amateur who with a civil defense organization--regardless of their affiliation with the particular
RACES organization--can communicate/transmit on any RACES net?" is, I believe, not really -- but ...

According to FEMA, it is the RACES Officer (a General class or higher ARS operator appointed by the government Emergency Manager or director of the Emergency Operations Center) who "develops the application" that is filled out by the ARS operator in order to gain "registration" or affiliation with a civil defense organization. That RACES Officer makes a recommendation to the EM/EOC as to whether to accept the ARS applicant.

A later question by another poster asked, "How can one have a radio ... service without RACES (Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service) being licensed as a radio station? I believe RACES is/will be the umbrella ARS network collaborating with the civil defense organization (i.e., Red Cross, EOC, etc.) to form the RACES network.

And still another poster suggested that ARES and RACES are two faces of the same service. In fact, as Incident Command System (ICS) standards become more common place, ARRL ARES affiliates are developing response plans that look very much like RACES plans. Many areas are describing their response organizations as ARES/RACES or RACES/ARES in order to affiliate with both ARRL and FEMA in the local response plan.

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:<3cbf844c_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> Noting the recent exchange on interpreting FCC R&R, note the following:
>
> PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents
> Subpart E--Providing Emergency Communications
> Sec. 97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service.
> (a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed
> primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a
> civil defense organization as registered with that organization, or it
> is an FCC-licensed RACES station. No person may be the control operator
> of a RACES station, or may be the control operator of an amateur station
> transmitting in RACES unless that person holds a FCC-issued amateur
> operator license and is certified by a civil defense organization as
> enrolled in that organization.
>
> and:
>
> (c) A RACES station may only communicate with:
> (1) Another RACES station;
> (2) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization;
> (3) A United States Government station authorized by the responsible
> agency to communicate with RACES stations;
> (4) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such
> communication is authorized by the FCC.
> (d) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization
> may only communicate with:
> (1) A RACES station licensed to the civil defense organization with
> which the amateur station is registered;
> (2) The following stations upon authorization of the responsible
> civil defense official for the organization with which the amateur
> station is registered:
> (i) A RACES station licensed to another civil defense organization;
> (ii) An amateur station registered with the same or another civil
> defense organization;
> (iii) A United States Government station authorized by the
> responsible agency to communicate with RACES stations; and
> (iv) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such
> communication is authorized by the FCC.
>
> Regarding (a), what do you all think? Can a RACES organization make its
> rules on whom may and may not transmit during their RACES nets? I have
> heard this debated all over the place and have RACES organizations here that

> allow "just anyone" to enter their nets; and those who allow no one but
> their own organization's participants. By "their own" I mean, literally,
> *only* those RACES stations who are authorized by the city in which they
> live/work.
>
> Regarding (c)(2) and (4), does this mean that any amateur who with a civil
> defense organization--regardless of their affiliation with the particular
> RACES organization--can communicate/transmit on any RACES net? And, (4)
> pretty much covers any amateur at a station of the Red Cross, etc., right?
> So, what would be "legal" about a RACES net control saying to that person
> that they cannot enter the net because they are not recognized by that
> particular RACES organization.
>
> Overall, if the R&R are to be followed, to the letter, is it OK for a RACES
> organization to allow anyone onto their nets?
>
> Kim W5TIT

2289. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 22:46:14 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204241446.3cc4fff7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41608

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020419232344.10062.00001124@mb-cu.aol.com>...
> In this case, the rules are so clear that there is really only one
> interpretation. A RACES station is what the FCC says it is, and the local
> civil defense officials who control RACES nets in any given area have
> the FCC-mandated authority to limit participation in their nets only to
> the local amateurs who are certified members of their organization.

Larry's right, but it really goes farther than that. The Emercency
Manager or director of the Emergency Operations Center (depending upon
the structure) appoints the ham who is the RACES Officer. The RACES
Officer designs the application and recommends affiliation with the CD
organization -- not necessarily "members." Also, affiliation or
registration with the CDO does not guarantee that all affiliated hams
may participate in any given RACES event or response. The RO, along
with the selected Net Control Station can limit participation
according to the Incident Command System response plan for the event.

How this is different than ARES lies in the Memoranda of Understanding
between the ARS and the CD services. Given certain events or response
requirements, it would not be unheard of for a Formal Directed ARES
Emergency Net to limit, by instructions, participation of ARS
operators. Stretching it, after open check-in to a Skywarn Net, NCS
could instruct in such a way that some operators would have nothing to
report if they weren't observing certain events.

In areas where RACES/ARES have unified responses, the EM/EOC usually
appoints the local ARES Emergency Coordinator as RACES Officer or the
ARES group asks the RO to double up as the ARES EC. Sometimes An
Assistant EC is appointed RO, or sometimes an Assistant RO is
appointed EC if the organizations are large enough.

> This is crystal clear, not the least bit "gray," and is solidly enforceable.

What has not been crystal clear is that long adjective structure in
the FEMA definitions: as "an amateur radio station licensed civil
defense organization." So many people were boggled. Is it "licensed
[to]," "licensed [by]," "licensed [as]?" I read it as RACES Station is
a CD organization with an ARS license (even if there is no ham as the
"control operator"). That's what the new protocol hopes to end.

2290. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 23:02:04 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204242259460.25390-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41609

On 24 Apr 2002, Carl Zager wrote:
>"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<3cbf844c_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
>asked for comments on FCC Part 97 relative to RACES and FEMA ...
>
>While organizing an Net Control Station Operator's training
>session/manual, I came across a definition of RACES on the FEMA
>website and that "quoted" section of Part 97 on another site and came
>to this conclusion:
>
>"There is considerable debate about ARS participation during RACES
>activation by a local EM/EOC director. The debate is based primarily
>on the wording of the definition of "RACES Station" by FEMA and the
>FCC regulations. FEMA defines RACES Station as 'an amateur radio
>station licensed civil defense organization.'"
>
>If read as "an amateur-radio-station-licensed civil defense
>organization" or "...licensed, civil defense organization," then only
>a civil defense organization with an amateur radio station license is
>a RACES Station. ARS stations registered with a civil defense
>organization are not RACES stations but are registered with RACES."

That part is correct. Note that with the attrition of RACES licenses by
expiration, there soon will be no RACES stations. This may also fall out of
FEMA's definition....

>Further, Part 97, E, (c) and (d) seem to indicate that the FCC is thus
>distinguishing between a RACES Station ("licensed to a civil defense
>organization") and an ARS station "registered with a civil defense
>organization and operating in RACES."

Correct - until it repealed RACES station licenses (existing stations continue
to exist until their licenses expire).

>The second part of your question, can "any amateur who with a civil
>defense organization--regardless of their affiliation with the
>particular
>RACES organization--can communicate/transmit on any RACES net?" is, I
>believe, not really -- but ...
>
>According to FEMA, it is the RACES Officer (a General class or higher
>ARS operator appointed by the government Emergency Manager or director
>of the Emergency Operations Center) who "develops the application"
>that is filled out by the ARS operator in order to gain "registration"
>or affiliation with a civil defense organization. That RACES Officer

>makes a recommendation to the EM/EOC as to whether to accept the ARS
>applicant.
>
>A later question by another poster asked, "How can one have a radio
>... service without RACES (Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service)
>being licensed as a radio station? I believe RACES is/will be the
>umbrella ARS network collaborating with the civil defense organization
>(i.e., Red Cross, EOC, etc.) to form the RACES network.
>
>And still another poster suggested that ARES and RACES are two faces
>of the same service. In fact, as Incident Command System (ICS)
>standards become more common place, ARRL ARES affiliates are
>developing response plans that look very much like RACES plans. Many
>areas are describing their response organizations as ARES/RACES or
>RACES/ARES in order to affiliate with both ARRL and FEMA in the local
>response plan.
>
>
>"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<3cbf844c_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
>> Noting the recent exchange on interpreting FCC R&R, note the following:
>>
>> PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents
>> Subpart E--Providing Emergency Communications
>> Sec. 97.407 Radio amateur civil emergency service.
>> (a) No station may transmit in RACES unless it is an FCC-licensed
>> primary, club, or military recreation station and it is certified by a
>> civil defense organization as registered with that organization, or it
>> is an FCC-licensed RACES station. No person may be the control operator
>> of a RACES station, or may be the control operator of an amateur station
>> transmitting in RACES unless that person holds a FCC-issued amateur
>> operator license and is certified by a civil defense organization as
>> enrolled in that organization.
>>
>> and:
>>
>> (c) A RACES station may only communicate with:
>> (1) Another RACES station;
>> (2) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization;
>> (3) A United States Government station authorized by the responsible
>> agency to communicate with RACES stations;
>> (4) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such
>> communication is authorized by the FCC.
>> (d) An amateur station registered with a civil defense organization
>> may only communicate with:
>> (1) A RACES station licensed to the civil defense organization with
>> which the amateur station is registered;
>> (2) The following stations upon authorization of the responsible
>> civil defense official for the organization with which the amateur
>> station is registered:

>> (i) A RACES station licensed to another civil defense organization;
>> (ii) An amateur station registered with the same or another civil
>> defense organization;
>> (iii) A United States Government station authorized by the
>> responsible agency to communicate with RACES stations; and
>> (iv) A station in a service regulated by the FCC whenever such
>> communication is authorized by the FCC.
>>
>> Regarding (a), what do you all think? Can a RACES organization make its
>> rules on whom may and may not transmit during their RACES nets? I have
>> heard this debated all over the place and have RACES organizations here that
>> allow "just anyone" to enter their nets; and those who allow no one but
>> their own organization's participants. By "their own" I mean, literally,
>> *only* those RACES stations who are authorized by the city in which they
>> live/work.
>>
>> Regarding (c)(2) and (4), does this mean that any amateur who with a civil
>> defense organization--regardless of their affiliation with the particular
>> RACES organization--can communicate/transmit on any RACES net? And, (4)
>> pretty much covers any amateur at a station of the Red Cross, etc., right?
>> So, what would be "legal" about a RACES net control saying to that person
>> that they cannot enter the net because they are not recognized by that
>> particular RACES organization.
>>
>> Overall, if the R&R are to be followed, to the letter, is it OK for a RACES
>> organization to allow anyone onto their nets?
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>

2291. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 23:20:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204241520.7789203c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41610

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<EHFw8.4100$Wa3.203070532@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0204210734.752d047e@posting.google.com...
> > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message news:<knKv8.5244
>
> > > Steve, relax, the ARS isn't going away any time soon. It'll take
> another
> > > decade for the actuarial table to do any real damage. The first boomer
> > > turns 65 in 2010.
> > >
> > Yeah, then watch all those well-heeled tech-smart boomers pile into ham
> radio.
> > >
> > >
> > w3rv
>
> Brian, you are so damned paranoid that you might actually have to talk to
> someone new on the radio, aren't you?
>
>
OK, I give up: Where is the connect amongst my "paranoia", QSOs with
hams I've never worked before and boomers?? I *TOLDJA* not to smoke
the stuff which has been sprayed . . .
>
>
w3rv

2292. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 23:38:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424193836.13688.00001033@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 41611

In article <20020424173042.22519.00005582@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>
>>If anything, today's code tests are tougher
>>than the old ones, because the Farnsworth method is used
>>(high speed characters spaced at 5wpm).
>
>Actually, I believe that the Farnsworth spacing makes copying code easier,
>not
>harder. The additional time between characters gives the applicant more time
>to
>recognize the character and to write it down.

Yup.

And while most VEs use the Farnsworth method, they will substitute a "regular" 5 wpm test if requested. Examinee's choice.

The number of written tests for an Extra was reduced from 5 to 3 and the total number of questions in those tests from 190 to 120.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2293. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-24 23:55:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gv3bcjk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 41612

On 24 Apr 2002 15:46:14 -0700, Carl Zager wrote:

>So many people were boggled. Is it "licensed
>[to]," "licensed [by]," "licensed [as]?" I read it as RACES Station is
>a CD organization with an ARS license (even if there is no ham as the
>"control operator"). That's what the new protocol hopes to end.

Do not confuse the RACES statsion control operator (who has been
required to be a licensed ARS operator for several decades now) with
the RACES station trustee who could be a non-amateur. With the
abolition of the RACES station per se, the anility pf a non-amateur
to be such a trustee goes away just as the abilityof a nn-amateur
tooperate the statsion went away several decades ago.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2294. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 00:22:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424202246.06881.00005339@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41613

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>"Where we find obvious internal contradictions and discrepancies in the Part
>97 regulations, and obvious external contradictions and discrepancies
>between Part 97 and other Title 47 regulations, we petition our government
>to get their act together and make it read like one document rather than a
>hodge-podge of lazy bureaucratic nonsense."

>How's that?

Probably not a good choice of words to persuade the FCC to make a specific
change.

Can we expect to see your petition soon? Will you choose different words? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2295. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 00:25:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424202522.06881.00005340@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41614

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> Morse is only one of an infinite ways that a CW signal can be encoded.

>True, another seemingly popular encoding scheme is called Farnworth.

Farnsworth is a method of spacing the characters in Morse encoding.

>> Morse encoding can be used on modes other than OOK CW. Repeater IDs are
>>often made using Morse.

>? Is that digital too?

To the same extent that an RTTY signal sent using FM of two tones would be
digital?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2296. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 00:49:02 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <2oIx8.2320$iU4.205903@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41615

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> Farnsworth is a method of spacing the characters in Morse encoding.
>

What good is my twit filter if you're gonna rise to Brians bi-monthly
"Farnsworth testing is illegal" troll?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
1943 Poster Child for The National Precocious Little Bastard Campaign

2297. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:06:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424220651.26511.00000483@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41617

In article <20020424062358.20540.00003466@mb-mn.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3c@fast.net
>
>>Whoa ... going in the wrong direction again ... how about like SS
>>100W max, anything over 1W requires APC ???
>
>The only real effect of that rule in SS has been to ensure that hams do not
>use
>more than 1 watt on SS.
>
>I don't think that the need for automatic power control has been established.
>
>IMHO, those capable of devising modes so new that they are not covered by
>existing rules should have no problem at all doing what the present rules
>require of all amateur communications -- manually adjusting the power level
>to
>the minimum necessary to achieve the desired communication.
>
>And the old "I desire to be loud" ploy doesn't cut it. :-)
>
I'm beginning to think that the whole APC requirement for the "experimental farm" is unnecessary regulation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2298. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:06:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424220651.26511.00000482@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41619

In article <gxFx8.11468$IL.318888082@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0204241012.6c2581b0@posting.google.com...
>> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
>news:<f45x8.9416$ox4.265898416@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20020422140818.13688.00000947@mb-da.aol.com...
>> > > In article <L2Kw8.21$iQ5.6675@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"K0HB"
>> > > <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>>
>> > > >How can I propose
>> > > >a "Experimentation Reservation" and then tolerate the use of
>decades-old
>> > > >technology on that reservation?
>> > >
>> > > Several reasons:
>> > >
>> > > 1) It simplifies the rules (no need to decide and specify what is
>allowed
>> > and
>> > > what is not). That's a BIG deal to the FCC
>> > >
>> > > 2) It does not push away anyone who is currently there.
>> >
>> > That's what this is all about.. There's not currently anyone there.
>They
>> > abandoned it 15 years ago, at least.
>>
>> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
>> Or even on one of those bands?
>
>What's your point?

Your credibility.

You have talked about the conditions on various HF bands, but you give no indication of actually having used those bands.

>
>> > > 3) It will be supported by far more hams. (Political reality being
>what it
>> > is,
>> > > an idea that gathers lots of support has a better chance than one that

>has
>> > > almost no support).
>> >
>> > The ARRL tried the "poll" route.
>>
>> I responded to that poll. Did you?
>
>I wan't polled, but I did send in kind of a response.

>Their canned
>responses did not suit my answers and I don't like to be pigeon holed by
>their nonsense answers.

Which poll are you talking about? I'm referring to the one asking about
"refarming" the Novice bands.
>
>> > Works for Bill Clinton, doesn't work for
>> > them.
>>
>> The ARRL BoD developed an idea and presented it to the FCC. Hans has
>> developed a different idea and has done the same. I'm in the process
>> of developing a modification of Hans' idea.
>
>No original idea of your own?

I posted my first draft here a few days ago.

Why reinvent the wheel? Hans has done most of the work already.
>
>> What have you done in this area, Brian?
>
>I've printed out the arrl proposal from the FCC site. I expect to comment.

Uh-huh.
>
>> > They need to lead, not follow or take another poll. Or just get out
>> > of the way.
>>
>> The ARRL BoD thinks giving lots more privs to Tech Pluses and Novices
>> is lead. They also think turning the Novice subbands over to 'phone is
>> leading. I agree with the first part but not the second.
>
>Putting the Novices in the General CW portion of the band 25+ years ago is
>Lead.

I was a ham 25 years ago. Were you?

>To do so in 2002 is not lead. The damage is irretrievably done, no
>more novice or tech+ licenses.

Nonsense.

The ARRL BoD proposed instant upgrading of all existing Novices and Tech Pluses
to General way back in 1998. FCC said no.
>
>Keeping the Novice power limits in the new "phone" band is not lead, if I
>read here correctly, especially when the Novices are relocated and cannot
>use the old authorization anyway. Help me out if I got it wrong.

The old Novices and Tech Pluses could continue to use the old allocations if
they are reallocated to the "experimental farm" idea.

The 200 W power limit has to do with written testing.

I'm beginning to think the power limit thing should just be dropped. Allow full
power on all the subbands after reallocation to the experimental farm.

>> > > 6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned
>unless
>> > there
>> > > is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).
>> >
>> > Planned obsolescense?
>>
>> Planned obsolescence is only a good reason to those trying to sell new
>> rigs and accessories.
>
>If Kenwood came out with a new mode, it would probably be fantastic.
>
Why should hams depend on the manufacturers? It's our job to lead them.

>> > > A simple question:
>> > >
>> > > Do you think the presence of a few amateur signals using "decades old
>> > > technology" will be a problem for those hams who want to try out new
>modes
>> > in
>> > > the subbands?
>> > >
>> > > I don't.
>> > >
>> > > Anybody else?
>> >
>> > Limit the decades old modes to Part 15 power levels.
>>
>> The "decades old modes" include AM, FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, AMTOR and
>> even packet.
>
>We don't want to interfere with bleeding edge modes, do we?
>
>> Tell ya what, Brian, you lead the way by running Part 15 power levels
>> for all your HF operating.
>
>Might as well in the Novice subbands. No ones there and it would save on
>the power bill.

>
>But why do you want me to bear all of the burden?

Because it's your idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2299. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:06:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020424220652.26511.00000484@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41618

In article <3cc6d4e7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020424072053.08742.00000577@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> In article <3cc60174$1_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3c@fast.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:9f4bfe89.0204230927.4e91e233@posting.google.com...
>> >> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
>> >news:<20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com>...
>> >>
>> >> > Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by using
>> >the
>> >> > entire sub-band.
>> >>
>> >> Would there be any advantage considering how little spreading would
>> >> actually take place?
>> >
>> >If the data rates were REALLY low, you could still get some reasonable
>> >processing gain. If you used a 12.5 kHz spreading sequence, the bw
>> >(clock null to clock null) would be 25 kHz ... if you only wanted 1 bps
>> >data rate, the process gain would be about 44 dB ... with implementation
>> >losses of 2 dB and a S/N requirement of, say 14 dB for a decent BER, you
>> >could get a theoretical jamming margin of 28 dB ... in other words, the
>> >system
>> >could tolerate an on-channel jammer as much as 28 dB stronger than the
>> >desired
>> >signal.
>>
>> An on-channel jammer with the same spreading sequence or an on channel
>jammer
>> that is just a carrier, or a carrier with narrow sidebands?
>
>A CW carrier or something close in b/w ... a CW carrier is the "best" jammer
>against a DSSS system ... because it is spread the least by the despreading
>in the receiver ... wider signals will be spread even more, thus less of
>their
>energy will fall in the despread b/w of the receiver.

OK
>
> >On the other hand, if you wanted 10 bps data rate, the processing gain

>would
>> >be
>> >10 dB lower and you'd "only" have 18 dB of jamming margin.
>> >
>> >Assuming ASCII at 10 bits/character, just for the sake of argument, that
>> >would be
>> >60 characters minute, or about 12 wpm ...
>>
>> In a band 25 kHz wide?
>
>That's the spread bandwith, which gives a processing gain of 34 dB and
>a jamming margin of 18 dB.
>
Right.

So a single interfering carrier 20 dB above the desired signal wipes out the desired signal.

But in that same 25 kHz bandwidth, at least fifty 12 wpm CW/Morse signals could coexist with no significant interference, even is some were 20 dB above others (and decent receiver selectivity was used).

73 de Jim, N2EY

2300. Re: FCC Requires Positioning Coordinates?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:06:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1xJx8.11763$5f6.326835449@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41616

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0204240115.1a300e00@posting.google.com...
> "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:<PfSs8.2739$T_7.1192280264@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> > I don't know how many of you go to www.QRZ.com, but when you lookup a
> > callsign in their database, it indicates coordinates of the location.
Does
> > anyone know how they figure what these coordinates are and how
accurate.
> > I'm wondering if the FCC requires or mandates it, or if QRZ just adds it
> > based on the address of the applicant.
> >
> > Lars
> >
> >
> Even the $30 consumer mapping programs like MS Streets and Delorme
> Streets USA will calculate the coordinates of an address right down to
> the seconds plus one decimal place level of precision. Click on your
> home location and then click on the mower shed in your back yard and
> the coordinates change. Scary.

DeLorme does not map your mower shed nor your house. They map a distance
from an intersection and assume a residence is there.

Brian

2301. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:10:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5AJx8.11766$dq6.327152860@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41620

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0204241520.7789203c@posting.google.com...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<EHFw8.4100$Wa3.203070532@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0204210734.752d047e@posting.google.com...
> > > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<knKv8.5244
> >
> > > > Steve, relax, the ARS isn't going away any time soon. It'll take
> > another
> > > > decade for the actuarial table to do any real damage. The first
boomer
> > > > turns 65 in 2010.
> > > >
> > > Yeah, then watch all those well-heeled tech-smart boomers pile into
ham
> > radio.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Brian, you are so damned paranoid that you might actually have to talk
to
> > someone new on the radio, aren't you?
> >
> >
> OK, I give up: Where is the connect amongst my "paranoia", QSOs with
> hams I've never worked before and boomers?? I *TOLDJA* not to smoke
> the stuff which has been sprayed . . .
> >
> >
> w3rv

Brian, I don't smoke anything. Don't you want to talk to well heeled,
tech-smart boomers? Or would you prefer to keep it your private playground.
No unwashed allowed.

2302. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:13:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gDJx8.11769$et6.327234949@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41621

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424173042.22519.00005582@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>
> >If anything, today's code tests are tougher
> >than the old ones, because the Farnsworth method is used
> >(high speed characters spaced at 5wpm).
>
> Actually, I believe that the Farnsworth spacing makes copying code easier,
not
> harder. The additional time between characters gives the applicant more
time to
> recognize the character and to write it down.

Luckily, the exams are computer generated and there is a timing consistency
in character elements and spacings.

That in itself makes it easier to copy than manually formed, infinitely
variable elements and spacings.

Brian

2303. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:19:47 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7JJx8.11773$G%5.326432938@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41622

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424202246.06881.00005339@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >"Where we find obvious internal contradictions and discrepancies in the
Part
> >97 regulations, and obvious external contradictions and discrepancies
> >between Part 97 and other Title 47 regulations, we petition our
government
> >to get their act together and make it read like one document rather than
a
> >hodge-podge of lazy bureaucratic nonsense."
>
> >How's that?
>
> Probably not a good choice of words to persuade the FCC to make a specific
> change.
>
> Can we expect to see your petition soon? Will you choose different words?
:-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

My goal is to get it there before the comment period ends. May 15?

Of course I'll use different language.

Brian

2304. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:26:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aa7pmbvfc1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41623

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC5ACB2.5740D8EE@IEEE.org...
> K0HB wrote:
> > C. I propose that the normal power output level of 1500W
> > be allowed for those segments, but transmitters which are
> > adjusted and capable of more than 50W must include auto-
> > adaptive circuitry to reduce power to the minimum level
> > needed to maintain reliable communications.
>
> Hans, is the FCC going to raid ham stations looking for auto-adaptive
> circuitry or is compliance going to be completely voluntary? What do
> you do about homebrew auto-adaptive circuits that don't work right?
> How do you propose to enforce such a regulation? Any regulation that
> increases the FCC's workload is probably not going to be adopted.

There are many "technical regulations" that do not lend themselves to
easy or immediate enforcement via FCC monitoring.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2305. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:30:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BTJx8.11781$AS6.327850142@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41624

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424202522.06881.00005340@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> Morse is only one of an infinite ways that a CW signal can be encoded.
>
> >True, another seemingly popular encoding scheme is called Farnworth.
>
> Farnsworth is a method of spacing the characters in Morse encoding.

Actually, its not. Morse is Morse. Its very specific.

> >> Morse encoding can be used on modes other than OOK CW. Repeater IDs
are
> >>often made using Morse.
>
> >? Is that digital too?
>
> To the same extent that an RTTY signal sent using FM of two tones would be
> digital?

I must be tone deaf. Which two tones does the digital repeater ID use?

2306. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:30:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CTJx8.11782$AS6.327850142@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41625

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:2oIx8.2320$iU4.205903@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Farnsworth is a method of spacing the characters in Morse encoding.
> >
>
> What good is my twit filter if you're gonna rise to Brians bi-monthly
> "Farnsworth testing is illegal" troll?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --
> 1943 Poster Child for The National Precocious Little Bastard Campaign

Hey Hans, you're supposed to be a smart guy. Build a better filter.

2307. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:37:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aa7qb6$9ft$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41626

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424062920.20540.00003468@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >There's nothing gratuitous about it. It's pure realism. Cross calls the
> >shots at FCC for the ARS. Why wouldn't you lobby him for what you
> >want? Why would he want to expose himself to your criticism as a
> >"backward Luddite"?
>
> Are you saying that the threat of calling FCC staffers "Luddites" is all
that
> is necessary for people to win their way in the regulatory arena?
>
> If so, I disagree.
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I'm ROTFLMAO!

That lengthy diatribe by Dick was a true classic.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2308. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 02:59:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <iiKx8.11802$fu7.328902134@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41627

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424220651.26511.00000482@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <gxFx8.11468$IL.318888082@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:9f4bfe89.0204241012.6c2581b0@posting.google.com...
> >> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> >news:<f45x8.9416$ox4.265898416@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20020422140818.13688.00000947@mb-da.aol.com...
> >> > > In article <L2Kw8.21$iQ5.6675@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> >"K0HB"
> >> > > <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
> >>
> >> > > >How can I propose
> >> > > >a "Experimentation Reservation" and then tolerate the use of
> >decades-old
> >> > > >technology on that reservation?
> >> > >
> >> > > Several reasons:
> >> > >
> >> > > 1) It simplifies the rules (no need to decide and specify what is
> >allowed
> >> > and
> >> > > what is not). That's a BIG deal to the FCC
> >> > >
> >> > > 2) It does not push away anyone who is currently there.
> >> >
> >> > That's what this is all about.. There's not currently anyone there.
> >They
> >> > abandoned it 15 years ago, at least.
> >>
> >> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
> >> Or even on one of those bands?
> >
> >What's your point?
>
> Your credibility.

What is wrong with my credibility? Do you have an accusation to make?

> You have talked about the conditions on various HF bands, but you give no
> indication of actually having used those bands.

I have.

> >> > > 3) It will be supported by far more hams. (Political reality being
> >what it
> >> > is,
> >> > > an idea that gathers lots of support has a better chance than one
that
> >has
> >> > > almost no support).
> >> >
> >> > The ARRL tried the "poll" route.
> >>
> >> I responded to that poll. Did you?
> >
> >I wan't polled, but I did send in kind of a response.
>
> >Their canned
> >responses did not suit my answers and I don't like to be pigeon holed by
> >their nonsense answers.
>
> Which poll are you talking about? I'm referring to the one asking about
> "refarming" the Novice bands.

The "rarely or never" poll in which the ARRL concluded there was no reason
to change anything.

> >> > Works for Bill Clinton, doesn't work for
> >> > them.
> >>
> >> The ARRL BoD developed an idea and presented it to the FCC. Hans has
> >> developed a different idea and has done the same. I'm in the process
> >> of developing a modification of Hans' idea.
> >
> >No original idea of your own?
>
> I posted my first draft here a few days ago.

Excellent. I must have missed it. All I saw was a workover of Hans' idea.

> Why reinvent the wheel? Hans has done most of the work already.
> >
> >> What have you done in this area, Brian?
> >
> >I've printed out the arrl proposal from the FCC site. I expect to
comment.
>
> Uh-huh.

Yep.

> >> > They need to lead, not follow or take another poll. Or just get out
> >> > of the way.
> >>

> >> The ARRL BoD thinks giving lots more privs to Tech Pluses and Novices
> >> is lead. They also think turning the Novice subbands over to 'phone is
> >> leading. I agree with the first part but not the second.
> >
> >Putting the Novices in the General CW portion of the band 25+ years ago
is
> >Lead.
>
> I was a ham 25 years ago. Were you?

Here we go again. "I've got more time in the chow hall..."

I'm looking over my shoulder. The Novice bands had long since lost their luster in 1986 and 1987.

> >To do so in 2002 is not lead. The damage is irretrievably done, no
> >more novice or tech+ licenses.
>
> Nonsense.

Not nonsense. The FCC is not issuing any more Novice or Tech+ licenses. Why?

> The ARRL BoD proposed instant upgrading of all existing Novices and Tech
Pluses
> to General way back in 1998. FCC said no.

Who the hell wants an instant upgrade? Just stop the divisions and segregation in the band. If the Novices had been in the General CW portion of the band they might have had a chance. I didn't say phone, did I? Instead you now have a dead license class because of a dead idea.

> >Keeping the Novice power limits in the new "phone" band is not lead, if I
> >read here correctly, especially when the Novices are relocated and cannot
> >use the old authorization anyway. Help me out if I got it wrong.
>
> The old Novices and Tech Pluses could continue to use the old allocations
if
> they are reallocated to the "experimental farm" idea.

What mode?

> The 200 W power limit has to do with written testing.

Really? Correct me if I'm wrong (and you will), but weren't the old, bonifide Extras limited in power in some of those segments? I think only on 10M were they allowed the 1500 (2000) watts.

> I'm beginning to think the power limit thing should just be dropped. Allow
full
> power on all the subbands after reallocation to the experimental farm.

Yep.

> >> > > 6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned
> >unless
> >> > there
> >> > > is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).
> >> >
> >> > Planned obsolescense?
> >>
> >> Planned obsolescence is only a good reason to those trying to sell new
> >> rigs and accessories.
> >
> >If Kenwood came out with a new mode, it would probably be fantastic.
> >
> Why should hams depend on the manufacturers? It's our job to lead them.

True. About the time "packet ready" rigs came out packet was about over.

> >> > > A simple question:
> >> > >
> >> > > Do you think the presence of a few amateur signals using "decades
old
> >> > > technology" will be a problem for those hams who want to try out
new
> >modes
> >> > in
> >> > > the subbands?
> >> > >
> >> > > I don't.
> >> > >
> >> > > Anybody else?
> >> >
> >> > Limit the decades old modes to Part 15 power levels.
> >>
> >> The "decades old modes" include AM, FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, AMTOR and
> >> even packet.
> >
> >We don't want to interfere with bleeding edge modes, do we?
> >
> >> Tell ya what, Brian, you lead the way by running Part 15 power levels
> >> for all your HF operating.
> >
> >Might as well in the Novice subbands. No ones there and it would save on
> >the power bill.
> >
> >But why do you want me to bear all of the burden?
>
> Because it's your idea.

You're silly. We're talking about a rules change in which everyone must
comply, not just me.

2309. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 03:03:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mmKx8.11810$9A7.329034986@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41628

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message

> And the old "I desire to be loud" ploy doesn't cut it. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, has Riley given an opinion on that? Is Riley ever wrong?

Brian

2310. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 03:07:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8qKx8.11814$Bt7.328887561@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41629

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:nkex8.636$iI5.36693@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > Hans, I've been mulling your proposal for experimental reservations and
I
> just
> > can't get past the "reservation" part. I guess it's the Cherokee blood
in
> me.
>
> I guess I never thought of that connotation, even though I'm 1/16th
Cherokee
> and a member of the Ojibwe tribe.

I'm reminded of the old show, "F-Troop" where the indians were the only ones
who had anything figured out.

2311. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 03:21:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hDKx8.11821$QW7.329563451@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41630

"Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:77f1797e.0204241332.64ee3f7c@posting.google.com...
> Somewhere in every thread on this newsgroup there will appear a
> mention of a particular ham operator's callsign. Why don't we just
> drop all the other topics in the headers and use "Single unifying
> thread?" After all, it's what holds us together.
>
> kb9rvb
> Carl

Carl, not all of us have callsigns. Brian

2312. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 03:29:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5KKx8.11824$U8.329804915@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41631

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020423090313.16884.00004336@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >I don't think many non-experimenters will move into those subbands.
>
> If the band is open to SSB, SSB will move in pretty quickly.

No doubt about it.

The real question
> is whether digital signals can coexist with them and vice versa.

Lets just open them up to CW.

> Some slow-data rate spread spectrum could probably get along by using the
> entire sub-band.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, its fascinating to see everyone divying up the Novice subbands. Too bad the bands didn't receive much interest when they were supposed to be the training ground for new operators.

Have at it.

Brian

2313. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 03:36:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NQKx8.11829$i77.328297817@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41632

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:vo6ecuskdc50knecesahfjh6s0ce1f6qnq@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 24 Apr 2002 20:38:05 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20020423225435.01774.00001924@mb-cg.aol.com...
> >> In article <1uuacukp0661rmb9tqc0bgk5ainm48hqsa@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> >> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >I do miss her though. In a ng, where she can't really dictate what
> >> >people say by beating them over the head with misinterpreted FCC
> >> >rules, she was quite funny.
> >>
> >> Bob:
> >>
> >> Yeah, Kim did cause a lot of guffaws! Now Brian will have to pull
> >> double-duty.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Hell, I could run circles around Kim in the "Guffaws" department. And I
> >otta leave the group as well. Who'se got time for this nonsense?
> >
>
> I come and I go (for sometimes years at a time.) See you when you get
> back.

Sayonara Bob.

2314. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 04:07:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE79EEB.F8A91DD0@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41633

Robert Casey wrote:

so far no one has shown any valid

> reason
> >why hams should be lining up to dump everything they've grown to like and that
> >works so well for them in favor of somebody's vague notions of "the way things
>
> >should be because I know how to do it and I KNOW it should be" that way.
>
> I would agree that SSB and CW work quite well, but realize that people
> like NASA's JPL don't use CW for communicating with deep space
> probes.

Right you are, but so far there are darn few hams needing
to work deep space
probes.
A number of the current and older digital modes do well at
terrestrial weak signal
work.

> I can see a use for say high speed packet on HF for among
> other things long distance health and welfare traffic from a remote
> disaster site. All you need is an equipment setup, antennas and
> a source of power (generator or from a car battery) and needing no
> infrastructure like that needed for the internet or short distance
> VHF/UHF packet. We get on the internet via dial up with
> 56K modems, so something similar might be possible on HF
> that can take QSB, QRM, QRN and such you don't get
> usually on a phone line. We would need some subbands
> where the 300 baud rule is not applied.
>

What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
fast can the fastest typist
type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
typists? How many large
databases can you generate and forward in any potential
disaster? Methinks the
"grande" factor has overpowered common sense in far too many
instances. It's always
better to be overprepared, but we risk forcing
underpreparation by urging hams to
abandon the tried and true for the untested and largely
unavailable.

>
> SO a new mode should do something better than the old mode,
> or do something new. And how would "better" be defined?
> "needs minimal equipment", "Best performance with lowest
> power, i.e., gets through when not even CW would", "can be
> interfaced with existing radios to do a new mode, i.e., packet
> over 2m FM radios (not the best way of doing it from a
> spectrum efficiency viewpoint, but required a minimum of
> new equipment). Sure it's a tall order to make a great
> new mode, but we all will like it when someone does
> accomplish it. The DXers will be able to snag more
> weak DX while using stealth antennas with say 50W,
> etc....

OK, but we already have stuff that will do all that! And
have had for many years!
PACTOR is probably capable of handling any disaster comms
for which hams will ever
need to provide communications. Sure, there will be even
better modes developed,
have already been, depending on what ones criteria for
'better' happens to be. None
of this provides cause to dump what we already have proven
by use.

2315. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 04:28:03 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <nBLx8.2793$8p3.261744@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41634

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> OK, but we already have stuff that will do all that! And have had
> for many years! PACTOR is probably capable of handling any
> disaster comms for which hams will ever need to provide
> communications. Sure, there will be even better modes developed,
> have already been, depending on what ones criteria for 'better'
> happens to be. None of this provides cause to dump what we
> already have proven by use.

Dick,

With all due regard for the welcome 'common sense' you seem to try to bring to this discussion, your last sentence puzzles me.

Nobody in this discussion (that I've seen -- I admit I filter some of the gadflies) has even remotely suggested that we "dump what we already have proven by use."

73, de Hans, K0HB

2316. ARD Software Pukes and Dies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 04:46:19 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <vSLx8.2872$8p3.268424@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41635

I pulled my old ARRL Radio Designer software (V1.0) out tonight to run some simulations. I think the last time I ran it was on Win 3.11 or some such ancient OS. Pukes and dies on Win 98.

Anybody here running it on Win 98? How'd you do it?

Hans, K0HB

2317. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 05:05:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE7AC57.254086EC@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41637

W1RFI wrote:

I don't think that ARRL

> will win the current 70 cm RFID spectrum battle by threatening to insult the
> FCC.

Nope, different battle with different players. You don't have Carl yelling
"Luddite!" at everyone who finds value in a mode more than a week old.

> As you say, believing that to be a factor is YOUR right, too, but you
> appear rather foolish in thinking that insulting the FCC is the way to win
> anything.

So who is insulting the FCC? Stating facts or 'if the shoe fits' isn't an insult.
And it's definitely a fact that Carl yells "Luddite!" at every perceived
opportunity. It is also a fact that Cross can be assumed to prefer to avoid getting
in the way of one of Carl's fusillades.
Oh, I forgot, you see insults behind every bush.

> > Would YOU want Carl hounding you?
>
> Been there; done that, Dick, and Carl and I both learned from each other.
>

Well at least YOU learned about Carl.

> >Cross is said to be a CW operator who likes DX. All the more reason why he
> >"must be careful to avoid any appearance" of allowing his personal
> >preferences to show up in his work.
>
> What appearances. Did it ever dawn on you that it is possible that Cross
> actually does not allow his personal preferences to show up in his work?
>

Of course. It also dawned on me that he might also find it an attractive
alternative to dance around the loudmouth with the Luddite branding iron in hand.

> > Let me be very clear-the advancement of technology in ham radio is a forgone
> > conclusion.
>
> I sure would hate to see the long tradition of Amateur Radio embracing
> technology come to an end.
>

It is NOT happening and won't, at least for some hams who didn't get their
licenses via the "Extra in a Day" program noted in the online ham radio news
yesterday. All bets are of for those folks. Either way, all the gloom and doom

about all the bad things that will happen to us all if we don't dump every mode dating back more than six months is so much nonsense.

> > Just as is the fact that we WILL lose portions of our spectrum as the
> >need for it by other services grows. It's as inevitable as the rising sun,
> >always
> >has been.
>
> The value brought by the Amateur Radio Service will be balanced against the
> value brought by others who want to use the spectrum. Most of our spectrum
> battles of late have been vis a vis Part 15 operation, and we have not lost
> most of that spectrum. Part 15 has been given more access to Amateur spectrum,
> but as a secondary user.

Yes and on a non-interference basis as well. So try to enforce that. Once in a while hams will actually be able to find the interference source. All too often you will not, I'm afraid. Been there and done that, long ago, on the job, not just as a ham.

>
> >In the past FCC has done an outstanding job of providing us with the
> >use of spectrum that was largely sitting idle for our use while it sits idle,
> >to
> >the point that we have become accustomed to considering all 'our' spectrum
> >that
> >isn't covered by international allocations to amateurs, as ours forever.
>
> Back when nobody wanted spectrum above 30 MHz, it was really easy to keep it.
> Nowdays, virtually all spectrum is shared between users, in all sorts of
> sharing relationships (from co-primary to primary/secondary). Most amateur
> bands are shared with ISM and NTIA authorizations.

Which I believe to be authorizations that are rarely or never used. Comes the day when they are routinely needed, what will happen? You really think that just because we keep up with Jones and Company in their latest modes that will make difference? Not likely.

>
>
> >Portions of the 430-450 mhz band is an example.
> >Sure, we don't want to lose any of it, but I see it as almost inevitable.
>
> What part of the 420-450 MHz band are we set to lose? I know of no rulemaking
> proposal that seeks to take it away from us.
>

Take a look at the international amateur allocations. They cover 10 mHz of that band IIRC. hen ask around among public safety comm agencies to find out how virtually impossible it is to obtain a frequency authorization in the 450 mhz region. Everything is loaded up and widely shared under tone access. I'm surprised we still have anything left there that isn't covered under the international allocations.

> >When
> >communications needs can be met with far less power consumption by modes that
> >operate well in noisy environments it would be folly to NOT adopt them. Such
> >efficiencies are not nearly as important and are not primary to ham radio
> >operators daily activities.
>
> If we find ourselves sharing more and more of our bands with more and more
> users, spectrally efficient modes that operate well in the presence of noise
> will become very important to us. And even if there is no one else on the
> band, being able to hear and use signals that are deeper into thermal noise
> would be an improvement.

I certainly have no argument with any of that and have repeatedly said as much. Why do you join Carl in insisting I do?

>
>
> > The lame mantra that "if we don't adopt the efficient
> >modes the commercials have (or even develop better ones) ham radio will be
> >falling down on its basis and purpose" is so much nonsense. That's ONE of the
> >bases, but by no means the main reason for our existence.
>
> Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted your
> attitude in 1914, it would not exist today.

Nonsense! The early days of radio desperately needed all the technical improvement they could get and they did get it. Today is a different situation entirely, and surely you know that. So why the sour attitude? How many times must I say it before it soaks in? Time marches on, people invent new things, they are tried, tested, adopted or discarded, and if attractive and useful, absorbed over time into use within the ARS. So it has always been, so it will always be. But the fact that so many hams like to use modes that have been around a long time
(one of my personal favorites is Hellschreiber) is proof that evolution of ham radio has reached a point beyond which it will take some clear and demanding need for large shifts in technology for drastic changes to be made. Sometime in the future conditions may indeed force drastic technical changes. But until they do, Carl will still be talking digital and working SSB. I think the people doing all the yelling at hams about "Tecdnology or else" know this and understand it.

> How far behind do you think we can
> be and still have value to our regulators?

Behind what? Ourselves? Carl? FCC? ARRL? Who?
Maybe if you only work CW you can consider yourself to be behind. I don't work only CW, I do lots of other modern things. But I did make a CW contact yesterday. With W6BNB, Bob Shrader, the author of the excellent technical textbook "Electronic Communication" a book that I've mentioned here before. I understand that he works only CW, and with a 'Cootie Key' sideswiper, at that. Heck of a nice and interesting fellow. And no Luddite by a long stretch. I'm quite sure he's not "behind".

2318. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 05:06:07 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <3k3fcuo07ru90ucftm5sucsfgid60k275q@4ax.com>
Source record: 41636

```
On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 03:36:13 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>
>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:vo6ecuskdc50knecesahfjh6s0ce1f6qnq@4ax.com...
>> On Wed, 24 Apr 2002 20:38:05 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
>> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>> >news:20020423225435.01774.00001924@mb-cg.aol.com...
>> >> In article <1uuacukp0661rmb9tqc0bgk5ainm48hqsa@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>> >> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >I do miss her though. In a ng, where she can't really dictate what
>> >> >people say by beating them over the head with misinterpreted FCC
>> >> >rules, she was quite funny.
>> >>
>> >> Bob:
>> >>
>> >> Yeah, Kim did cause a lot of guffaws! Now Brian will have to pull
>> >> double-duty.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> >
>> >Hell, I could run circles around Kim in the "Guffaws" department. And I
>> >otta leave the group as well. Who'se got time for this nonsense?
>> >
>>
>> I come and I go (for sometimes years at a time.) See you when you get
>> back.
>
>Sayonara Bob.
>

Bye. Perhaps, like myself, you will decide to return periodically as
time passes. I hope that is the case and that you may return in the
future.
```

2319. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 07:02:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425030207.27437.00004551@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41638

>Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/24/02 13:35 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020424133538.06459.00000829@mb-mo.aol.com>

>>> No, Lennie....YOU keep making stupid mistakes that even relatively new
>>> radio hobbyists know are dumb.
>>
>>How could he? He's never been on an amateur band that you are aware of.
>
>A more basic question is regarding "awareness." Of anything.

It still all comes down to what Lennie CLAIMS he knows and what he CLAIMS is "good" for Amateur radio.

In this case, as in most everything Lennie spouts here, it is zero.

I aliken Lennie to the people who show up in my ER spouting "medical" terms they have heard on episodes of "E.R." or read in "Reader's Digest"....They have heard/read "just enough" to be able to repeat the terms, but they have little comprehension of what they say.

They know the words, but they "know" nothing.

Just like Lennie.

G'nite

Steve

2320. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 07:06:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425030640.27437.00004552@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41639

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/24/02 13:35 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020424133540.06459.00000833@mb-mo.aol.com>

>It's so nice of you to tell us that an itinerant portrait painter was
>working on "digital electronics" as early as 1840. Thank you.

And the problem with that concept is...?!?!

Another painter was working on concepts of aviation and astronomics in the
1500's. Seems no one has a problem with HIS finidings.

Steve

2321. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 09:41:54 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204250141.4a43b8a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41640

> >"been there, done that" I haven't done packet for years.
>
>
1200 baud packet is far from dead around here, we have at least a
couple hundred dxers tuned to ten +/- nodes. But it's a very different
ballgame from packet of the 80s, today it's not something you "do" for
jolies like packet was back when, it's now just a fully automated
utility which provides almost instantly-available hard info for HF
dxers and not much more. You bet it works.
>
>
> All that Hans is proposing is to set up a place where such development can
> flourish.
>
There hasn't been a new HF mode developed or adopted in ham radio yet
which needed any setaside spectrum space to "flourish", every one of
'em has sucessfully duked it out with modes which were already in use
in the same space going back to AM, then ssb, and more recently PSK31.
Or it died. NBFM and DSB are two examples of duds. If a new mode has
sufficient merit to capture enough market share in competition with
the rest of the available choices the results will be obvious. Welcome
to the basics of the capitalist free market and to hell with welfare
for modes.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
w3rv

2322. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 10:16:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425061608.06846.00005546@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41641

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>There hasn't been a new HF mode developed or adopted in ham radio yet
>which needed any setaside spectrum space to "flourish", every one of
>'em has sucessfully duked it out with modes which were already in use
>in the same space going back to AM, then ssb, and more recently PSK31.

If you give a listen to the commercial bands around our bands, you will hear all sorts of signals that are not permitted on our bands under the current rules. The limitations on modulation modes and data rates preclude the development of new HF modes in ham radio that could "flourish" in a setaside spectrum place.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2323. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 10:20:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425062050.06846.00005548@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41642

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> Farnsworth is a method of spacing the characters in Morse encoding.

>Actually, its not. Morse is Morse. Its very specific.

You are free to believe what you want, as is everyone else.

>>Repeater IDs are often made using Morse.

>> >? Is that digital too?

>> To the same extent that an RTTY signal sent using FM of two tones would be
>> digital?

>I must be tone deaf. Which two tones does the digital repeater ID use?

It does not. It was an example of a ficticious signal that used audio tones but
that would be considered digital.

Sorry for the confusion. I will try to express myself in less convoluted ways
in the future.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2324. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 10:27:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425062757.06846.00005549@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41643

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>So a single interfering carrier 20 dB above the desired signal wipes out the
>desired signal.

And that would occur if that signal appeared anywhere in the 25 kHz bandwidth.

>But in that same 25 kHz bandwidth, at least fifty 12 wpm CW/Morse signals
>could
>coexist with no significant interference, even is some were 20 dB above
>others
>(and decent receiver selectivity was used).

That "decent receiver selectivity" is key to one major advantage of narrowband over SS in the context we are discussing. Not only can those 50 signals coexist with each other, they can do so if the PEP of the 50 signals combined is less than the dynamic-range of the receiver can handle. Typically, that will be about 90 dB. Typically, only 3 or 4 of those signals would be really loud, so that would give about 75-80 dB of total rejection of the out-of-passband signals. Now, this is a simplification, because the really close-in signals wouldn't offer 90 dB of dynamic range, but the general idea holds.

Remember, this started with an off-the-cuff statement by me that a really slow data rate would allow some true SS in a 25- or 50-kHz bandwidth. I was not implying that such was an optimum system. It might be intersting to see what could be done on HF with a data rate of <1 b/s, though.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2325. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 10:31:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425063102.06846.00005550@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41644

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>That in itself makes it easier to copy than manually formed, infinitely
>variable elements and spacings.

The majority of "manually" sent Morse encoding is done with an electronic
keyer.

The majority of code sent with a hand key is close enough to the Morse standard
that a human does not find it easier to copy than machine-sent, more precise
code. To the contrary, the slightly longer character spacing sent by most
operators makes it a bit easier.

The words "infinitely variable" are an exaggeration.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2326. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 10:32:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425063230.06846.00005551@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41645

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> And the old "I desire to be loud" ploy doesn't cut it. :-)

>Ed, has Riley given an opinion on that?

Not to my knowledge. You could ask him and tell us what he says.

>Is Riley ever wrong?

You can ask him that, too. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2327. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 10:34:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425063444.06846.00005552@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41646

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Ed, its fascinating to see everyone divying up the Novice subbands. Too bad
>the bands didn't receive much interest when they were supposed to be the
>training ground for new operators.

The premise in all this divvying is that the training ground for new operators will be elsewhere in the band, right along with the more experienced operators who will be able to offer some Elmering. Although some of those experienced ops did slide up the band a bit to the Novice/+ segments, most did not.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2328. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 10:35:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425063548.06846.00005553@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41647

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
>typists?

A picture is worth a thousand words...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2329. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 10:49:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425064916.06846.00005554@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 41648

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>So who is insulting the FCC? Stating facts or 'if the shoe fits' isn't an
>insult.

Fortunately, no one is insulting, or threatinging to insult, the FCC.

>And it's definitely a fact that Carl yells "Luddite!" at every perceived
>opportunity. It is also a fact that Cross can be assumed to prefer to avoid
>getting
>in the way of one of Carl's fusillades.

Do you think that Cross even knows what Carl says on rec.radio.amateur.policy?

>Oh, I forgot, you see insults behind every bush.

Not at all, Dick; I see insults where insults are offered, though. Maybe you should threaten Bill Cross with a public "go soak your head" and turn the regulatory tide back to what you want it to be. You are claiming that all one has to do is to threaten him with a public lashing. . .

> Of course. It also dawned on me that he might also find it an attractive
>alternative to dance around the loudmouth with the Luddite branding iron in
>hand.

Okay, offer us one tiny shred of evidence that is more than speculation that Cross did something different than what he felt was in the public interest because he was afraid Carl would call him a Luddite. Just one tiny real piece of proof.
> Either way, all the gloom and doom
>about all the bad things that will
>happen to us all if we don't dump every mode
>dating back more than six months is so much nonsense.

Is that another one of those "what he said, what you heard" sort of things. Carl has repeatedly told us that he does not believe that hams need to stop using any mode in Amateur Radio that pleases them. Your "dump" stuff is, well, a dump...

> Yes and on a non-interference basis as well. So try to enforce that. Once
>in a while hams will actually be able to find the interference source. All too
>often you will not, I'm afraid. Been there and done that, long ago, on the
job, not
>just as a ham.

I agree, but until we prove this to the FCC with real cases, they will continue to gut the effectiveness of radio services by allowing more and more unlicensed stuff in their bands.

>> Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted your
>> attitude in 1914, it would not exist today.

>Nonsense!

Why is it nonsense? For you to believe it is nonsense, you must believe that what I said is not true. So that means you are saying that if ham radio had chosen not to use the technology of the day in 1914, it would still exist today. THAT is nonsense, Dick, and YOU know it!

Is this another one of those "what you said and what you really meant" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2330. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 12:06:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425080646.26511.00000496@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41649

In article <iiKx8.11802$fu7.328902134@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
>> >> Or even on one of those bands?
>> >
>> >What's your point?
>>
>> Your credibility.
>
>What is wrong with my credibility?

On the subject of the use of the non-phone amateur HF band segments, you have little to none.

>Do you have an accusation to make?

Just an observation: You talk about the use of various subbands and modes in amateur radio, but you are evading
simple questions:

When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
Or even on one of those bands?

They are not trick questions.

>> You have talked about the conditions on various HF bands, but you give no
>> indication of actually having used those bands.

>I have.

But not when, or how often, or with what equipment.

Example: I was on 80 meter CW less than a week ago. Made a few good contacts. When's the last time
you were on 80 CW?

It's a simple question. No tricks.
>> Which poll are you talking about? I'm referring to the one asking about
>> "refarming" the Novice bands.
>
>The "rarely or never" poll in which the ARRL concluded there was no reason
>to change anything.

Wrong poll. I'm talking about the refarming poll. Was on the ARRL website and in QST.

>> >> > They need to lead, not follow or take another poll. Or just get out
>> >> > of the way.
>> >>
>> >> The ARRL BoD thinks giving lots more privs to Tech Pluses and Novices
>> >> is lead. They also think turning the Novice subbands over to 'phone is
>> >> leading. I agree with the first part but not the second.
>> >
>> >Putting the Novices in the General CW portion of the band 25+ years ago
>is
>> >Lead.
>>
>> I was a ham 25 years ago. Were you?
>
>Here we go again. "I've got more time in the chow hall..."

It's a simple fact that I have been an active ham for three and half decades,
using a variety of bands, modes and equipment. It's called qualifications.

> The FCC is not issuing any more Novice or Tech+ licenses.
>Why?

- Less admin work.
- Administrative cluelessness.
- Desire to purge the database of SKs.
- Lowered requirements for all licenses means FCC sees no reason for new
licenses in those license classes.
- Tech Plus has become "Tech-with-HF".
- Few new Novices in recent years.
>
>> The ARRL BoD proposed instant upgrading of all existing Novices and Tech
>Pluses
>> to General way back in 1998. FCC said no.
>
>Who the

[expletive deleted]

>wants an instant upgrade?

All the pre-1987 Tech Pluses who got Generals after restructuring, for one.

>Just stop the divisions and segregation in the band.

Which means what? No more subbands by license class? No more subbands by mode?

>If the Novices had been in the General CW portion
>of the band they might have had a chance.

Then why did the FCC reject the ARRL idea, and the AH0A petition to do just
that?

> I didn't say phone, did I?

You said "stop the divisions and segregation in the band".

>Instead you now have a dead license class because of a dead idea.

Not dead to those who have one. Look at AH0A figures for renewals and renewals
in the grace period for those "dead" classes.
>
>> The 200 W power limit has to do with written testing.
>
>Really? Correct me if I'm wrong (and you will), but weren't the old,
>bonifide Extras limited in power in some of those segments?

All US hams were limited in power in those subbands to provide a "level playing
field". It was not always that way. Dumb rule, actually.

>> >> > > 6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned
>> >unless
>> >> > there
>> >> > > is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).
>> >> >
>> >> > Planned obsolescense?
>> >>
>> >> Planned obsolescence is only a good reason to those trying to sell new
>> >> rigs and accessories.
>> >
>> >If Kenwood came out with a new mode, it would probably be fantastic.
>> >
>> Why should hams depend on the manufacturers? It's our job to lead them.
>
>True. About the time "packet ready" rigs came out packet was about over.

How many hams do you know (besides me) who have designed and built complete
homebrew HF stations that are not QRP?

How many amateur rigs of any kind have you built from scratch, Brian?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2331. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 12:59:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC7FDBA.C41D8290@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41650

Dick Carroll wrote:
> None of this provides cause to dump what we already
> have proven by use.

Who has suggested outlawing anything proven by use?
Nobody has suggested dumping anything except the code *test*.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2332. Re: ARD Software Pukes and Dies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 13:01:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC7FE23.22C35F69@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41551

K0HB wrote:
>
> I pulled my old ARRL Radio Designer software (V1.0) out tonight to run some
> simulations. I think the last time I ran it was on Win 3.11 or some such
> ancient OS. Pukes and dies on Win 98.
>
> Anybody here running it on Win 98? How'd you do it?

Hans, last time I checked, it would not run on Win 98.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2333. Re: ARD Software Pukes and Dies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 13:42:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CC807B8.38728A5D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 41552

K0HB wrote:
>
> I pulled my old ARRL Radio Designer software (V1.0) out tonight to run some
> simulations. I think the last time I ran it was on Win 3.11 or some such
> ancient OS. Pukes and dies on Win 98.
>
> Anybody here running it on Win 98? How'd you do it?
>
> Hans, K0HB

Hans,

Try restarting your computer in DOS mode and then bring up the program.

Dave K8MN

2334. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 14:01:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204250601.2ebc0742@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41553

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3CC71461.F7CC79A2@ix.netcom.com>...
>
> The FCC itself noted that it has observed no "damage" to the
> HF bands since restructuring happened, specifically the CW
> test requirement.

Kinda premature to make such a judgement. It's been only two years.

> If anything, today's code tests are tougher
> than the old ones, because the Farnsworth method is used
> (high speed characters spaced at 5wpm).

They are actually easier, not harder. For one thing, 13 and 20 wpm
tests
are gone. While Farnsworth is the usual method, "regular" 5 wpm can be
had on request. And as W1RFI notes, 5 wpm Farnsworth allows more time
to write down the characters.

5 wpm Morse works out to 1 character every 2.4 seconds. With "5/13"
Farnsworth, most of that 2.4 seconds is writing time.

> And they didn't
> change the writtens except for the routine updates to the
> question pools.

Just the opposite! The number of writtens and the total number of
questions for a given license dropped due to restructuring.
>
> The mess that was on 14.313 was caused by a few people who
> did pass a 13wpm test (of course not everyone who passed
> 13wpm caused those problems :-)).

Not necessarily. Code waivers for the 13 and 20 wpm code tests were
created in 1990.

The mess that was on 14.313 was caused by a few people who
did pass several written tests (of course not everyone who passed
written tests caused those problems :-)).

> And this trouble wasn't
> the sort that newbies might inadvertly cause. A "newbie"
> is someone who might make mistakes but soon learns to
> avoid those mistakes, a "lid" persists in making the same
> mistakes over and over.

Agreed to a certain extent. The real problem is one of attitude and
"culture". Some newbies and old timers simply have bad attitudes and a
destructive on-air "culture". Example: A few, even in this newsgroup,
think it's OK to cuss on the air.
>
> from Dick:
> > One more point- the modes hams use today have evolved over time, assisted by
> >advances in technology, to the point that most of them are very well suited to
> >the uses that hams make of them. Some modes and systems are efficient and some
> >are not, such as the VHF/UHF repeater allocations, and should be revised toward
>
> >more efficient uses. Others, such as SSB, CW and most of the digital modes in
> >use, do just fine. That doesn't mean that further development isn't desirable
> >nor that it should not be continued. But so far no one has shown any valid
> reason
> >why hams should be lining up to dump everything they've grown to like and that
> >works so well for them in favor of somebody's vague notions of "the way things
>
> >should be because I know how to do it and I KNOW it should be" that way.
>
> I would agree that SSB and CW work quite well, but realize that people
> like NASA's JPL don't use CW for communicating with deep space
> probes.

They don't use SSB, either. Nor SS, as far as I know. Nor HF

NASA uses modes and technologies suited to the environment and
available technologies. So do hams. But radio to NASA is just a means
to an end, not an end in itself. Radio to hams is the goal.

> I can see a use for say high speed packet on HF for among
> other things long distance health and welfare traffic from a remote
> disaster site. All you need is an equipment setup, antennas and
> a source of power (generator or from a car battery) and needing no
> infrastructure like that needed for the internet or short distance
> VHF/UHF packet. We get on the internet via dial up with
> 56K modems, so something similar might be possible on HF
> that can take QSB, QRM, QRN and such you don't get
> usually on a phone line. We would need some subbands
> where the 300 baud rule is not applied.

Thus the "experiment farm".
>
> SO a new mode should do something better than the old mode,
> or do something new. And how would "better" be defined?
> "needs minimal equipment", "Best performance with lowest
> power, i.e., gets through when not even CW would", "can be
> interfaced with existing radios to do a new mode, i.e., packet
> over 2m FM radios (not the best way of doing it from a
> spectrum efficiency viewpoint, but required a minimum of
> new equipment). Sure it's a tall order to make a great
> new mode, but we all will like it when someone does

> accomplish it. The DXers will be able to snag more
> weak DX while using stealth antennas with say 50W,
> etc....

The main thing needed is that a new mode must have a certain special something that makes hams WANT to use it. PSK31 has a mixture of things - low cost, narrow bandwidth, good performance/cost/bandwidth ratios, easy to use, etc. It's a mix. Hitting the mix right is the challenge.

The development of PSK31 led to the development of specialized hardware like the "Warbler". End result is a "tail wags the dog" station - a tiny, inexpensive
rig controlled by a much more complex and expensive computer. Watta concept.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2335. The new DXer - Reach out and REALLY touch someone!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 15:45:00 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <0wVx8.3860$8p3.345468@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41555

LONDON (Reuters) - Squeezable mobile phones could soon be adding new meaning to keeping in touch.

Researchers at MIT's Media Lab in Cambridge, Massachusetts have developed a new vibrating rubber cellphone that can transmit vibrations along with words.

Unlike other cellphones that vibrate instead of ringing, the MIT latex prototype has five tiny speakers that you wrap your fingers around and which vibrate against the skin at around 250 times per second.

"Beneath these speakers sit pressure sensors, so you can transmit vibration as well as receiving it," New Scientist magazine said on Wednesday.

"When you squeeze with a finger, a vibration signal is transmitted to your caller's corresponding finger, its strength is dependent on how hard you squeeze."

Students who tested the vibrating cellphones used them to add emphasis to their conversations and even developed their own type of Morse code, according to researcher Angela Chang.

She believes the new cellphone has a big advantage over mobile phones because you can communicate without anyone knowing what you are saying.

"And imagine actually being able to shake someone's hand when you close a business deal," she said.

-30-

Who says you'd necessarily be shaking their *_hand_*?

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

"1943 Poster Child for The National Precocious Little Bastard Campaign"

2336. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 15:53:02 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <yDVx8.3877$8p3.349673@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41556

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

>
> But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
> told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
> not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
> FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
> DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.
>

A rose by any other name.....

If his self-esteem would be wounded because his FCC license contained the word "Amateur", then he probably has the wrong mindset to mingle with us lowly amateurs anyhow.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

"1943 Poster Child for The National Precocious Little Bastard Campaign"

2337. An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 16:00:52 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ucg8vjl62e320e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41554

Hello, all!

A friend of mine, another astro-type, is also an electronics technician. He maintains a lot of pretty high-end hospital equipment and has done so for about 15 years. He has seen the various messages on our astro club list serve about the Ham activities that were done in connection with Astronomy Day, and we have been exchanging ideas on small-bore radio astronomy.

Yesterday he mentioned that he had "thought about being a Ham" from time to time but "didn't want to learn Morse Code." At least, that's what he SAID, at first.

But, what came out in the exchanges that followed told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him, not really, but rather the fact that a "professional, FCC-licensed technician" was going to step DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.

I'm telling you, this is a PROBLEM to be considered down the road, if the Ham Community is serious about its future. This is NOT a trivial matter, in my view. The whole avocation needs an image upgrade for the new century, regardless of what is actually on the air.

Val Germann
KC0MUB

2338. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:43:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204250943.2de0408b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41557

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020425062757.06846.00005549@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >So a single interfering carrier 20 dB above the desired signal wipes out the
> >desired signal.
>
> And that would occur if that signal appeared anywhere in the 25 kHz bandwidth.

oh mama....

Adjust the phasing contol on the crystal filter.

> >But in that same 25 kHz bandwidth, at least fifty 12 wpm CW/Morse signals
> >could
> >coexist with no significant interference, even is some were 20 dB above
> >others
> >(and decent receiver selectivity was used).
>
> That "decent receiver selectivity" is key to one major advantage of narrowband
> over SS in the context we are discussing.

Then there's the near-far problem.

> Not only can those 50 signals coexist
> with each other, they can do so if the PEP of the 50 signals combined is less
> than the dynamic-range of the receiver can handle. Typically, that will be
> about 90 dB. Typically, only 3 or 4 of those signals would be really loud, so
> that would give about 75-80 dB of total rejection of the out-of-passband
> signals. Now, this is a simplification, because the really close-in signals
> wouldn't offer 90 dB of dynamic range, but the general idea holds.

I don't consider 90 dB blocking dynamic range in an amateur HF rx to
be "decent". The Ancient Ones got that sort of performance 40 years
ago. Of course, I've been spoiled by a rig with more than 120 dB BDR -
at 5 kHz spacing.

> Remember, this started with an off-the-cuff statement by me that a really slow
> data rate would allow some true SS in a 25- or 50-kHz bandwidth. I was not
> implying that such was an optimum system.

Sure. But the whole point of the "experimental farm" idea is to allow
hams to
muck around with whatever PBIs they want - optimum or not. Without
lotsa paperwork and such.

> It might be intersting to see what
> could be done on HF with a data rate of <1 b/s, though.

You mean even non-optimum systems can be interesting? Some would call that electro-politically incorrect. A few "professionals" might want to boil you in transformer oil for suggesting such a thing. ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2339. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:44:34 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204250944.3fde7ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41558

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gv3bcjk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 24 Apr 2002 15:46:14 -0700, Carl Zager wrote:
>
> >So many people were boggled. Is it "licensed
> >[to]," "licensed [by]," "licensed [as]?" I read it as RACES Station is
> >a CD organization with an ARS license (even if there is no ham as the
> >"control operator"). That's what the new protocol hopes to end.
>
> Do not confuse the RACES statsion control operator (who has been
> required to be a licensed ARS operator for several decades now) with
> the RACES station trustee who could be a non-amateur. With the
> abolition of the RACES station per se, the anility pf a non-amateur
> to be such a trustee goes away just as the abilityof a nn-amateur
> tooperate the statsion went away several decades ago.

I didn't think I was. But you're right to remind us of that. The
"RACES station control operator" is a ham -- appointed, named,
selected by the RACES Officer (a General class or higher ham). It is,
in fact, the RACES station trustee which is in question and which the
new regs would catch. TNX.

2340. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:53:19 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204250953.29c251c4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41559

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<ht9ecu8uuh7fhgi18vnptplkr5mhu5c8dh@4ax.com>...
> On 24 Apr 2002 14:32:31 -0700, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) wrote:
>
> >Somewhere in every thread on this newsgroup there will appear a
> >mention of a particular ham operator's callsign. Why don't we just
> >drop all the other topics in the headers and use "Single unifying
> >thread?" After all, it's what holds us together.
>
> Huh?

I'm suggesting that instead of having to go through threads on CW,
Rules and Regulations, Death of Ham Radio, etc. to find comments about
how dumb certain posters are or about how some callsigns are
destroying ham radio, we just agree to have one single long thread --
since all of the other threads eventually turn into those comments. It
usually occurs somewhere around the 5th to the 10th posting. <sarcasm>

2341. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:54:15 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204250954.5e304e93@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41560

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<hDKx8.11821$QW7.329563451@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:77f1797e.0204241332.64ee3f7c@posting.google.com...
> > Somewhere in every thread on this newsgroup there will appear a
> > mention of a particular ham operator's callsign. Why don't we just
> > drop all the other topics in the headers and use "Single unifying
> > thread?" After all, it's what holds us together.
> >
> > kb9rvb
> > Carl
>
> Carl, not all of us have callsigns. Brian

Perhaps I should have phrased it, "The callsign of a particular ham
operator from Texas."

2342. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:56:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE84AC0.C3F10C09@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41561

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> >typists?
>
> A picture is worth a thousand words...

Since when do you need a 56k circuit for a picture? You
don't, unless for some strange reason you demand Internet
download speeds. Seems to me like dedication of resources
far beyond any rational need, at least in this era.
If the goal is to duplicate the Internet that becomes a
different matter. As well as a huge limitation on usage of
those resources. I can't imagine a ham radio that would
allow all users of our spectrum to have the communications
capability of the Internet on ham radio. I don't think
that's technically feasable.

2343. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:56:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE8559A.E1FED17@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41562

Valentine Germann wrote:

> But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
> told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
> not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
> FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
> DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.
>

This is a common situation among radio technical professionals who did not receive the start of their interest in the field via ham radio. They don't seem to realize the potential for furthering their knowledge and experience through the wide variety of experimenting possibilities that exist in ham radio. Sometimes they find out through ham friends what they've been missing, and go on to become hams. Mostly they just avoid the "amateurs" as though such activity was beneath a radio professional.

One unlicensed poster to rrap comes to mind, and I doubt I need to name him. Evidently he has so little to do in his retirement that he spends most of his time criticizing and bashing hams and ham radio. May be some Freudian problem at work there, too.

Another anecdote comes to mind. I recently attended the funeral for a former co-worker after which I and a group of other former work mates, most of whom were licensed hams, were visiting. One fellow who was not a ham was asked if he had ever got a ham radio license, and he replied, "No, I just work with radio, I don't play with it". Pretty well sums up that attitude and its flaws. They don't understand that the limits placed on only "working" with radio are largely absent in ham radio. We're free to experiment and in conjunction with that experimentation, radiate signals almost without restraint by comparison. Within the rules and within reason, of course. Most of what one learns experimenting as a ham will transfer directly to a professional radio setting.

You might want to mention this point to your friend.

> I'm telling you, this is a PROBLEM to be considered
> down the road, if the Ham Community is serious
> about its future. This is NOT a trivial matter, in my
> view. The whole avocation needs an image upgrade

> for the new century, regardless of what is actually on
> the air.
>

It does make one wonder how many technical professionals
who know little about ham radio would view it differently if
they knew all the facts. They can't seem to get past the
"hobby" aspect of it. It is truly their loss.

BTW I spent 40 years working as a "FCC licensed
professional", too. But I started in ham radio as a kid.

Dick W0EX

2344. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:56:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE8573A.B4BE5867@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41563

W1RFI wrote:

> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >There hasn't been a new HF mode developed or adopted in ham radio yet
> >which needed any setaside spectrum space to "flourish", every one of
> >'em has sucessfully duked it out with modes which were already in use
> >in the same space going back to AM, then ssb, and more recently PSK31.
>
> If you give a listen to the commercial bands around our bands, you will hear
> all sorts of signals that are not permitted on our bands under the current
> rules. The limitations on modulation modes and data rates preclude the
> development of new HF modes in ham radio that could "flourish" in a setaside
> spectrum place.

And it is curious indeed that current and former FCC officials would urge us to do that which rules at best make difficult, to adopt the modern modes and modulations that we are at least hampered, or at worst prevented from using on our bands. Why wouldn't one wonder what is going on?

2345. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:56:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE858F5.7A5DF4EC@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41564

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Ed, its fascinating to see everyone divying up the Novice subbands. Too bad
> >the bands didn't receive much interest when they were supposed to be the
> >training ground for new operators.
>
> The premise in all this divvying is that the training ground for new operators
> will be elsewhere in the band, right along with the more experienced operators
> who will be able to offer some Elmering. Although some of those experienced
> ops did slide up the band a bit to the Novice/+ segments, most did not.

Not exactly the whole story, by any means. I used to make a practice of scanning across the Novice bands to see what was on, and, after Novice Enhancement, almost universally the answer was - nothing. Seems all the Novices were up on 10 meter SSB. THAT was the big problem. FCC made a huge mistake in allowing Novices SSB access if they in fact intended for them to gain skill in code operations. When I was a Novice the band segments were loaded - with Novices. We all talked to each other on CW, and the crowd did indeed draw many higher class licensees down into the Novice bands. That changed when they got SSB on 10 meters. It became a matter of
"No use even checking, they're all up on 10 meter SSB".

2346. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:56:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE85C68.CF308BB0@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41565

W1RFI wrote:C.

>
> >And it's definitely a fact that Carl yells "Luddite!" at every perceived
> >opportunity. It is also a fact that Cross can be assumed to prefer to avoid
> >getting
> >in the way of one of Carl's fusillades.
>
> Do you think that Cross even knows what Carl says on rec.radio.amateur.policy?
>

Do you think this is the only place he ever said it? I'd wager Cross knows all he needs to know about all this.

> >Oh, I forgot, you see insults behind every bush.
>
> Not at all, Dick; I see insults where insults are offered, though. Maybe you
> should threaten Bill Cross with a public "go soak your head" and turn the
> regulatory tide back to what you want it to be. You are claiming that all one
> has to do is to threaten him with a public lashing. . .
>

There you go again, assigning meanings never stated nor intended. Carl isn't just "one", he's Carl the "Luddite" and CW hater. Big difference.

>
> > Of course. It also dawned on me that he might also find it an attractive
> >alternative to dance around the loudmouth with the Luddite branding iron in
> >hand.
>
> Okay, offer us one tiny shred of evidence that is more than speculation that
> Cross did something different than what he felt was in the public interest
> because he was afraid Carl would call him a Luddite. Just one tiny real piece
> of proof.

You're saying that all Carl's raging and ranting is totally ignored, even when he later shows up for an ex parte party. Sure it is.

>
> > Either way, all the gloom and doom
> >about all the bad things that will
> >happen to us all if we don't dump every mode
> >dating back more than six months is so much nonsense.
>
> Is that another one of those "what he said, what you heard" sort of things.
> Carl has repeatedly told us that he does not believe that hams need to stop

> using any mode in Amateur Radio that pleases them. Your "dump" stuff is, well,
> a dump...
>

So you're not paying attention these days, Ed? To Carl or Dale Hatfield either? Carl has repeatedly howled about our "50 years behind" the commercials technology. If years of that and Hatfield's stark warning don't mean something on that order maybe you can do a better job of explaining it to us than they did.

> > Yes and on a non-interference basis as well. So try to enforce that. Once
> >in a while hams will actually be able to find the interference source. All too
> >often you will not, I'm afraid. Been there and done that, long ago, on the
> job, not
> >just as a ham.
>
> I agree, but until we prove this to the FCC with real cases, they will continue
> to gut the effectiveness of radio services by allowing more and more unlicensed
> stuff in their bands.
>
> >> Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted your
> >> attitude in 1914, it would not exist today.
>
> >Nonsense!
>
> Why is it nonsense? For you to believe it is nonsense, you must believe that
> what I said is not true.

Since you edited out my entire explanatory paragraph, I'll answer by putting it back in.

Nonsense! The early days of radio desperately needed all the technical improvement they could get and they did get it. Today is a different situation entirely, and surely you know that. So why the sour attitude? How many times must I say it before

it soaks in? Time marches on, people invent new things, they are tried, tested, adopted or discarded, and if attractive and useful, absorbed over time into use within the ARS. So it has always been, so it will always be. But the fact that so many hams like to use modes that have been around a long time
(one of my personal favorites is Hellschreiber) is proof that evolution of ham radio has reached a point beyond which it will take some clear and demanding need for large shifts in technology for drastic changes to be made. Sometime in the future conditions may indeed force drastic technical changes. But until they do, Carl will still be talking digital and working SSB. I think the people doing all the yelling at hams about "Tecnology or else" know this and understand it.

2347. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 17:56:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE860B0.A952D433@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41566

K0HB wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > OK, but we already have stuff that will do all that! And have had
> > for many years! PACTOR is probably capable of handling any
> > disaster comms for which hams will ever need to provide
> > communications. Sure, there will be even better modes developed,
> > have already been, depending on what ones criteria for 'better'
> > happens to be. None of this provides cause to dump what we
> > already have proven by use.
>
> Dick,
>
> With all due regard for the welcome 'common sense' you seem to try to bring
> to this discussion, your last sentence puzzles me.
>
> Nobody in this discussion (that I've seen -- I admit I filter some of the
> gadflies) has even remotely suggested that we "dump what we already have
> proven by use."

I don't think I read too much into all the pronouncements of Carl, Dale Hatfield, Ed and others when they seem to insist that we hams are "(some long number of time up to and including light years) behind the industry....."

2348. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 18:12:46 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <yGXx8.4247$8p3.367256@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41567

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> .....when they seem to insist that we hams are "(some long
> number of time up to and including light years) behind the industry....."

If the foo shits........

73, Hans, K0HB

2349. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 18:48:51 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ncYx8.4331$8p3.367149@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41568

"Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote

>
> Perhaps I should have phrased it, "The callsign of a particular ham
> operator from Texas."
>

W5DXP?

73, de Hans, K0HB

2350. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 18:53:33 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204251852050.25965-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41569

On 25 Apr 2002, Carl Zager wrote:
>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gv3bcjk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>> On 24 Apr 2002 15:46:14 -0700, Carl Zager wrote:
>>
>> >So many people were boggled. Is it "licensed
>> >[to]," "licensed [by]," "licensed [as]?" I read it as RACES Station is
>> >a CD organization with an ARS license (even if there is no ham as the
>> >"control operator"). That's what the new protocol hopes to end.
>>
>> Do not confuse the RACES statsion control operator (who has been
>> required to be a licensed ARS operator for several decades now) with
>> the RACES station trustee who could be a non-amateur. With the
>> abolition of the RACES station per se, the anility pf a non-amateur
>> to be such a trustee goes away just as the abilityof a nn-amateur
>> tooperate the statsion went away several decades ago.
>
>I didn't think I was. But you're right to remind us of that. The
>"RACES station control operator" is a ham -- appointed, named,
>selected by the RACES Officer (a General class or higher ham). It is,
>in fact, the RACES station trustee which is in question and which the
>new regs would catch. TNX.

Where does it say that the "RACES officer" (as you describe it above) need also
have an amateur radio license? Neither the trustee nor the "responsible
person" in charge of the organization (i.e., the "officer") need hold a
license.

2351. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 19:16:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425151650.19503.00001029@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 41574

In article <tfFx8.11439$Iu.318505244@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020424133537.06459.00000828@mb-mo.aol.com...
>> In article <4Wix8.1068$607.85083@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"K0CKB"
>> <k0ckb@arrl.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>> >
>> >> The "other interested citizen" is your WIFE, isn't she?
>> >
>> >Yes, I am.
>>
>> Oh, oh, here we go..."outraged wife" stuff again... :-)
>
>Was it the guy with two first names, a boys name and a girls name, or the
>Cop?

I'd normally put something creative and witty here, but this group doesn't like creative and witty... :-)

A problem with this faceless (and clueless) mode of exchange, of only screens full of characters and words, is that anyone can pretend to be anybody they want...and then feign "outrage" and "offense" at others not believing them. We, the readers, cannot be sure of anything posted solely by others, therefore the only believability is to have other references available...and mentioned.

It's rather coincidental that ol' Black Silver suddenly has his "wife" start posting in a "lecture mode" when he is confronted. That has several advantages -

1. It can take the onus off the original discussion (misdirection).

2. It can start a whole new thread of "outrage" and "impoliteness."

3. It can make the writer feel so very much "superior" and think he has won "message points."

Pfui. I am very suspicious of "coincidences" like the CKB exchange.

2352. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 19:16:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425151651.19503.00001031@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 41570

In article <20020424202522.06881.00005340@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>> Morse is only one of an infinite ways that a CW signal can be encoded.
>
>>True, another seemingly popular encoding scheme is called Farnworth.
>
>Farnsworth is a method of spacing the characters in Morse encoding.
>
>>> Morse encoding can be used on modes other than OOK CW. Repeater IDs are
>>>often made using Morse.
>
>>? Is that digital too?
>
>To the same extent that an RTTY signal sent using FM of two tones would be
>digital?

The rest of the radio world regards TTY and RTTY as
telegraphy.

The amateur radio world thinks TTY and RTTY are "data."

"Data" is a character in the fictional "Star Trek" universe.

2353. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 19:16:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425151651.19503.00001030@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 41572

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.guxzhca.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 00:55:10 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>
>>> Which are you signed up for? What do they require?
>>
>>I'm currently involved in neither.
>>
>>From 1993-1998, I was an operator on call for a federal facility
>>(local VA hospital). We were only called out once - On January 16,
>>1994 - for the Northridge, CA earthquake. Our facility was not hit,
>>but the next one over (Sepulveda) was within 3 miles of the epicenter.
>>The only "emergency" thing we did was at the direction of the VA
>>police: Their radio equipment couldn't reach the Sepulveda facility
>>and telco was down. Using our equipment (better than their puny 5w
>>HT's), we contacted the other facility to arrange for patient
>>transfer. That's it.

The Northridge earthquake occurred on January 17, 1994. A bit after
4 in the ack-emma. About 10 million or so folks "noticed" it.

It's nice to know amateur radio can be prepared for catastrophies a
day ahead of time. Remarkable ability.

2354. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 19:16:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425151652.19503.00001032@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 41575

In article <20020424172049.22519.00005579@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>> Why would a computer not handle OOK CW?
>
>>Because of the wildly varying rate and ratio of dit and dah elements and
>>spacing, AKA the Banana Boat Swing.
>
>Morse is only one of an infinite ways that a CW signal can be encoded. A
>computer could easily handle most of them, although manually Morse encoded
>OOK CW is probably the hardest.
>
>Morse encoding can be used on modes other than OOK CW.

Yes, it can be done on fast-scan TV using a whole 6 MHz of emission space. Wonderful stuff.

>Repeater IDs are often made using Morse.

Yes, very important to identify some station locked into a certain fixed frequency by frequency coordinators with local and national repeater listings available.

The technical reason behind automatic identification is simplicity. Unattended stations were doing that before WW2 on radionavigation beacons at LF. Seven decades ago. Those were all mechanical "keyers." Voice over some LF beacons did not come in until after WW2.

Our two-year-old combo FAX and answering telephone has digitized voice recording, can play back messages on demand, has several prerecorded voice prompts in permanent memory. Commercial consumer electronics item costing less than $150. The only time it has "failed" was when some NYC NBC staffer kept trying to send FAXes to our machine by mistake and it kept printing the same FAX until it ran out of paper. No doubt the NYC NBC staffer can be blamed for "not knowing morse code?" :-)

>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

2355. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 19:16:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425151653.19503.00001033@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 41571

In article <T9Fx8.11429$Pk.318333256@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CC6F5D0.E6C624B7@IEEE.org...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > It's so nice of you to tell us that an itinerant portrait painter was
>> > working on "digital electronics" as early as 1840. Thank you.
>>
>> Dang Len, I knew you were old but I didn't know you were *that* old.

I'll pause in chopping down the cherry tree but have to admit that I was on Al Vail's side, not Sam's. Sam was just a hack artist in the early 1800s. Most itinerant artists of that time were the "portrait-painter" variety. Film cameras hadn't been invented yet, you understand, so the itinerants went around making others' egos feel good.

Sam was a fair salesman (itinerants had to be to survive) but only a hack when it came to art. He was seduced by the electricity side of the Force and played around with mechanical gadgetry. If he hadn't met Al Vail there wouldn't be any "morse code."

Vail's family already had the kilobucks to spare, being manufacturers of railroad things, plus some spare room in the Vail factory. It was Vail who turned Morse around from his "recording pen" system to the dot-dash coding scheme. Morse never did get the recording pen part of his gadget working successfully. [BIC pens were over a century in the future]

Eventually, Morse got too full of hisself and split from Vail. This is not unlike some current morsemen...so fond of themselves and their ability that they assume a god-like attitude.

>He also might have known that guy who used to make silencers for weapons.
>Hiram somebody.

Hiram Colt? Hiram Winchester? Hiram Brakob? Hiram Roll?

I know only Saint Hiram of Newington and His acolytes.

NB: "Acolyte" is similar to "electrolyte" in that it is fluid and soaked, may generate RF energy when provoked, but it normally only mildly toxic to normal humans.

2356. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 19:16:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425151655.19503.00001034@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 41573

In article <g7Dx8.1742$8p3.166625@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> I don't understand why any amateur organization hasn't asked for
>> more spectrum space in the MF-HF region...or even below MF.
>> The UK got a "lowfer" band, below the US' 160-190 KHz open
>> territory for unlicensed emitters.
>
>Obviously the Old Sir has been too busy grinding his organ to notice the
>various requests for such spectrum.
>
>http://www.arrl.org/announce/lf-pet.pdf RM-9404
>
>http://www.arrl.org/announce/regulatory/5MHz/ RM-10209

Obviously the Old Switch-hitter from MN cannot read worth shit on
what was written. ALL of it, not just some selective quoting. Let's
unroll some alphanumeric gobbledegoop and go to the FCC site
instead of Big Mother.

Firstly, an "RM" is like a recommendation from either the FCC or a
request from an outside party for a regulation change. If the legal
procedure is followed and the FCC thinks the outside party is still
with mental faculties intact, it assigns a number to the RM and
puts it out in front of the public for all to see.

Anyone can go to the FCC website and click up the ECFS or
Electronic Comment Filing System and enter either "RM-9404" or
"RM-10209" in the upper left blank block of the ECFS form, then
click the "Submit" button at the form bottom. That returns all the
available documents in a list form (if over 10 items, click on "all" in
blue at the bottom to get the entire list). Each individual comment
submittor is linked to the document, indicated by the blue letters.
Click on the link to get the documents themselves.

RM-9404 is a request to add all of 2.1 KHz of band at around
136 KHz for amateur radio use plus making the present free band
(very limited antenna-power, but license free) at 160-190 KHz a
ham band. It has received less than 50 comments (in addition to
the original request from Booth, Freret, Imlay, and Arrl) in the
three years it has existed. At least three different power companies
have filed objections to the proposal and B-F-I-A has filed a Motion
to Strike their comments. All of that is still on public record and
the FCC hasn't made any ruling on it.

RM-10209 is younger than 9404 and concerns the proposed "60 meter" band of 150 KHz just above 5 MHz. [5250-5400 KHz for the math-challenged] Special permission has been granted by the FCC for a dozen licensed radio amateurs to "experiment" in communications in that proposed band. Apparently all concerned are unaware that other radio services have existed in the band space for a half century and more, know its characteristics so well that it can be coded into a computer program (ICEPAK, a free download from NTIA, origin the VOA, ICEPAK is included in footnotes to the B-F-I-A comment). Less than 100 total Comments have been received by the FCC on RM-10209.

What is interesting is that New Zealand has pioneered experimentation on 136 KHz, beginning in 1990, followed by several other countries in the 1990s. That makes it a dozen (12) years ago. LF and VLF has been largely empty of users for over two decades, users being largely LF broadcast stations. The 160-190 KHz "Lowfer" band has been FREE for over three decades with limited power and antenna size. Apparently the ARRL feels it should be a ham band after all this time of freedom.

The "60m" band was last seen in the March 1995 NTIA document, "National Spectrum Requirements." That is 7 years ago, and fitting what I described as "over 6 years" for "new bands." Brakob may want to argue that nit-picky point but it has been KNOWN to be desired by amateurs for at least 7 years. The 60m band doesn't seem to be on any US WRC-03 preliminary view statements, nor the LF band. Quite probably because the FCC hasn't ruled on either RM yet?

Meanwhile, a dozen hams are "experimenting" with the 60m band as if the characteristics are "new" or something. Perhaps that is "pioneering" or "breaking new ground" or just wishing all the parties could do that sort of thing? The true "pioneering" of HF took place rather before WW2, before the time of the "new experimenters."

In the LF region, OTHERS have led the way. The ARRL is just a follower...just as it didn't pioneer PSK31 in the UK or Yurp. For the 60m band proposal, I cannot for the life of me see the value of "experimentation" on HF propagation that has been known for over a half century by dozens of other radio services!

Nobody need go to predigested comments on the ARRL site or feed on some doses of spin (aspirin helps overindulgence of spin). All of it is still on the FCC site under their ECFS. ECFS content may be hard to take for some who need the reassurance of Big Brother's soothing pep-talk words. The gutless, those afraid to learn the bigger picture can content themselves with the ARRL website and feel secure.

Everyone else can now go ahead and quibble and squabble over sub-dividing the narrow little HF ham bands. Feel secure in your respective righteousnesses and closed quarters. It will make you feel proud.

2357. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 19:35:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC85A89.ABB9DE52@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41576

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote
> > Perhaps I should have phrased it, "The callsign of a particular ham
> > operator from Texas."
> >
>
> W5DXP?

Oh No! Is my callsign also bringing the ARS one step closer to destruction?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

2358. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 19:42:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3AE87A2F.46DA2DC2@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41577

K0HB wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > .....when they seem to insist that we hams are "(some long
> > number of time up to and including light years) behind the industry....."
>
> If the foo shits........

So what? Where is it mandated that the needs of ham radio shall forever coincide with that of some elusive "industry" when the intent, details and goals are so far divergent? You need what you need, want what you want, afford what you can pay for. So far Uncle Sam hasn't subsidized a single piece of my ham radio gear, particularly as being tax deductible. You KNOW "the industry" can't say the same.

2359. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 19:42:44 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204251941410.26001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41578

On 25 Apr 2002, Len Over 21 wrote:
>In article <cuvyxnansvbet.guxzhca.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
><Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:
>
>>On Sun, 21 Apr 2002 00:55:10 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>>
>>>> Which are you signed up for? What do they require?
>>>
>>>I'm currently involved in neither.
>>>
>>>From 1993-1998, I was an operator on call for a federal facility
>>>(local VA hospital). We were only called out once - On January 16,
>>>1994 - for the Northridge, CA earthquake. Our facility was not hit,
>>>but the next one over (Sepulveda) was within 3 miles of the epicenter.
>>>The only "emergency" thing we did was at the direction of the VA
>>>police: Their radio equipment couldn't reach the Sepulveda facility
>>>and telco was down. Using our equipment (better than their puny 5w
>>>HT's), we contacted the other facility to arrange for patient
>>>transfer. That's it.
>
>The Northridge earthquake occurred on January 17, 1994. A bit after
>4 in the ack-emma. About 10 million or so folks "noticed" it.
>
>It's nice to know amateur radio can be prepared for catastrophies a
>day ahead of time. Remarkable ability.

For some of us, the 17th was just an extension of the 16th, especially if we
hadn't been to bed yet. :-)

2360. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 20:06:50 UTC
From: K0CKB <k0ckb@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ulZx8.4516$8p3.383664@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41579

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> I don't understand why any amateur organization hasn't asked for
> >> more spectrum space in the MF-HF region...or even below MF.
> >> The UK got a "lowfer" band, below the US' 160-190 KHz open
> >> territory for unlicensed emitters.
> >
> >Obviously the Old Sir has been too busy grinding his organ to notice the
> >various requests for such spectrum.
> >
> >http://www.arrl.org/announce/lf-pet.pdf RM-9404
> >
> >http://www.arrl.org/announce/regulatory/5MHz/ RM-10209
>
> Obviously the Old Switch-hitter from MN cannot read worth shit on
> what was written.

For all your fuming, fussing, and desperate attempts at misdirection, HB proved you wrong. Everything after that is nothing more than keyboard-masturbation on your part.

This would be a good time to learn to laugh at yourself. Or, develop multiple personalities! That way you won't be laughing at you, you'll be laughing with you.

CKB

2361. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 20:40:27 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ucgpbqhppsii59@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41580

K0HB wrote, about a electronic technician who is reluctant
to join an "amateur" group:

>A rose by any other name.....
>
>If his self-esteem would be wounded because his FCC
>license contained the word "Amateur", then he probably
>has the wrong mindset to mingle with us lowly amateurs
>anyhow.

Well, this is one way to view things, I guess. However,
the person in question is exactly the kind of fellow I am
interested in recruiting into the avocation. He's a solid
guy, friendly, and makes a good impression with the
public when he's in front of them. I'm going to keep working
on him. Oh, I forgot to mention, he's a First Phone who
was eased out of his radio station job, along with a lot of
other people apparently, in the 1980s. But, of course, he
still does work for radio stations, as a "consultant." What
a deal, eh? Only glory lies ahead for us all, I'm sure.

Val Germann
KC0MUB

2362. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 20:43:41 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ucgphf7937mjbf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41581

Dick Carroll wrote, about a technical guy who views Amateur Radio as a step down:

>It does make one wonder how many technical professionals
>who know little about ham radio would view it differently if
>they knew all the facts. They can't seem to get past the
>"hobby" aspect of it. It is truly their loss.

I wonder about this, too. And, well, it may be their loss but, hey, it's Amateur Radio's loss, too, in many cases, I think. And we're going to need all the help we can get, down the road, aren't we? Like I say, I'm going to keep working on this fellow, in hopes of a conversion!

Val Germann
KC0MUB

2363. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 20:46:02 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC86B0A.B9706BD1@psu.edu>
Source record: 41583

Hey Val

What reasons does he give for his belief that it would be a downgrade?

Status? respect? Perhaps he doesn't like the nerdy stereotype?

What does he want the ARS to be? What do you want it to be?

How do you want us to "upgrade" our image? is perhaps the most
important question.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote, about a electronic technician who is reluctant
> to join an "amateur" group:
>
> >A rose by any other name.....
> >
> >If his self-esteem would be wounded because his FCC
> >license contained the word "Amateur", then he probably
> >has the wrong mindset to mingle with us lowly amateurs
> >anyhow.
>
> Well, this is one way to view things, I guess. However,
> the person in question is exactly the kind of fellow I am
> interested in recruiting into the avocation. He's a solid
> guy, friendly, and makes a good impression with the
> public when he's in front of them. I'm going to keep working
> on him. Oh, I forgot to mention, he's a First Phone who
> was eased out of his radio station job, along with a lot of
> other people apparently, in the 1980s. But, of course, he
> still does work for radio stations, as a "consultant." What
> a deal, eh? Only glory lies ahead for us all, I'm sure.
>
> Val Germann
> KC0MUB

2364. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 20:47:50 UTC
From: K0CKB <k0ckb@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <WXZx8.4633$8p3.389763@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41582

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> I'd normally put something creative and witty here, but this group
> doesn't like creative and witty... :-)
>

My favorite game is "Wind Up Kitty". This is when you take an adult,
misanthropic cat and pick it up (kindly) by the midsection with one hand and
hold it about 6 inches off the floor. With the other hand you twirl the
tail (again, kindly; I'm not suggesting you twist it off) and make "rrrrr
rrrr RRRR RRRR" noises. Then, when the cat is at his height of annoyance,
sputtering and snarling like Len Anderson, put it down on the floor and let
it
go. The cat will speed off like one of those little cars, and forever after
spit and fuss at you like Leonard Anderson when caught with his facts
astray.

CKB

2365. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 20:49:04 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC86BBF.849AF772@psu.edu>
Source record: 41584

I think its a conspiracy against folks from Texas, Cecil! ;^) First they
went after Kim, and now you!

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote
> > > Perhaps I should have phrased it, "The callsign of a particular ham
> > > operator from Texas."
> > >
> >
> > W5DXP?
>
> Oh No! Is my callsign also bringing the ARS one step closer to destruction?
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

2366. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 21:30:10 UTC
From: K0CKB <k0ckb@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Cz_x8.4761$8p3.396030@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41585

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Nothing whatsoever has been done in the interim by any
> amateur radio group or individual in regards to enlarging any
> bandspace on HF for amateurs.
>

Wrong again, organ grinder with egg white (or something) all over your face:

1) Go to http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi

2) Enter RM-10209 in the block entitled "Proceeding".

3) Mash the button labeled "Retrieve Document List".

4) Enjoy.

CKB

2367. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 21:39:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425173900.20822.00004608@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 41586

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/25/02 15:16 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020425151650.19503.00001029@mb-cm.aol.com>

>I'd normally put something creative and witty here, but this group
>doesn't like creative and witty

We do...you just don't have a very acute sense of what IS "creative and witty"...Comes from being an out-of-touch loser, I think.

>A problem with this faceless (and clueless) mode of exchange, of
>only screens full of characters and words, is that anyone can
>pretend to be anybody they want...(SNIP)

How true. YOU (speaking of clueless) pretend to be a communications professional with some knowledgeable outlook on Amateur Radio. The only one fooled, however, is yourself.

>...and then feign "outrage" and
>"offense" at others not believing them.

You have THAT one down pat!

>We, the readers, cannot
>be sure of anything posted solely by others, therefore the only
>believability is to have other references available...and mentioned.

In this part you do well. Lotsa stuff copied, perhaps plagerized, from other sources and websites. The only "evidence" we have of any skill or knowledge on your part is your ability to research these sites to reinforce your rantings. In this you excell. No accountable evidence of any practical experience in Amateur (or any other form) Radio.

>Pfui. I am very suspicious of "coincidences" like the CKB exchange.

I am sure you are even MORE suspicious when the facts keep undermining your rants.

No doubt.

2368. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 21:54:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425175417.20822.00004609@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 41587

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/25/02 15:16 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020425151655.19503.00001034@mb-cm.aol.com>

>Obviously the Old Switch-hitter from MN cannot read worth shit on
>what was written....(SNIP)

Sure we can. You asked why no one has made any move to obtain new
allocations in HF-MF.

You were put back in your ignorant place. You don't like it. Too bad,
wittle Wennie...

>Anyone can go to the FCC website and click up the ECFS or
>Electronic Comment Filing System...(SNIP)

...and subsequently see that you were wrong again.

>RM-9404 is a request to add all of 2.1 KHz of band at around
>136 KHz for amateur radio use plus making the present free band
>(very limited antenna-power, but license free) at 160-190 KHz a
>ham band. It has received less than 50 comments (in addition to
>the original request from Booth, Freret, Imlay, and Arrl) in the
>three years it has existed.

Well gee willikers, Lennie...YOU said no organization has made any effort
to obtain these allocations, yet right here you acknowledge that the ARRL
(capitals, per proper English contruct), HAS been involved.

>RM-10209 is younger than 9404 and concerns the proposed "60
>meter" band of 150 KHz just above 5 MHz. [5250-5400 KHz for
>the math-challenged] Special permission has been granted by the
>FCC for a dozen licensed radio amateurs to "experiment" in
>communications in that proposed band. Apparently all concerned
>are unaware that other radio services have existed in the band
>space for a half century and more, know its characteristics so
>well that it can be coded into a computer program (ICEPAK, a free
>download from NTIA, origin the VOA, ICEPAK is included in
>footnotes to the B-F-I-A comment). Less than 100 total Comments
>have been received by the FCC on RM-10209.

I guess we don't need to do anything to determine OUR needs there, huh
Lennie? Yeah...just lay back and try to pass on someone elses' work? That's
fine for YOU perhaps, but others prefer to do thier OWN work.

You should try it some time. It's fun.

>The 160-190 KHz "Lowfer" band has been FREE
>for over three decades with limited power and antenna size. Apparently
>the ARRL feels it should be a ham band after all this time of freedom.

Hardly free, and one watt of HF and the restrictions put on it grossly
limit any utilitarian use the band might otherwise be able to provide....And
bully for the Kiwis, Lennie...But U.S. Amateur's cannot operate on that
allocation under thier regulations, now can they?

>Meanwhile, a dozen hams are "experimenting" with the 60m band
>as if the characteristics are "new" or something. Perhaps that is
>"pioneering" or "breaking new ground" or just wishing all the parties
>could do that sort of thing? The true "pioneering" of HF took place
>rather before WW2, before the time of the "new experimenters."

But not with modes/techniques/practives that are used TODAY.

>In the LF region, OTHERS have led the way. The ARRL is just a
>follower...just as it didn't pioneer PSK31 in the UK or Yurp.
>For the 60m band proposal, I cannot for the life of me see the
>value of "experimentation" on HF propagation that has been
>known for over a half century by dozens of other radio services!

Well gee whiz, Lennie... ! ! ! Let's tell the FCC >>YOU<< can't see the
need and we'll just put the "86" on that project, huh...?!?!?

>The gutless, those afraid to
>learn the bigger picture can content themselves with the ARRL
>website and feel secure.

Speaking of gutless, when are you going to tke that Amateur exam, Lennie?

>Everyone else can now go ahead and quibble and squabble over
>sub-dividing the narrow little HF ham bands. Feel secure in your
>respective righteousnesses and closed quarters. It will make
>you feel proud.

And YOU can go ahead and quibble and squabble over policy and practices of
a radio service in which you are not licensed nor have any practical experince
or vested interest.

Putz.

2369. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:18:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Yg%x8.12237$rq5.352387227@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41588

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ucg8vjl62e320e@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> A friend of mine, another astro-type, is also an
> electronics technician. He maintains a lot of
> pretty high-end hospital equipment and has done
> so for about 15 years. He has seen the various
> messages on our astro club list serve about the
> Ham activities that were done in connection with
> Astronomy Day, and we have been exchanging
> ideas on small-bore radio astronomy.
>
> Yesterday he mentioned that he had "thought
> about being a Ham" from time to time but "didn't
> want to learn Morse Code." At least, that's what
> he SAID, at first.

Its important to always dig deeper, because everyone of us knows that it couldn't be our beloved Morse Code that keeps people out.

> But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
> told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
> not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
> FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
> DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.

Was or wasn't? Doesn't matter. If what you say is true it souds like he would have an attitude coming in, rather than spending the time and developing one from within. I wonder if Larry will remind him "Not to let the door...

> I'm telling you, this is a PROBLEM to be considered
> down the road, if the Ham Community is serious
> about its future. This is NOT a trivial matter, in my
> view. The whole avocation needs an image upgrade
> for the new century, regardless of what is actually on
> the air.

Yeh, you've told us this before. Conviently you ignore what your friend actually said (didn't want to learn the code) and derive from that that he didn't like the word "amateur."

Lets go ahead and try to fix this thing now and get it over with.

We don't want the word, "Amateur Radio."

We can't use the word, "Professional Radio."

"Middle of the Road Radio?" Smacks of CB.

If we tried, "Not for Profit Radio," all the Christian shortwave broadcasters would say we were horning in on their territory. Besides, lots of "non-profits" manage to have stinking rich CEO's.

How about "Radio Enthusiasts?" Most couldn't pronounce it let alone spell it.

"Hobby Radio?" No, who would want to stoop to that?

"Society for Uncreative Radio Anachronism" There's just something about that that I don't like.

"Hiram's Hams?" Might as well go with that. Pass it by your ET friend and see what he says.

73, Brian

2370. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:27:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ep%x8.12240$NS5.353049763@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41592

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE8559A.E1FED17@townsqr.com...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> > But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
> > told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
> > not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
> > FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
> > DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.
> >
>
> This is a common situation among radio technical
> professionals who did not receive the start of their
> interest in the field via ham radio. They don't seem to
> realize the potential for furthering their knowledge and
> experience through the wide variety of experimenting
> possibilities that exist in ham radio. Sometimes they find
> out through ham friends what they've been missing, and go on
> to become hams. Mostly they just avoid the "amateurs" as
> though such activity was beneath a radio professional.

It could be that mere hobbyists are a threat to his image of himself as a
professional. Much technical work these days is running a piece of
equipment through several self-test cycles then replace the appropriate
card.

> One unlicensed poster to rrap comes to mind, and I doubt I
> need to name him. Evidently he has so little to do in his
> retirement that he spends most of his time criticizing and
> bashing hams and ham radio. May be some Freudian problem at
> work there, too.

He's never bashed me. I do hear him criticizing some things that some hams
say. Though I do wish he'd get a license. I mean an Amateur Radio license

> Another anecdote comes to mind. I recently attended the
> funeral for a former co-worker after which I and a group of
> other former work mates, most of whom were licensed hams,
> were visiting. One fellow who was not a ham was asked if he
> had ever got a ham radio license, and he replied, "No, I
> just work with radio, I don't play with it". Pretty well
> sums up that attitude and its flaws. They don't understand
> that the limits placed on only "working" with radio are
> largely absent in ham radio. We're free to experiment and in
> conjunction with that experimentation, radiate signals

> almost without restraint by comparison. Within the rules and
> within reason, of course. Most of what one learns
> experimenting as a ham will transfer directly to a
> professional radio setting.

Then he's condemned forever to be on the short cord to a dummy load.

2371. Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:29:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ir%x8.12242$XR5.353023194@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41597

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020425030207.27437.00004551@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: For Those Who Think Ham Radio's Dying....
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 04/24/02 13:35 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020424133538.06459.00000829@mb-mo.aol.com>
>
> >>> No, Lennie....YOU keep making stupid mistakes that even relatively new
> >>> radio hobbyists know are dumb.
> >>
> >>How could he? He's never been on an amateur band that you are aware of.
> >
> >A more basic question is regarding "awareness." Of anything.
>
> It still all comes down to what Lennie CLAIMS he knows and what he
CLAIMS
> is "good" for Amateur radio.
>
> In this case, as in most everything Lennie spouts here, it is zero.
>
> I aliken Lennie to the people who show up in my ER spouting
"medical"
> terms they have heard on episodes of "E.R." or read in "Reader's
> Digest"....They have heard/read "just enough" to be able to repeat the
terms,
> but they have little comprehension of what they say.
>
> They know the words, but they "know" nothing.
>
> Just like Lennie.
>
> G'nite
>
> Steve

How many of them lived?

2372. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:40:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qB%x8.12248$CU5.353083570@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41589

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020425063102.06846.00005550@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >That in itself makes it easier to copy than manually formed, infinitely
> >variable elements and spacings.
>
> The majority of "manually" sent Morse encoding is done with an electronic
> keyer.

Is that anything like an A/D device?

> The majority of code sent with a hand key is close enough to the Morse
standard
> that a human does not find it easier to copy than machine-sent, more
precise
> code. To the contrary, the slightly longer character spacing sent by most
> operators makes it a bit easier.

Then publish the specifications of the "Hare Code" and have the VEC's use it
in the exams.

> The words "infinitely variable" are an exaggeration.

I'll bet they're not, especially when Dick doesn't want another ham to copy
his sending.

73, Brian

2373. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:44:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <AF%x8.12250$Oe6.353594546@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41590

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE87A2F.46DA2DC2@townsqr.com...
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > > .....when they seem to insist that we hams are "(some long
> > > number of time up to and including light years) behind the
industry....."
> >
> > If the foo shits........
>
> So what? Where is it mandated that the needs of ham radio shall forever
> coincide with that of some elusive "industry" when the intent, details and
> goals are so far divergent? You need what you need, want what you want,
afford
> what you can pay for. So far Uncle Sam hasn't subsidized a single piece of
my
> ham radio gear, particularly as being tax deductible. You KNOW "the
industry"
> can't say the same.

The FCC doesn't want amateur radio to keep pace with industry. They want us
to occasionally -surpass- it.

As it is we merely lag industry by decades.

73, Brian

2374. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:46:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425184646.27329.00000811@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 41591

In article <3AE8559A.E1FED17@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Valentine Germann wrote:
>
>> But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
>> told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
>> not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
>> FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
>> DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.
>
> This is a common situation among radio technical
>professionals who did not receive the start of their
>interest in the field via ham radio. They don't seem to
>realize the potential for furthering their knowledge and
>experience through the wide variety of experimenting
>possibilities that exist in ham radio.

Some licensed radio amateurs fail to realize that
experimentation does not always require a license to
radiate RF energy deliberately.

>Sometimes they find
>out through ham friends what they've been missing, and go on
>to become hams. Mostly they just avoid the "amateurs" as
>though such activity was beneath a radio professional.

A stronger probability is their (the licensed amateurs) mindset
which turns off many a pro.

>One unlicensed poster to rrap comes to mind, and I doubt I
>need to name him. Evidently he has so little to do in his
>retirement that he spends most of his time criticizing and
>bashing hams and ham radio.

Poor baby. Your mindset got kicked in the nose, did it?

>May be some Freudian problem at work there, too.

Not really. The mindset-enhanced, bunting wavers seem to
have the much-greater problem.

> Another anecdote comes to mind. I recently attended the
>funeral for a former co-worker after which I and a group of
>other former work mates, most of whom were licensed hams,
>were visiting. One fellow who was not a ham was asked if he
>had ever got a ham radio license, and he replied, "No, I

>just work with radio, I don't play with it". Pretty well
>sums up that attitude and its flaws.

If there is one thing exhibited by the long-timer one-by-twos
in here it is a definite LACK OF SENSE OF HUMOR.

Poor baby. :-)

>They don't understand
>that the limits placed on only "working" with radio are
>largely absent in ham radio. We're free to experiment and in
>conjunction with that experimentation, radiate signals
>almost without restraint by comparison.

Germann was talking about radio astronomy. Astronomy
doesn't radiate signals, it RECEIVES signals at wavelengths
ranging from deep UV to as low as one can go in frequency.

>Within the rules and
>within reason, of course. Most of what one learns
>experimenting as a ham will transfer directly to a
>professional radio setting.

Of course, and those are: Manual telegraphy skills, maintenance
of a nationwide telegram network (ever since 1914), working DX
contests, and continuous pioneering of the "shortwaves."

> You might want to mention this point to your friend.

No one (according to the groupie experts in here) can "ever KNOW
anything about amateur radio unless they become licensed and
"qualified." Point that out, too.

Grant of the amateur license provides the heretofore secret "key"
to QST, QEX, CQ, 73 encryption so that all may become "Real
Hams" by finding out the Real Truth! A most important point.

> It does make one wonder how many technical professionals
>who know little about ham radio would view it differently if
>they knew all the facts. They can't seem to get past the
>"hobby" aspect of it. It is truly their loss.

...as I said above. :-)

> BTW I spent 40 years working as a "FCC licensed
>professional", too. But I started in ham radio as a kid.

Some believe you never left that childhood. :-)

2375. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:46:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425184648.27329.00000813@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 41595

In article <20020425063102.06846.00005550@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>That in itself makes it easier to copy than manually formed, infinitely
>>variable elements and spacings.
>
>The majority of "manually" sent Morse encoding is done with an electronic
keyer.
>
>The majority of code sent with a hand key is close enough to the Morse
standard
>that a human does not find it easier to copy than machine-sent, more precise
>code. To the contrary, the slightly longer character spacing sent by most
>operators makes it a bit easier.
>
>The words "infinitely variable" are an exaggeration.

Nonetheless the words are mathematically and logically true.

2376. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:46:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425184648.27329.00000812@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 41596

In article <9f4bfe89.0204250601.2ebc0742@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:<3CC71461.F7CC79A2@ix.netcom.com>...

>> I would agree that SSB and CW work quite well, but realize that people
>> like NASA's JPL don't use CW for communicating with deep space
>> probes.
>
>They don't use SSB, either. Nor SS, as far as I know. Nor HF

Sorry, old-timer, but NASA indeed does use SSB, now as a backup to the TDRS (Tracking and Data Relay Satellite) relays, but in older spaceflight days used it on HF as part of the DSN (Deep Space Network) and for astronaut and recovery communications during Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, and Skylab programs.

In Apollo digitized biomedical data from en-route astronauts was deliberately made "noisy" with pseudo-random shift generators to enhance the signal-to-noise ratio. Does NASA use any sort of Spread Spectrum techniques? Yes, but the details haven't been publicly released yet.

>NASA uses modes and technologies suited to the environment and
>available technologies. So do hams. But radio to NASA is just a means
>to an end, not an end in itself. Radio to hams is the goal.

NASA uses ALL technologies to fulfill their assigned missions.

Contrary to the long-timer's opinion, NASA does indeed use some kinds of radios as an end in itself: Radar-like earth imagery, emissions from planetary bodies are two examples. Radio is vital to the health and safety of all manned space missions.

Some radio amateurs use their federal merit badges as a form of personal gratification and one-upmanship to attempt besting unlicensed-in-amateur-radio "civilians." They also use designed and manufactured by commercial makers' radios and claim "expertise" in radio. :-)

>The main thing needed is that a new mode must have a certain special
>something that makes hams WANT to use it. PSK31 has a mixture of
>things - low cost, narrow bandwidth, good performance/cost/bandwidth
>ratios, easy to use, etc. It's a mix. Hitting the mix right is the
>challenge.

PSK31 was designed and developed by a Brit. Europeans did the
on-air trials.

Besides APRS, what has US amateur radio accomplished in the way
of experimentation and new modes in the last three decades or so?
Note that APRS won't work without the GPSS or GLONASS.

>The development of PSK31 led to the development of specialized
>hardware like the "Warbler". End result is a "tail wags the dog"
>station - a tiny, inexpensive
>rig controlled by a much more complex and expensive computer. Watta
>concept.

A single microcontroller IC these days is the "complex and expensive
computer." Nearly every manufactured ham transceiver has a micro-
controller and has had one for at least 15 years.

Do you need a link to Microchip, makers of the PIC series of do-it-
yourself microcontrollers? www.microchip.com

You'll have to look there yourself. I can't do all your teaching.

2377. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:46:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425184649.27329.00000814@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 41593

In article <8qKx8.11814$Bt7.328887561@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
>news:nkex8.636$iI5.36693@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

>> I guess I never thought of that connotation, even though I'm 1/16th Cherokee
>> and a member of the Ojibwe tribe.
>
>I'm reminded of the old show, "F-Troop" where the indians were the only ones
>who had anything figured out.

Okay, a compromise is in order. I think we can all agree that
Hans is right 1/16th of the time... :-)

2378. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:48:00 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <5758922bed70e963aa5c9b161b4474d1.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 41594

Val, you might gently remind him that the 1st phone no longer exists. I know, I had one. It is now the 'General Radiotelephone Operators license'. I also had a commercial telegraph ticket (not much use anymore, but ..). The FCC has been 'dumbing down' everything. My guess is that various companies can now determine who is qualified (and, not just perchance, downgrade wages as well). I used to be the chief engineer of WWHG, a 5000 watt AM-FM station. As he has discovered, as one door shuts, another opens. So, now that many establishments have their lower priced spread, one can act as a consultant since many of their employees also have much less grasp on the subject. Perhaps he has seen the article on eme on 24 GHz with 85 watts? Then again, maybe not. Certainly the standards have been lowered all over in an attempt to reduce wages and make the entrance into amateur radio easier; but amateur radio should be an entrance and amateurs should (hopefully) be continuously improving. There will be a number of folk on the air that are quite capable of keeping up with the guy - as well as going on quite a bit more. Give it another spin, this time with some technical articles
of what amateurs (at least the ones with a little giddyap-and-go) are doing.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message news:ucg8vjl62e320e@corp.supernews.com...

> Hello, all!
>
> A friend of mine, another astro-type, is also an
> electronics technician. He maintains a lot of
> pretty high-end hospital equipment and has done
> so for about 15 years. He has seen the various
> messages on our astro club list serve about the
> Ham activities that were done in connection with
> Astronomy Day, and we have been exchanging
> ideas on small-bore radio astronomy.
>
(snip)
>
> But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
> told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
> not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
> FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
> DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.

>

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2379. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:51:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BL%x8.12254$co6.353825130@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41598

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020425063230.06846.00005551@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> And the old "I desire to be loud" ploy doesn't cut it. :-)
>
> >Ed, has Riley given an opinion on that?
>
> Not to my knowledge. You could ask him and tell us what he says.
>
> >Is Riley ever wrong?
>
> You can ask him that, too. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, I can read Part 97. Unless Riley says otherwise, "I desire to be loud" does work. If you don't like the wording you can petition your government to make a change. Even if Riley said it, it could be challenged.

2380. Re: Check out that dial!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:53:56 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <7122ce8e4f6fd1391a7a484701dad771.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 41599

Why am I not surprised?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2381. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 22:56:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8Q%x8.12256$Eu6.353952145@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41600

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE858F5.7A5DF4EC@townsqr.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >
> > >Ed, its fascinating to see everyone divying up the Novice subbands.
Too bad
> > >the bands didn't receive much interest when they were supposed to be
the
> > >training ground for new operators.
> >
> > The premise in all this divvying is that the training ground for new
operators
> > will be elsewhere in the band, right along with the more experienced
operators
> > who will be able to offer some Elmering. Although some of those
experienced
> > ops did slide up the band a bit to the Novice/+ segments, most did not.
>
> Not exactly the whole story, by any means. I used to make a practice of
scanning
> across the Novice bands to see what was on, and, after Novice Enhancement,
almost
> universally the answer was - nothing. Seems all the Novices were up on 10
meter
> SSB. THAT was the big problem.

Wrong-O. I was on months prior to enhancement and it was dead then.

> FCC made a huge mistake in allowing Novices SSB
> access if they in fact intended for them to gain skill in code
operations.

The big mistake was made decades earlier in segregating the Novices. Just
how many decades did the FCC conspire against CW?

> When I was a Novice the band segments were loaded - with Novices. We all
talked
> to each other on CW, and the crowd did indeed draw many higher class
licensees
> down into the Novice bands.

Welp, not so in late 86, early 87. But you'll claim otherwise.

> That changed when they got SSB on 10 meters. It
> became a matter of
> "No use even checking, they're all up on 10 meter SSB".

See, I knew you would.

73, Brian

2382. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:00:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <vU%x8.12261$jB6.354090327@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41651

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE8573A.B4BE5867@townsqr.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >
> > >There hasn't been a new HF mode developed or adopted in ham radio yet
> > >which needed any setaside spectrum space to "flourish", every one of
> > >'em has sucessfully duked it out with modes which were already in use
> > >in the same space going back to AM, then ssb, and more recently PSK31.
> >
> > If you give a listen to the commercial bands around our bands, you will
hear
> > all sorts of signals that are not permitted on our bands under the
current
> > rules. The limitations on modulation modes and data rates preclude the
> > development of new HF modes in ham radio that could "flourish" in a
setaside
> > spectrum place.
>
> And it is curious indeed that current and former FCC officials would urge
us to
> do that which rules at best make difficult, to adopt the modern modes and
> modulations that we are at least hampered, or at worst prevented from
using on
> our bands. Why wouldn't one wonder what is going on?

So you support Hans' idea? Let me log on to the FCC site and see what you
said.

Oh wait a minute, I get it. The conspiracy is even deeper. The FCC has
been trying to kill CW for decades and decades, and they're also trying to
put down any attempts at innovation. They're trying to wipe us out and give
our frequencies to Radio Evangelists.

Brian

2383. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:01:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%U%x8.12263$fC6.354121101@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41652

```
"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:3k3fcuo07ru90ucftm5sucsfgid60k275q@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 03:36:13 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:vo6ecuskdc50knecesahfjh6s0ce1f6qnq@4ax.com...
> >> On Wed, 24 Apr 2002 20:38:05 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> >> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >> >news:20020423225435.01774.00001924@mb-cg.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <1uuacukp0661rmb9tqc0bgk5ainm48hqsa@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> >> >> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >I do miss her though. In a ng, where she can't really dictate what
> >> >> >people say by beating them over the head with misinterpreted FCC
> >> >> >rules, she was quite funny.
> >> >>
> >> >> Bob:
> >> >>
> >> >> Yeah, Kim did cause a lot of guffaws! Now Brian will have to pull
> >> >> double-duty.
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >> >
> >> >Hell, I could run circles around Kim in the "Guffaws" department. And
I
> >> >otta leave the group as well. Who'se got time for this nonsense?
> >> >
> >>
> >> I come and I go (for sometimes years at a time.) See you when you get
> >> back.
> >
> >Sayonara Bob.
> >
>
> Bye. Perhaps, like myself, you will decide to return periodically as
> time passes. I hope that is the case and that you may return in the
> future.

Bye.
```

2384. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:05:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2Z%x8.12266$1H6.354232645@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41653

"K0CKB" <k0ckb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:Cz_x8.4761$8p3.396030@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Nothing whatsoever has been done in the interim by any
> > amateur radio group or individual in regards to enlarging any
> > bandspace on HF for amateurs.
> >
>
> Wrong again, organ grinder with egg white (or something) all over your
face:
>
> 1) Go to http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi
>
> 2) Enter RM-10209 in the block entitled "Proceeding".
>
> 3) Mash the button labeled "Retrieve Document List".
>
> 4) Enjoy.
>
> CKB

Thanks Hans. Interesting reading. Brian

2385. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:11:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <U20y8.12271$FP6.354429271@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41654

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020425062050.06846.00005548@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> Farnsworth is a method of spacing the characters in Morse encoding.
>
> >Actually, its not. Morse is Morse. Its very specific.
>
> You are free to believe what you want, as is everyone else.

Its especially easy for anyone to believe anything they want when the FCC is remiss in publishing the specifications on something that they demand an exam be given on.

> >>Repeater IDs are often made using Morse.
>
> >> >? Is that digital too?
>
> >> To the same extent that an RTTY signal sent using FM of two tones would
be
> >> digital?
>
> >I must be tone deaf. Which two tones does the digital repeater ID use?
>
> It does not. It was an example of a ficticious signal that used audio
tones but
> that would be considered digital.
>
> Sorry for the confusion. I will try to express myself in less convoluted
ways
> in the future.

Ed, I'll let you slide this time. Hey, could the ARRL VEC invert the "code" and make a noise where there are supposed to be spaces and the examinee copies the silence? Then the examinee could leave the paper blank and have 100% copy.

2386. Re: ARD Software Pukes and Dies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:16:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425191603.23265.00000996@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 41655

In article <vSLx8.2872$8p3.268424@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>I pulled my old ARRL Radio Designer software (V1.0) out tonight to run some
>simulations. I think the last time I ran it was on Win 3.11 or some such
>ancient OS. Pukes and dies on Win 98.
>
>Anybody here running it on Win 98? How'd you do it?

Ask K0CKB how to do it. "She" knows everything... :-)

2387. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:16:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425191604.23265.00000998@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 41656

In article <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204251941410.26001-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>>The Northridge earthquake occurred on January 17, 1994. A bit after
>>4 in the ack-emma. About 10 million or so folks "noticed" it.
>>
>>It's nice to know amateur radio can be prepared for catastrophies a
>>day ahead of time. Remarkable ability.
>
>For some of us, the 17th was just an extension of the 16th, especially if we
>hadn't been to bed yet. :-)

Party hearty, Dieter! :-)

2388. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:16:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425191604.23265.00000997@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 41658

In article <WXZx8.4633$8p3.389763@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0CKB"
<k0ckb@arrl.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> I'd normally put something creative and witty here, but this group
>> doesn't like creative and witty... :-)

>
>My favorite game is "Wind Up Kitty". This is when you take an adult,
>misanthropic cat and pick it up (kindly) by the midsection with one hand and
>hold it about 6 inches off the floor. With the other hand you twirl the
>tail (again, kindly; I'm not suggesting you twist it off) and make "rrrrr
>rrrr RRRR RRRR" noises. Then, when the cat is at his height of annoyance,
>sputtering and snarling like Len Anderson, put it down on the floor and let
>it
>go. The cat will speed off like one of those little cars, and forever after
>spit and fuss at you like Leonard Anderson when caught with his facts
>astray.

You are WEIRD, "CKB." Or wired, don't know which.

Go work on your personality some. Good girl. Nice kitty.

Oh, and by the way, better work on that vanity callsign. Somebody
may think it's "suggestive" or other nasty-thought kind of things.

2389. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:16:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425191605.23265.00000999@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 41657

In article <ulZx8.4516$8p3.383664@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0CKB"
<k0ckb@arrl.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>> >
>> >> I don't understand why any amateur organization hasn't asked for
>> >> more spectrum space in the MF-HF region...or even below MF.
>> >> The UK got a "lowfer" band, below the US' 160-190 KHz open
>> >> territory for unlicensed emitters.
>> >
>> >Obviously the Old Sir has been too busy grinding his organ to notice the
>> >various requests for such spectrum.
>> >
>> >http://www.arrl.org/announce/lf-pet.pdf RM-9404
>> >
>> >http://www.arrl.org/announce/regulatory/5MHz/ RM-10209
>>
>> Obviously the Old Switch-hitter from MN cannot read worth shit on
>> what was written.
>
>For all your fuming, fussing, and desperate attempts at misdirection, HB
>proved you wrong. Everything after that is nothing more than
>keyboard-masturbation on your part.

No, "CKB." The "Lowfer" band at 160-190 KHz was already being
used over 30 years ago...by licensed amateurs.

The 136 KHz bandslice was already okay for NZ amateurs a dozen
years ago followed by some Yurps after that and before the ARRL
could afford Booth, Freret, and Imlay to lay billing on them for a
formal RM proceding. Old news, really. I would surmise the ARRL
was desperately looking for something to "advance the amateur
cause" and decided to join the lowfers by making the request formal.

The 60m band proposal was already started in 1995. Hello? Can
you do any arithmetic? Seven years ago. That start is in an NTIA
document, not on the ARRL website. The formality of an RM came
in the year following the Lowfer RM.

That's about it, "CKB."

What's so pathetic about it is that both RMs were mentioned IN
HERE by myself before B-F-I could charge billing to ARRL.

The NTIA's 1995 Report indicates that hams had asked for a LOT more bandspace in HF than the mere 150 KHz slice for 60m. Over ten times that much bandspace. Nothing more in 7 years.

Whatever happened to such requests?

>This would be a good time to learn to laugh at yourself. Or, develop
>multiple personalities!

No problem with laughing. Lots of problems with Multiple Personality Disorder, Hans...oops, sorry, "Colleen."

>That way you won't be laughing at you, you'll be laughing with you.

You ought to talk to this "Jack Mehoff" guy that posted in here a while back (he has a callsign) or Broose or the ever-popular W2DNE.

Better yet, work over the little monkey from Tennessee.

>CKB

Now, about that vanity call... :-)

2390. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:34:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <lo0y8.12280$Ti7.355248191@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41659

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020425080646.26511.00000496@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <iiKx8.11802$fu7.328902134@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
> >> >> Or even on one of those bands?
> >> >
> >> >What's your point?
> >>
> >> Your credibility.
> >
> >What is wrong with my credibility?
>
> On the subject of the use of the non-phone amateur HF band segments, you
have
> little to none.

Why is that?

> >Do you have an accusation to make?
>
> Just an observation: You talk about the use of various subbands and modes
in
> amateur radio, but you are evading
> simple questions:

They're my priveleges we're talking about. Why shouldn't I be able to
comment?

> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
> Or even on one of those bands?
>
> They are not trick questions.

Why do you need to know?

> >> You have talked about the conditions on various HF bands, but you give
no
> >> indication of actually having used those bands.
>
> >I have.
>
> But not when, or how often, or with what equipment.

Are you from the FCC?

> Example: I was on 80 meter CW less than a week ago. Made a few good
contacts.
> When's the last time
> you were on 80 CW?
>
> It's a simple question. No tricks.

I'll open my logs to the FCC. Not that I'm required to keep any.

> >> Which poll are you talking about? I'm referring to the one asking about
> >> "refarming" the Novice bands.
> >
> >The "rarely or never" poll in which the ARRL concluded there was no
reason
> >to change anything.
>
> Wrong poll. I'm talking about the refarming poll. Was on the ARRL website
and
> in QST.

OK. You weren't specific.

> >> >> > They need to lead, not follow or take another poll. Or just get
out
> >> >> > of the way.
> >> >>
> >> >> The ARRL BoD thinks giving lots more privs to Tech Pluses and
Novices
> >> >> is lead. They also think turning the Novice subbands over to 'phone
is
> >> >> leading. I agree with the first part but not the second.
> >> >
> >> >Putting the Novices in the General CW portion of the band 25+ years
ago
> >is
> >> >Lead.
> >>
> >> I was a ham 25 years ago. Were you?
> >
> >Here we go again. "I've got more time in the chow hall..."
>
> It's a simple fact that I have been an active ham for three and half
decades,
> using a variety of bands, modes and equipment. It's called qualifications.

Let me go look in Part 97 for "qualifications."

I was an ARRL member before I held a license. The ARRL wasn't worried about
my "qualifications." I've been to the FCC website, and missed the part
about commenting without "qualifications." But Jim demands my
qualifications.

Who are you to demand anything?

> > The FCC is not issuing any more Novice or Tech+ licenses.
> >Why?
>
> - Less admin work.
> - Administrative cluelessness.
> - Desire to purge the database of SKs.
> - Lowered requirements for all licenses means FCC sees no reason for new
> licenses in those license classes.
> - Tech Plus has become "Tech-with-HF".
> - Few new Novices in recent years.

And I was thinking that the "Novice" idea was a just faliure over the last
several decades. Its just less work for the FCC.

> >> The ARRL BoD proposed instant upgrading of all existing Novices and
Tech
> >Pluses
> >> to General way back in 1998. FCC said no.
> >
> >Who the
>
> [expletive deleted]

hell

> >wants an instant upgrade?
>
> All the pre-1987 Tech Pluses who got Generals after restructuring, for
one.

Nothing instant about it. They met the requirements years earlier.

> >Just stop the divisions and segregation in the band.
>
> Which means what? No more subbands by license class? No more subbands by
mode?

By License class. Their might actually be some rationale for "by mode."

> >If the Novices had been in the General CW portion
> >of the band they might have had a chance.
>
> Then why did the FCC reject the ARRL idea, and the AH0A petition to do
just
> that?

In what decade did the FCC reject this ARRL idea? the AH0A petition?

> > I didn't say phone, did I?
>
> You said "stop the divisions and segregation in the band".

Look Jim, if the Novices were in with the General CW band in the late 70's
and early 80's this discussion might not be taking place. To suggest it in
the waning years of the 20th century as any kind of fix is absurd. You just
want more fone.

> >Instead you now have a dead license class because of a dead idea.
>
> Not dead to those who have one. Look at AH0A figures for renewals and
renewals
> in the grace period for those "dead" classes.

Whoopee. Can you expect that class to ever increase? By even ONE ham?

> >> The 200 W power limit has to do with written testing.
> >
> >Really? Correct me if I'm wrong (and you will), but weren't the old,
> >bonifide Extras limited in power in some of those segments?
>
> All US hams were limited in power in those subbands to provide a "level
playing
> field". It was not always that way. Dumb rule, actually.

C'mon Jim, ALL the Novice CW subbands?

> >> >> > > 6) Old technology is not bad technology. It should not be banned
> >> >unless
> >> >> > there
> >> >> > > is a very good reason. No very good reason has been shown (IMO).
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Planned obsolescense?
> >> >>
> >> >> Planned obsolescence is only a good reason to those trying to sell
new
> >> >> rigs and accessories.
> >> >
> >> >If Kenwood came out with a new mode, it would probably be fantastic.
> >> >
> >> Why should hams depend on the manufacturers? It's our job to lead them.
> >
> >True. About the time "packet ready" rigs came out packet was about over.
>
> How many hams do you know (besides me) who have designed and built
complete
> homebrew HF stations that are not QRP?
>
> How many amateur rigs of any kind have you built from scratch, Brian?

Is this the guy from the FCC again?

2391. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:46:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3z0y8.12284$2D7.355723673@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41660

"K0CKB" <k0ckb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:ulZx8.4516$8p3.383664@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> > >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> > >
> > >> I don't understand why any amateur organization hasn't asked for
> > >> more spectrum space in the MF-HF region...or even below MF.
> > >> The UK got a "lowfer" band, below the US' 160-190 KHz open
> > >> territory for unlicensed emitters.
> > >
> > >Obviously the Old Sir has been too busy grinding his organ to notice
the
> > >various requests for such spectrum.
> > >
> > >http://www.arrl.org/announce/lf-pet.pdf RM-9404
> > >
> > >http://www.arrl.org/announce/regulatory/5MHz/ RM-10209
> >
> > Obviously the Old Switch-hitter from MN cannot read worth shit on
> > what was written.
>
> For all your fuming, fussing, and desperate attempts at misdirection, HB
> proved you wrong. Everything after that is nothing more than
> keyboard-masturbation on your part.
>
> This would be a good time to learn to laugh at yourself. Or, develop
> multiple personalities! That way you won't be laughing at you, you'll be
> laughing with you.
>
> CKB

"Keyboard masturbation?"

Hans has got one swingin' wife!

2392. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-25 23:47:03 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204251547.f671471@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41661

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.44.0204251852050.25965-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>...

> Where does it say that the "RACES officer" (as you describe it above) need also
> have an amateur radio license? Neither the trustee nor the "responsible
> person" in charge of the organization (i.e., the "officer") need hold a
> license.

According to the FEMA document, Guidance for Radio Amateur Civil
Emergency Service, at http://www.fema.gov/library/civilpg.htm, in
Section 2-3 at
http://www.fema.gov/library/civilpg.htm#2-3. Procedures for
Establishing a RACES Organization,

"2-3. Procedures for Establishing a RACES Organization.
The following procedures are to be followed for establishing a RACES
organization:

"a. To establish a RACES organization, the Director, State or local
government Emergency Operating Center (EOC) or Director of Emergency
Management (or designated representative) should first appoint, in
writing, a reliable amateur to serve as the RACES Officer. This
individual serves as a liaison between the RACES organization and the
Director's office and assists in the development of the RACES
organization, recruits members, and keeps the Director, EOC, informed
of all RACES activities, progress, and needs.

"b. The RACES Officer is a General Class Amateur, or higher,
thoroughly knowledgeable of FCC Rules and Regulations and familiar
with the functions of the Amateur Radio Relay League (ARRL) and the
Amateur Radio Emergency Services of the ARRL. Individuals with strong
organizational abilities, good verbal and written communications
skills, and experience in emergency center operations are ideal
candidates."

I was NOT talking about "the 'responsible person' in charge of the
organization," which you added parenthetically to be "(i.e., the
'officer')." Both a. and b. indicate that the "RACES Officer" is an
amateur, specifically "General Class Amateur, or higher."

It is possibly a confusion over what is RACES that we have been
discussing. RACES is not the civil defense organization -- it is a
cooperative effort between the civil defense organization and the ARS,
under the auspices of FEMA and local or State government Emergency
Management operations. Without the ARS, there is no RACES, only the
civil defense organization. Without the civil defense/FEMA/government

participation, there is no RACES, but there could be ARES.

Further, the "RACES station" as defined by the FEMA and referenced by the FCC is licensed to the civil defense organization/agency. Perhaps that's why we have thought that RACES was the agency rather than the cooperation.

2393. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 00:21:16 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 41663

<Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
>> fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
>>
>> If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
>
>Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.

It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
is 0 encoding.

Dennis Ferguson

2394. Re: ARD Software Pukes and Dies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 00:29:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425202927.16837.00005584@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 41662

K0HB wrote:

> I pulled my old ARRL Radio Designer software (V1.0) out tonight to run some
> simulations. I think the last time I ran it was on Win 3.11 or some such
> ancient OS. Pukes and dies on Win 98.
>
>> Anybody here running it on Win 98? How'd you do it?

I checked into this a bit at work today. Apparently Compact software had been sold to Ansoft. Ansoft chose not to continue to support ARD, probably because they felt it competed with their present product line. The program does not run on 95 and 98 because it would need to be recompiled. ARRL does not own the rights, but had sold it under a licensing agreement.

Ansoft does have a freeware student version that does most of the things that ARD used to do.

For info, see:

http://www.arrl.org/ard/

73,
Ed, W1RFI

2395. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 00:36:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425203606.16837.00005586@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 41664

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>I don't consider 90 dB blocking dynamic range in an amateur HF rx to
>be "decent". The Ancient Ones got that sort of performance 40 years
>ago. Of course, I've been spoiled by a rig with more than 120 dB BDR -
>at 5 kHz spacing.

I used a reasonable number for two-tone, third-order IMD dynamic range because I am not sure which dynamic range best equates to spread spectrum. It is moot either way, because no practical implementation of SS has 90 dB of jamming margin.

>Sure. But the whole point of the "experimental farm" idea is to allow
>hams to muck around with whatever PBIs they want - optimum or not.
>Without lotsa paperwork and such.

I agree, not everything done in ham radio need be optimum, and it is sometimes hard to say what is "optimum" anyway.

The only potential problem I see in the "no paperwork" idea is that the Amateur Radio Service has always consisted of communications that are publically decodable. I am not sure we are ready to hear signals that we have no idea of knowing what they are or how to decode them. If we solve that by requiring that the encoding method be publically documented, other than the current limitations on bandwidth, we are right where we are right now with the rules, except that we can do what we want in any part of the band.

>> It might be intersting to see what
>> could be done on HF with a data rate of <1 b/s, though.

>You mean even non-optimum systems can be interesting? Some would call
>that electro-politically incorrect. A few "professionals" might want
>to boil you in transformer oil for suggesting such a thing. ;-)

I bet not! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2396. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 00:36:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aaa7j1$v6o$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41666

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE79EEB.F8A91DD0@townsqr.com...
> Robert Casey wrote:
> > I can see a use for say high speed packet on HF for among
> > other things long distance health and welfare traffic from a remote
> > disaster site. All you need is an equipment setup, antennas and
> > a source of power (generator or from a car battery) and needing no
> > infrastructure like that needed for the internet or short distance
> > VHF/UHF packet. We get on the internet via dial up with
> > 56K modems, so something similar might be possible on HF
> > that can take QSB, QRM, QRN and such you don't get
> > usually on a phone line. We would need some subbands
> > where the 300 baud rule is not applied.
> >
>
> What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> fast can the fastest typist
> type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> typists?

Because the "smart" thing to do is to prepare the file "off-the-air"
and then send it all at once instead of typying in real-time on the air.

> How many large
> databases can you generate and forward in any potential
> disaster?

Ditto my last comment. If the files are prepared off-line, there could be
many...with considerable more detail included than typing directly into
the airwaves.

> Methinks the
> "grande" factor has overpowered common sense in far too many
> instances.

Methinks your not thinking beyond real-time circumstances.
Do you type directly into the internet? No, you use an
email application to write the email and then it gets sent as
one completed message in milliseconds.

> It's always
> better to be overprepared, but we risk forcing
> underpreparation by urging hams to
> abandon the tried and true for the untested and largely
> unavailable.

No one is urging you or any other ham to
abondon anything. If YOU want to have other
modes available, that's fine.

> > SO a new mode should do something better than the old mode,
> > or do something new. And how would "better" be defined?
> > "needs minimal equipment", "Best performance with lowest
> > power, i.e., gets through when not even CW would", "can be
> > interfaced with existing radios to do a new mode, i.e., packet
> > over 2m FM radios (not the best way of doing it from a
> > spectrum efficiency viewpoint, but required a minimum of
> > new equipment). Sure it's a tall order to make a great
> > new mode, but we all will like it when someone does
> > accomplish it. The DXers will be able to snag more
> > weak DX while using stealth antennas with say 50W,
> > etc....
>
> OK, but we already have stuff that will do all that! And
> have had for many years!
> PACTOR is probably capable of handling any disaster comms
> for which hams will ever
> need to provide communications. Sure, there will be even
> better modes developed,
> have already been, depending on what ones criteria for
> 'better' happens to be. None
> of this provides cause to dump what we already have proven
> by use.

Dump nothing. No one is asking you to dump anything.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2397. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 00:37:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425203701.16837.00005587@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 41665

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Since when do you need a 56k circuit for a picture? You
>don't, unless for some strange reason you demand Internet
>download speeds.

Why is it strange to want Amateur Radio to perform well?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2398. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 00:40:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425204012.16837.00005589@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 41667

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Okay, offer us one tiny shred of evidence that is more than speculation
>that
>> Cross did something different than what he felt was in the public interest
>> because he was afraid Carl would call him a Luddite. Just one tiny real
>piece
>> of proof.
>
> You're saying that all Carl's raging and ranting is totally ignored, even
>when he
>later shows up for an ex parte party. Sure it is.

That is your tiny shred of evidence?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2399. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 00:42:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425204219.16837.00005590@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 41668

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> I don't think I read too much into all the pronouncements of Carl, Dale
>Hatfield, Ed and others when they seem to insist that we hams are "(some long
>number of time up to and including light years) behind the industry....."

Um, light years is a measure of distance, not time...

And I didn't see the word "light years" in any of the writings of any of those
you cited.

Is this one of those exaggeration things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2400. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 00:49:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020425204921.16837.00005594@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 41669

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> The majority of "manually" sent Morse encoding is done with an electronic
>> keyer.

>Is that anything like an A/D device?

If you really don't know the difference between a keyer and an analog-to-digital converter, I don't think I can help you. If you do know the difference, but asked the question anyway, I don't think I can help you with that, either.

>> The majority of code sent with a hand key is close enough to the Morse
>standard
>> that a human does not find it easier to copy than machine-sent, more
>precise
>> code. To the contrary, the slightly longer character spacing sent by most
>> operators makes it a bit easier.

>Then publish the specifications of the "Hare Code" and have the VEC's use it
>in the exams.

Why? I am perfectly happy with the Farnsworth method in use right now. On the air, I can copy Morse code at Farnsworth timing, conventional timing and even do a passable job at lousy timing.

>> The words "infinitely variable" are an exaggeration.

>I'll bet they're not, especially when Dick doesn't want another ham to copy
>his sending.

Okay, as long as we agree that we are talking about the code Dick sends if he doesn't want another ham to copy his sending, and not a widespread problem in Amateur Radio as a whole, I am content to accept "infinitely variable" as a reasonable approximation of how you see it.

The question I have, though, if it truly is not an exaggeration, is how often the "infinitely variable" timing gets as long as a minute or more between characters in your perception of Dick's sending?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2401. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 01:02:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aaa93q$k12$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41670

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE85C68.CF308BB0@townsqr.com...
> W1RFI wrote:C.
>
> >
> > >And it's definitely a fact that Carl yells "Luddite!" at every
perceived
> > >opportunity. It is also a fact that Cross can be assumed to prefer to
avoid
> > >getting
> > >in the way of one of Carl's fusillades.
> >
> > Do you think that Cross even knows what Carl says on
rec.radio.amateur.policy?
> >
>
> Do you think this is the only place he ever said it? I'd wager Cross
knows all he
> needs to know about all this.

Just what does Mr. Cross know or need to know? Do you think
he (Bill Cross) has a fear of anyone becasue of what that
anyone may have said in RRAP?

> > >Oh, I forgot, you see insults behind every bush.
> >
> > Not at all, Dick; I see insults where insults are offered, though.
Maybe you
> > should threaten Bill Cross with a public "go soak your head" and turn
the
> > regulatory tide back to what you want it to be. You are claiming that
all one
> > has to do is to threaten him with a public lashing. . .
>
> There you go again, assigning meanings never stated nor intended. Carl
isn't just
> "one", he's Carl the "Luddite" and CW hater. Big difference.

Even assuming that your assessment of Carl is
accurate...do you think that means ANYTHING to
the FCC?

> > > Of course. It also dawned on me that he might also find it an
attractive
> > >alternative to dance around the loudmouth with the Luddite branding

iron in
> > >hand.
> >
> > Okay, offer us one tiny shred of evidence that is more than speculation
that
> > Cross did something different than what he felt was in the public
interest
> > because he was afraid Carl would call him a Luddite. Just one tiny real
piece
> > of proof.
>
> You're saying that all Carl's raging and ranting is totally ignored,
even when he
> later shows up for an ex parte party. Sure it is.

Just what do you (Dick) think goes on at an ex parte?

The ramblings, rantings, or whatever that take place in
RRAP mean nothing to the FCC...and that is as it should be.

If you think the FCC staff is in any way intimidated by
anyone in RRAP then you are truly amazing as to your
thought processes.

> > > Either way, all the gloom and doom
> > >about all the bad things that will
> > >happen to us all if we don't dump every mode
> > >dating back more than six months is so much nonsense.
> >
> > Is that another one of those "what he said, what you heard" sort of
things.
> > Carl has repeatedly told us that he does not believe that hams need to
stop
> > using any mode in Amateur Radio that pleases them. Your "dump" stuff
is, well,
> > a dump...
> >
>
> So you're not paying attention these days, Ed? To Carl or Dale Hatfield
either?
> Carl has repeatedly howled about our "50 years behind" the commercials
> technology. If years of that and Hatfield's stark warning don't mean
something on
> that order maybe you can do a better job of explaining it to us than they
did.

To whom at the FCC do they mean anything? The FCC cares not at all
about dialog/debate/discussion held on RRAP.

2402. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 01:56:13 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC8B39C.F293412B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41671

N2EY wrote:
>
>
> The whole point of the auto-ID (which, please note, would NOT be required by
> the regs at all) is to clue in tuners-by - any tuners-by, not just the
> technically inclined. Knowing the callsign, anyone interested could find out
> how to decode the rest of the signal.
>

I was just going to add that the auto forward digital robots
that operated in the lower 5KHz of the novice bands for
years under an extended STA did not auto-ID in the clear
code or voice. Remember to keep the auto-ID'g CW OOK to 5
WPM (yawn!) or less. ;-)

73,
Clay N4AOX

2403. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 02:09:34 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC8B6BD.E3A4E0CF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41672

N2EY wrote:
>
>
> > I
> > hope the idea is not to fashion the mode to fit the
> > YaComWood SSB gear just to accommodate or sell more of them.
>
> The simple truth is that most (not all) new modes on the ham bands
> will be "soundcard and shareware" developments. That's why PSK31 leapt
> to the fore so fast.
>
> (Besides me, how many hams do you know who have designed and built
> complete homebrew non-QRP HF ham stations in the past 10 years?)
>
I know two besides you. Both of the ground up homebrew
systems were very nice. Remember, the ARRL used to have
complete HF ham station construction articles in their
handbook.

PSK31 is a beautiful creation. FHSS on 80-40-15 will
probably require more than a soundcard, some software, and
an YaComWood rig.

73,
Clay N4AOX

2404. Re: ARD Software Pukes & Dies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 02:29:59 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <HY2y8.5162$iU4.424113@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41674
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bob Liesenfeld" <robert.liesenfeld@neicoltech.org> wrote in message
news:3CC85980.C07F78F@neicoltech.org...

>
> I'm running Win98 SE and simply installed the program from the floppies.
> Works ok for me.
>
> Bob WB0POQ

Now I'm really cornfused! Here's what W1RFI sent me from ARRL....

Hi, Hans,

I checked into this a bit at work today. Apparently Compact software had
been sold to Ansoft. Ansoft chose not to continue to support ARD, probably
because they felt it competed with their present product line. The program
does not run on 95 and 98 because it would need to be recompiled. ARRL does
not own the rights, but had sold it under a licensing agreement.

Ansoft does have a freeware student version that does most of the things
that
ARD used to do.

For info, see:

http://www.arrl.org/ard/

73,
Ed, W1RFI

2405. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 02:31:18 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC8BBD5.2AF2E0DA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41673

W1RFI wrote:

>
> >Portions of the 430-450 mhz band is an example.
> >Sure, we don't want to lose any of it, but I see it as almost inevitable.
>
> What part of the 420-450 MHz band are we set to lose? I know of no rulemaking
> proposal that seeks to take it away from us.
>

Excuse me for butting in, but as I have stated before, if
the RFID crowd shows that those bad old Hams have the
potential of jamming their IDers resulting in luggage left
on the tarmac and are, in effect, hampering "homeland
defense" in this war, we could lose it all.

73,
Clay N4AOX

2406. Manual & Schematic needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 02:43:48 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <E93y8.5195$iU4.427987@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41675
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I have a Techtronix 2213 Dual-Trace 60MHz scope which just lost a couple of ranges.

Anyone got a schematic?

de Hans, K0HB

k0hb at arrl.net

2407. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 02:47:07 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC8BF8A.68792B7B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41676

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Ed, its fascinating to see everyone divying up the Novice subbands. Too bad
> >the bands didn't receive much interest when they were supposed to be the
> >training ground for new operators.

The ARRL made their position clear with regard to the Novice
bands when they supported the STA's to allow auto-forward
digital robots in the first 5KHz (choice spots) of the
novice bands a few years back (before the no-code debacle).

>
> The premise in all this divvying is that the training ground for new operators
> will be elsewhere in the band, right along with the more experienced operators
> who will be able to offer some Elmering. Although some of those experienced
> ops did slide up the band a bit to the Novice/+ segments, most did not.

Slow coding in the novice bands is not dead yet. I worked
two (one was a new op.) at 7.101 MHz last weekend.

73,
Clay N4AOX

2408. The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 03:16:03 UTC
From: speaker kone <batterscakes@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <TD3y8.5242$iU4.431239@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41677
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I just found a link to a private WEBSITE which has
what appears to be, reproductions of the ARRL's
Official Tax Return filings, in .PDF format,
for FY-1993 to 2000.

Click on the URL below this line to see them.....

http://www.kr4uq.org/ARRL_Tax_Returns/arrl_tax_returns.html

(you will need Adobe Acrobat plugin to view - a free program with
a link on the site above - very useful if you don't have it, get it
Adobe Acrobat Reader)

2409. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 03:25:56 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aabkcl01q93@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 41700

I seem to have to deal with people's perception of ham radio operator's being the next possible cast for the Revenge of the Nerds movies.... that is the perception that alot of people I have run in to, or of course, the attempt to parallel ham radio to CB.

Fortunately this is not true of us, as we come from all walks of life!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> A rose by any other name.....
>
> If his self-esteem would be wounded because his FCC license contained the
> word "Amateur", then he probably has the wrong mindset to mingle with us
> lowly amateurs anyhow.
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> "1943 Poster Child for The National Precocious Little Bastard Campaign"
>
>
>
>
>

2410. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 03:40:39 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aabkcl11q93@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 41751

Unfortunately Cecil..... you're gonna have to change your callsign. I am sure people here can come up with a ton of dirty connotations!!!! :) :) :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3CC85A89.ABB9DE52@IEEE.org...
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote
> > > Perhaps I should have phrased it, "The callsign of a particular ham
> > > operator from Texas."
> > >
> >
> > W5DXP?
>
> Oh No! Is my callsign also bringing the ARS one step closer to destruction?
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

2411. Re: ARD Software Pukes & Dies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 03:59:29 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.04.25.23.59.22.521433.12791@arrl.org>
Source record: 41678
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 22:29:59 -0400, K0HB wrote:
>
> "Bob Liesenfeld" <robert.liesenfeld@neicoltech.org> wrote in message
> news:3CC85980.C07F78F@neicoltech.org...
>
>>
>> I'm running Win98 SE and simply installed the program from the floppies.
>> Works ok for me.
>>
>> Bob WB0POQ
>
> Now I'm really cornfused! Here's what W1RFI sent me from ARRL....
>
> ----------
>
> Hi, Hans,
>
> I checked into this a bit at work today. Apparently Compact software had
> been sold to Ansoft. Ansoft chose not to continue to support ARD, probably
> because they felt it competed with their present product line. The program
> does not run on 95 and 98 because it would need to be recompiled. ARRL does
> not own the rights, but had sold it under a licensing agreement.

Ed doesn't have it _quite_ right. ARD runs on some W98 systems but not on others. It's a 16-bit Windows (3.1) program that its manufacturer was uninterested in maintaining it as newer versions of Windows came out. (What, you thought Windows was really backward compatible with older versions? :-) So, if it runs on your machine running Win98, great! But it may not.

Serenade SV (see the URL Ed cited, below) is probably your best alternative.

> Ansoft does have a freeware student version that does most of the things
> that
> ARD used to do.
>
> For info, see:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/ard/
>
> 73,
> Ed, W1RFI

2412. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 04:07:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426000707.13101.00001028@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 41679

In article <20020425203606.16837.00005586@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>I don't consider 90 dB blocking dynamic range in an amateur HF rx to
>>be "decent". The Ancient Ones got that sort of performance 40 years
>>ago. Of course, I've been spoiled by a rig with more than 120 dB BDR -
>>at 5 kHz spacing.
>
>I used a reasonable number for two-tone, third-order IMD dynamic range
>because
>I am not sure which dynamic range best equates to spread spectrum.

Ah. OK.

>It is moot
>either way, because no practical implementation of SS has 90 dB of jamming
>margin.
>
BWAAHAAAHAAA!
>
>>Sure. But the whole point of the "experimental farm" idea is to allow
>>hams to muck around with whatever PBIs they want - optimum or not.
>>Without lotsa paperwork and such.
>
>I agree, not everything done in ham radio need be optimum, and it is
>sometimes hard to say what is "optimum" anyway.

Exactly.
>
>The only potential problem I see in the "no paperwork" idea is that the
>Amateur
>Radio Service has always consisted of communications that are publically
>decodable. I am not sure we are ready to hear signals that we have no idea
>of
>knowing what they are or how to decode them. If we solve that by requiring
>that the encoding method be publically documented, other than the current
>limitations on bandwidth, we are right where we are right now with the rules,
>except that we can do what we want in any part of the band.

I see the public documentation rules being the same as today. No need to change them.

One point of the "experimental farm" idea is to have a place where the symbol/datarate and occupied bandwidth rules are greatly relaxed, without

relaxing them all over the band. Suppose I want to try out a mode that allows both slow data and digital voice in a 4-5 kHz bandwidth. Is that a narrow band data mode or a wider digital voice mode or what? In the "experimental farm" it doesn't matter, as long as the mode is documented and the signal is inside the subband edges.

Another point of the "experimental farm" idea is that the widening of the 'phone bands is not a good idea, IMO.

>
>>> It might be intersting to see what
>>> could be done on HF with a data rate of <1 b/s, though.
>
>>You mean even non-optimum systems can be interesting? Some would call
>>that electro-politically incorrect. A few "professionals" might want
>>to boil you in transformer oil for suggesting such a thing. ;-)
>
>I bet not! :-)

All depends which "professionals" you're talking about.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2413. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 05:50:29 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CC8EA81.2CAE8DD8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41680

Very revealing. Thanks,

--Clay
wyn@att.net

speaker kone wrote:
>
> I just found a link to a private WEBSITE which has
> what appears to be, reproductions of the ARRL's
> Official Tax Return filings, in .PDF format,
> for FY-1993 to 2000.
>
> Click on the URL below this line to see them.....
>
> http://www.kr4uq.org/ARRL_Tax_Returns/arrl_tax_returns.html
>
> (you will need Adobe Acrobat plugin to view - a free program with
> a link on the site above - very useful if you don't have it, get it
> Adobe Acrobat Reader)

2414. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 05:58:23 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0204260555030.26507-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 41681

On 25 Apr 2002, Carl Zager wrote:
>"b. The RACES Officer is a General Class Amateur, or higher,
>thoroughly knowledgeable of FCC Rules and Regulations and familiar
>with the functions of the Amateur Radio Relay League (ARRL) and the
>Amateur Radio Emergency Services of the ARRL. Individuals with strong
>organizational abilities, good verbal and written communications
>skills, and experience in emergency center operations are ideal
>candidates."

FEMA may have that requirement, but the FCC does not.

>I was NOT talking about "the 'responsible person' in charge of the
>organization," which you added parenthetically to be "(i.e., the
>'officer')." Both a. and b. indicate that the "RACES Officer" is an
>amateur, specifically "General Class Amateur, or higher."
>
>It is possibly a confusion over what is RACES that we have been
>discussing. RACES is not the civil defense organization -- it is a
>cooperative effort between the civil defense organization and the ARS,
>under the auspices of FEMA and local or State government Emergency
>Management operations. Without the ARS, there is no RACES, only the
>civil defense organization. Without the civil defense/FEMA/government
>participation, there is no RACES, but there could be ARES.
>
>Further, the "RACES station" as defined by the FEMA and referenced by
>the FCC is licensed to the civil defense organization/agency. Perhaps
>that's why we have thought that RACES was the agency rather than the
>cooperation.

That's what the FCC effectively said when they issued RACES station licenses.

How FEMA defines RACES and how the FCC defines RACES don't necessarily match.

There is no such official organization as ARES. That is the ARRL's delusion.

2415. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 07:08:34 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ugshcukhqjr4cs0mo9roq4757e4bnupi3q@4ax.com>
Source record: 41682

On 25 Apr 2002 10:53:19 -0700, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) wrote:

>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<ht9ecu8uuh7fhgi18vnptplkr5mhu5c8dh@4ax.com>...
>> On 24 Apr 2002 14:32:31 -0700, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) wrote:
>>
>> >Somewhere in every thread on this newsgroup there will appear a
>> >mention of a particular ham operator's callsign. Why don't we just
>> >drop all the other topics in the headers and use "Single unifying
>> >thread?" After all, it's what holds us together.
>>
>> Huh?
>
>I'm suggesting that instead of having to go through threads on CW,
>Rules and Regulations, Death of Ham Radio, etc. to find comments about
>how dumb certain posters are or about how some callsigns are
>destroying ham radio, we just agree to have one single long thread --
>since all of the other threads eventually turn into those comments. It
>usually occurs somewhere around the 5th to the 10th posting. <sarcasm>

Perhaps it's not the call signs or the people with the call signs.
Perhaps it's the type of radio operators that those posters are
representative of. Perhaps showing intolerance towards intolerant
people is a way of showing them how it feels to be on the receiving
end for a change where they don't have misinterpreted rules and
regulations to hide behind.

I tend to stay away from repeaters, but if I wanted to discuss the
weather or the wreck that was holding me up in traffic with my friend,
that's what I'd talk about and yeah, it would piss some people off.
If I wanted to tell him that my tomatoes had grown a foot and had
blooms already, that's what I'd talk about. If I wanted to talk about
making molasses and how it went, that's what I'd talk about. I don't
appreciate someone telling me that my conversation doesn't meet their
criteria of things to talk about on a repeater, so I need to move
along so that they can talk about politics, religion, who is picking
up the kids and bring a gallon of milk home. I don't appreciate the
"regulars" on a repeater keying over the top of someone making
comments about 'where did they come from" or "who cares about that."

I don't appreciate someone making comments about "Roger Beeps" because
a ham has bought a Yeasu Memorizer at the local ham fest and doesn't
know about the 1750 hz. tone burst switch on the bottom of the radio.
I don't appreciate people telling other people that the FCC requires
announcing your call sign at the beginning of a conversation when they

don't do it themselves. But they don't have to, because everyone just knows who they are. I don't appreciate people telling a ham that he is operating illegally because he says "break" to try to gain access to a repeater in use and that 'break" can only be used for emergency according to pseudo FCC rules and regulations. I don't appreciate regulars on an open repeater telling regulars from a broken repeater that they can't use that repeater until theirs is fixed.

I don't appreciate someone telling a ham who had lost his voice to cancer that it was illegal to use Morse Code over a repeater and he needed to quit operating. The operator did quit operating in this illegal mode. He died. I don't appreciate it, but I tolerate it to the point that 99 percent of my transmissions are on sideband simplex.

In an unmoderated ng, they don't have those pseudo rules and regulations to beat people over the head with. In an unmoderated ng, they can't claim ownership of the frequency or repeater with any validity. In short, they can't control what people say and it is a control and an ego issue.

People are just too inconsiderate and intolerant unless it happens to be them who becomes the "victim" of the intolerance. When that happens in an unmoderated forum they pick up their marbles and run home to mommy. On a repeater, they can claim ownership or rely on their friends to make sure that the repeater is used properly according to their protocols and pseudo FCC rules and regulations. That doesn't cut it in an unmoderated ng.

If their is a death to ham radio, it will be from the operators who can't tolerate honest mistakes or the fact that some people may actually want to talk about things that don't interest them personally and their attempts to control what they talk about and how they talk about it.

Just look at it as a lesson in role reversal.

2416. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 07:19:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426031950.27486.00005203@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41683

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/25/02 18:46 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020425184648.27329.00000812@mb-bd.aol.com>

The minimally educated pseudo-engineer needs to re-read what was said, then reassess his comments:

>>But radio to NASA is just a means
>>to an end, not an end in itself. Radio to hams is the goal.
>
>NASA uses ALL technologies to fulfill their assigned missions.
>
>Contrary to the long-timer's opinion, NASA does indeed use some
>kinds of radios as an end in itself:

NASA uses radios just for the sake of using the radio?

I don't think so.

2417. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 07:29:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426032956.27486.00005204@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41685

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/25/02 19:16 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020425191605.23265.00000999@mb-ck.aol.com>

>No, "CKB." The "Lowfer" band at 160-190 KHz was already being
>used over 30 years ago...by licensed amateurs.

Wow! Talk about misdirection!

Yes, by "licensed amateurs"...but not as Amateur licensees...not in the
United States, anyway. Even YOU can operate there, Lennie.

Nice try at spin, Your Geezerness.

>The 136 KHz bandslice was already okay for NZ amateurs...(SNIP)

Where an interest lay. Not so in the U. S. until later years.

>I would surmise the ARRL
>was desperately looking for something to "advance the amateur
>cause" and decided to join the lowfers by making the request formal.

I would surmise that you are running out of black helicopter, "lodge hall"
rants and are looking to start another.

>What's so pathetic about it is that both RMs were mentioned IN
>HERE by myself before B-F-I could charge billing to ARRL.

All face west and hail Lennie the Towne Crier!

>Better yet, work over the little monkey from Tennessee

Little Monkey, Lennie? is this more of the name calling and "perjoratives"
you lament OTHERS using? Unalble to quite overcome your own misdeeds, are you?

>Now, about that vanity call.

And YOUR call, Lennie...?!?!

2418. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 07:32:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426033218.27486.00005205@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41686

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/25/02 18:46 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020425184649.27329.00000814@mb-bd.aol.com>

>Okay, a compromise is in order. I think we can all agree that
>Hans is right 1/16th of the time

Which STILL exceeds your record by an exponentially greater percentage.

2419. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 07:45:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426034510.27486.00005206@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41687

>Subject: Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/25/02 18:46 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020425184646.27329.00000811@mb-bd.aol.com>

How did I know that Lennie would venture beyond the scope of "Amateur Radio Policy"..???

>A stronger probability is their (the licensed amateurs) mindset
>which turns off many a pro.

I've found more people turned off by the aristocratic, snob-nosed "professional elite" than I have vice versa.

I know a lot of engineers who are Ham operators.

I know a lot of engineers who don't care about Amateur radio one way or the other, simply because they have enough "radio" stuff at work to want to do it at home, too. None have expoused an anti-ham attitude like Lennie the Loser for ANY reason.

>>One unlicensed poster to rrap comes to mind, and I doubt I
>>need to name him. Evidently he has so little to do in his
>>retirement that he spends most of his time criticizing and
>>bashing hams and ham radio.
>
>Poor baby. Your mindset got kicked in the nose, did it?

I think it is YOU with the bruised nose, Lennie. Val GOT his license. You are too cowardly.

>Germann was talking about radio astronomy. Astronomy
>doesn't radiate signals, it RECEIVES signals at wavelengths
>ranging from deep UV to as low as one can go in frequency.

Nope. Several radio astronomy groups have, in times past, obtained FCC permission to operate emmiters for the purpose of EME-type experimentation.

SETI is a receive-only program.

>>Within the rules and
>>within reason, of course. Most of what one learns
>>experimenting as a ham will transfer directly to a
>>professional radio setting.
>
>Of course, and those are: Manual telegraphy skills, maintenance
>of a nationwide telegram network (ever since 1914), working DX
>contests, and continuous pioneering of the "shortwaves."

Always the bitter loser, Lennie?

How does your wife validate waking up next to a loser like you? Or is she down the hall...kinda like the rest of your life?

>Grant of the amateur license provides the heretofore secret "key"
>to QST, QEX, CQ, 73 encryption so that all may become "Real
>Hams" by finding out the Real Truth! A most important point.

"Real Hams" participate in the program and have what you don't, Lennie...."practical experience".

>> BTW I spent 40 years working as a "FCC licensed
>>professional", too. But I started in ham radio as a kid.
>
>Some believe you never left that childhood.

Pot. Kettle. Black.

Nuff said....Now...go abuse your wife with more of your "watch me set these "amateurs" straight" armchair heroism, Your Putziness.

2420. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 07:47:10 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uci0dd3la7g61a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41684

mike coslo wrote, about a fellow who views membership
in "amateur radio" as a downgrade:

>What reasons does he give for his belief that it would
>be a downgrade?

Well, his exact words had something to with "professional"
versus "amateur" and the fact that he felt that "amateur" did
not fit his view of himself. Now, to me, the word "amateur"
has a different connotation BUT that does not cut any ice
with those to whom it has an, er, unfortunate spin.

> Status? respect?

Sure, those things are involved. When someone is on the
outside looking in, well, he gets a different view.

>Perhaps he doesn't like the nerdy stereotype?

I don't think this is a problem with him, per se, except as
the term "nerd" might apply to someone who is not really
top-flight at what he is doing.

>What does he want the ARS to be?

I don't think he has any idea, really, except that he thinks
it is somehow not in tune with his view of himself. For me,
this is a marketing problem for Ham Radio and NOT a
problem with my friend.

>What do you want it to be?

Been around the block on this one; don't care to go there
again. Check with the Big Boys about that.

>How do you want us to "upgrade" our image? is perhaps
>the most important question.

Been around the block on that one, too. Don't care to go
there again. I'm going to tend my little plot and report what
results I get. C'est la vie beyond that for me.

Val Germann
KC0MUB

**

2421. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 08:05:54 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uci1ginntnn40@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41688

Jim Hampton wrote:

>You might gently remind him that the 1st phone no
>longer exists. I know, I had one.

Oooh, I don't think I want to do that!

>It is now the 'General Radiotelephone Operators license'.
>I also had a commercial telegraph ticket (not much use
>anymore, but ..). The FCC has been 'dumbing down'
>everything. My guess is that various companies can now
>determine who is qualified (and, not just perchance, down-
>grade wages as well).

I think they just abolished his position, after an out-of-town outfit bought the station(s) he was working for. All the stations now are owned by a "group" and have staff, salespeople and even on-air personalities shared among them. It's really bizarre to me.

>I used to be the chief engineer of WWHG, a 5000 watt
>AM-FM station. As he has discovered, as one door shuts,
>another opens. So, now that many establishments have
>their lower priced spread, one can act as a consultant since
>many of their employees also have much less grasp on the
>subject.

I think this is what he is doing, some of the time, and he is probaby making pretty good money right now. But he is not truly happy with it all, I don't believe.

>Perhaps he has seen the article on eme on 24 GHz with
>85 watts? Then again, maybe not. Certainly the standards
>have been lowered all over in an attempt to reduce wages
>and make the entrance into amateur radio easier; but
>amateur radio should be an entrance and amateurs should
>(hopefully) be continuously improving. There will be a number
>of folk on the air that are quite capable of keeping up with
>the guy - as well as going on quite a bit more. Give it another
>spin, this time with some technical articles of what amateurs
>(at least the ones with a little giddyap-and-go) are doing.

I am going to try to use radio astronomy as the hook to keep things going, and ask for his help from time to time with different things. I want to do a bunch of public demonstrations, which he likes to participate in, and maybe that will help.
I may have been a Ham for only a few weeks but I have been

recruiting for a quarter century. THAT I DO know how to do!

Val Germann
KC0MUB

2422. Re: Manual & Schematic needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 08:45:23 UTC
From: John Miles <jmiles@pop.removethistomailme.net>
Message-ID: <3CC913B7.6B61@pop.removethistomailme.net>
Source record: 41689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

K0HB wrote:
>
> I have a Techtronix 2213 Dual-Trace 60MHz scope which just lost a couple of
> ranges.
>
> Anyone got a schematic?
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> k0hb at arrl.net

Search on the correct spelling (Tektronix) and you'll likely have better luck. Besides eBay, have a look at the manual resources listed at http://www.reprise.com/host/tektronix/home/default.asp. This is not a particularly rare bird, so it shouldn't be too tough to come up with a manual for it.

-- jm

---
http://www.qsl.net/ke5fx
Note: My E-mail address has been altered to avoid spam

2423. Re: ARD Software Pukes & Dies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 09:46:21 UTC
From: k9wkj <k9wkj@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Abay8.983$eV4.37271@reggie.win.bright.net>
Source record: 41690
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy

does this have anything todo with the user choosen FAT32 file system maybe
they only run on FAT16??
Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.04.25.23.59.22.521433.12791@arrl.org...
> On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 22:29:59 -0400, K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "Bob Liesenfeld" <robert.liesenfeld@neicoltech.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CC85980.C07F78F@neicoltech.org...
> >
> >>
> >> I'm running Win98 SE and simply installed the program from the
floppies.
> >> Works ok for me.
> >>
> >> Bob WB0POQ
> >
> > Now I'm really cornfused! Here's what W1RFI sent me from ARRL....
> >
> > ----------
> >
> > Hi, Hans,
> >
> > I checked into this a bit at work today. Apparently Compact software
had
> > been sold to Ansoft. Ansoft chose not to continue to support ARD,
probably
> > because they felt it competed with their present product line. The
program
> > does not run on 95 and 98 because it would need to be recompiled. ARRL
does
> > not own the rights, but had sold it under a licensing agreement.
>
> Ed doesn't have it _quite_ right. ARD runs on some W98 systems but not on
> others. It's a 16-bit Windows (3.1) program that its manufacturer was
> uninterested in maintaining it as newer versions of Windows came out.
(What,
> you thought Windows was really backward compatible with older versions?
> :-) So, if it runs on your machine running Win98, great! But it may not.
>
> Serenade SV (see the URL Ed cited, below) is probably your best
alternative.
>
> > Ansoft does have a freeware student version that does most of the things

> > that
> > ARD used to do.
> >
> > For info, see:
> >
> > http://www.arrl.org/ard/
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed, W1RFI

2424. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 11:48:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426074819.27399.00000904@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41691

In article <lo0y8.12280$Ti7.355248191@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020425080646.26511.00000496@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <iiKx8.11802$fu7.328902134@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
>P
>> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>>
>> >> >> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
>> >> >> Or even on one of those bands?
>> >> >
>> >> >What's your point?
>> >>
>> >> Your credibility.
>> >
>> >What is wrong with my credibility?
>>
>> On the subject of the use of the non-phone amateur HF band segments, you
>have
>> little to none.
>
>Why is that?

Because you won't tell us what recent experience you have with the bands in question. It's
like a strict vegetarian spouting off about the differences in taste of grades of beef.

>
>> >Do you have an accusation to make?
>>
>> Just an observation: You talk about the use of various subbands and modes
>in
>> amateur radio, but you are evading
>> simple questions:
>
>They're my priveleges we're talking about.

No, your experience or lack thereof.

>Why shouldn't I be able to comment?

You can comment all you like. Your credibility is what doesn't exist.

>
>> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
>> Or even on one of those bands?

>>
>> They are not trick questions.
>
>Why do you need to know?

To know whether you have any recent experience. Methinks you are just trolling
and blowing smoke.
>
>> >> You have talked about the conditions on various HF bands, but you give
>no
>> >> indication of actually having used those bands.
>>
>> >I have.
>>
>> But not when, or how often, or with what equipment.
>
>Are you from the FCC?
>
Nope. You don;t have to answer the questions.

>> Example: I was on 80 meter CW less than a week ago. Made a few good
>contacts.
>> When's the last time
>> you were on 80 CW?
>>
>> It's a simple question. No tricks.
>
>I'll open my logs to the FCC. Not that I'm required to keep any.

Sounds to me like there's nothing for you to record in them anyway.
>
>> >> Which poll are you talking about? I'm referring to the one asking about
>> >> "refarming" the Novice bands.
>> >
>> >The "rarely or never" poll in which the ARRL concluded there was no
>reason
>> >to change anything.
>>
>> Wrong poll. I'm talking about the refarming poll. Was on the ARRL website
>and
>> in QST.
>
>OK. You weren't specific.

Look at the subject line.
>
>> >> >> > They need to lead, not follow or take another poll. Or just get
>out
>> >> >> > of the way.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> The ARRL BoD thinks giving lots more privs to Tech Pluses and

>Novices
>> >> >> is lead. They also think turning the Novice subbands over to 'phone
>is
>> >> >> leading. I agree with the first part but not the second.
>> >> >
>> >> >Putting the Novices in the General CW portion of the band 25+ years
>ago
>> >is
>> >> >Lead.
>> >>
>> >> I was a ham 25 years ago. Were you?
>> >
>> >Here we go again. "I've got more time in the chow hall..."
>>
>> It's a simple fact that I have been an active ham for three and half
>decades,
>> using a variety of bands, modes and equipment. It's called qualifications.
>
>Let me go look in Part 97 for "qualifications."

More evasion. Says it all.
>
>I was an ARRL member before I held a license. The ARRL wasn't worried about
>my "qualifications." I've been to the FCC website, and missed the part
>about commenting without "qualifications." But Jim demands my
>qualifications.
>
>Who are you to demand anything?

I don't demand a thing. You can refuse to answer any and all questions. But
when someone says
they know about the use of certain bands but won't tell anything about their
recent use of those
bands, they cannot expect to be taken seriously.
>
>> > The FCC is not issuing any more Novice or Tech+ licenses.
>> >Why?
>>
>> - Less admin work.
>> - Administrative cluelessness.
>> - Desire to purge the database of SKs.
>> - Lowered requirements for all licenses means FCC sees no reason for new
>> licenses in those license classes.
>> - Tech Plus has become "Tech-with-HF".
>> - Few new Novices in recent years.
>
>And I was thinking that the "Novice" idea was a just faliure over the last
>several decades. Its just less work for the FCC.

Yup.
>

>> >> The ARRL BoD proposed instant upgrading of all existing Novices and
>Tech
>> >Pluses
>> >> to General way back in 1998. FCC said no.
>> >
>> >Who the
>>
>> [expletive deleted]

>> >wants an instant upgrade?
>>
>> All the pre-1987 Tech Pluses who got Generals after restructuring, for
>one.
>
>Nothing instant about it. They met the requirements years earlier.

Then why did the restructuring make them show up at VE sessions and pay the fee
to get Generals?

>> >Just stop the divisions and segregation in the band.
>>
>> Which means what? No more subbands by license class? No more subbands by
>mode?
>
>By License class.

I see. You want full access but you don't want to take any more written exams
either.

>Their might actually be some rationale for "by mode."

Thee is.
>
>> >If the Novices had been in the General CW portion
>> >of the band they might have had a chance.
>>
>> Then why did the FCC reject the ARRL idea, and the AH0A petition to do
>just
>> that?
>
>In what decade did the FCC reject this ARRL idea? the AH0A petition?

Both were rejected in the last few years. You weren't paying attention.
>
>> > I didn't say phone, did I?
>>
>> You said "stop the divisions and segregation in the band".
>
>Look Jim, if the Novices were in with the General CW band in the late 70's
>and early 80's this discussion might not be taking place.

"If is for children, spinning daydreams". Did you petition the FCC to do that
way back then? If not, your just griping.

> To suggest it in
>the waning years of the 20th century as any kind of fix is absurd.

Not at all.

> You just want more fone.

Not me!

You obviously have not read my proposal, nor Hans'.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2425. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 12:18:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426081821.09510.00005376@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 41692

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 04/26/02 07:48 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020426074819.27399.00000904@mb-mr.aol.com>

>>Why do you need to know?
>
>To know whether you have any recent experience. Methinks you are just
>trolling
>and blowing smoke.

My bets are on trolling. If you think he's clueless and uncivil here, you
should see what he sends folks directly!

He's the midwest version of Uncle Lennie, but WITH a license. RSVP for a
copy, if you'd like.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2426. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 12:25:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCA98AF.E6C4014D@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41693

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> Okay, offer us one tiny shred of evidence that is more than speculation
> >that
> >> Cross did something different than what he felt was in the public interest
> >> because he was afraid Carl would call him a Luddite. Just one tiny real
> >piece
> >> of proof.
> >
> > You're saying that all Carl's raging and ranting is totally ignored, even
> >when he
> >later shows up for an ex parte party. Sure it is.
>
> That is your tiny shred of evidence?

For sure it's more than your assumptions to the contrary.

2427. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 12:29:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCA999D.29C54B69@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41694

Bob Brock wrote:

> On 25 Apr 2002 10:53:19 -0700, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<ht9ecu8uuh7fhgi18vnptplkr5mhu5c8dh@4ax.com>...
> >> On 24 Apr 2002 14:32:31 -0700, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) wrote:
> >>
> >> >Somewhere in every thread on this newsgroup there will appear a
> >> >mention of a particular ham operator's callsign. Why don't we just
> >> >drop all the other topics in the headers and use "Single unifying
> >> >thread?" After all, it's what holds us together.
> >>
> >> Huh?
> >
> >I'm suggesting that instead of having to go through threads on CW,
> >Rules and Regulations, Death of Ham Radio, etc. to find comments about
> >how dumb certain posters are or about how some callsigns are
> >destroying ham radio, we just agree to have one single long thread --
> >since all of the other threads eventually turn into those comments. It
> >usually occurs somewhere around the 5th to the 10th posting. <sarcasm>
>
> Perhaps it's not the call signs or the people with the call signs.
> Perhaps it's the type of radio operators that those posters are
> representative of. Perhaps showing intolerance towards intolerant
> people is a way of showing them how it feels to be on the receiving
> end for a change where they don't have misinterpreted rules and
> regulations to hide behind.
>
> I tend to stay away from repeaters, but if I wanted to discuss the
> weather or the wreck that was holding me up in traffic with my friend,
> that's what I'd talk about and yeah, it would piss some people off.
> If I wanted to tell him that my tomatoes had grown a foot and had
> blooms already, that's what I'd talk about. If I wanted to talk about
> making molasses and how it went, that's what I'd talk about. I don't
> appreciate someone telling me that my conversation doesn't meet their
> criteria of things to talk about on a repeater, so I need to move
> along so that they can talk about politics, religion, who is picking
> up the kids and bring a gallon of milk home. I don't appreciate the
> "regulars" on a repeater keying over the top of someone making
> comments about 'where did they come from" or "who cares about that."
>
> I don't appreciate someone making comments about "Roger Beeps" because
> a ham has bought a Yeasu Memorizer at the local ham fest and doesn't

> know about the 1750 hz. tone burst switch on the bottom of the radio.
> I don't appreciate people telling other people that the FCC requires
> announcing your call sign at the beginning of a conversation when they
> don't do it themselves. But they don't have to, because everyone just
> knows who they are. I don't appreciate people telling a ham that he is
> operating illegally because he says "break" to try to gain access to a
> repeater in use and that 'break" can only be used for emergency
> according to pseudo FCC rules and regulations. I don't appreciate
> regulars on an open repeater telling regulars from a broken repeater
> that they can't use that repeater until theirs is fixed.
>
> I don't appreciate someone telling a ham who had lost his voice to
> cancer that it was illegal to use Morse Code over a repeater and he
> needed to quit operating. The operator did quit operating in this
> illegal mode. He died. I don't appreciate it, but I tolerate it to
> the point that 99 percent of my transmissions are on sideband simplex.
>
> In an unmoderated ng, they don't have those pseudo rules and
> regulations to beat people over the head with. In an unmoderated ng,
> they can't claim ownership of the frequency or repeater with any
> validity. In short, they can't control what people say and it is a
> control and an ego issue.
>
> People are just too inconsiderate and intolerant unless it happens to
> be them who becomes the "victim" of the intolerance. When that
> happens in an unmoderated forum they pick up their marbles and run
> home to mommy. On a repeater, they can claim ownership or rely on
> their friends to make sure that the repeater is used properly
> according to their protocols and pseudo FCC rules and regulations.
> That doesn't cut it in an unmoderated ng.
>
> If their is a death to ham radio, it will be from the operators who
> can't tolerate honest mistakes or the fact that some people may
> actually want to talk about things that don't interest them personally
> and their attempts to control what they talk about and how they talk
> about it.
>
> Just look at it as a lesson in role reversal.

Way to go Bob! Right on!

Dick

2428. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 12:31:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCA9A12.ACF2DE63@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41695

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 04/25/02 18:46 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020425184648.27329.00000812@mb-bd.aol.com>
>
> The minimally educated pseudo-engineer needs to re-read what was said, then
> reassess his comments:
>
> >>But radio to NASA is just a means
> >>to an end, not an end in itself. Radio to hams is the goal.
> >
> >NASA uses ALL technologies to fulfill their assigned missions.
> >
> >Contrary to the long-timer's opinion, NASA does indeed use some
> >kinds of radios as an end in itself:
>
> NASA uses radios just for the sake of using the radio?
>
> I don't think so.

Yes it does, and that is ham radio - the ARISS program on the international space station.

Although I doubt he knows about that.

2429. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 12:54:42 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC94E13.C4FAB6E9@psu.edu>
Source record: 41697

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote, about a fellow who views membership
> in "amateur radio" as a downgrade:
>
> >What reasons does he give for his belief that it would
> >be a downgrade?
>
> Well, his exact words had something to with "professional"
> versus "amateur" and the fact that he felt that "amateur" did
> not fit his view of himself. Now, to me, the word "amateur"
> has a different connotation BUT that does not cut any ice
> with those to whom it has an, er, unfortunate spin.

Interesting. Amateur *has* been transmuted by marketing forces into
something other than what it actually means. To be an "amateur" is quite
a compliment actually. It's kind of like mediocre, which means average,
but has been transmuted into poor. thank heavens for marketing forces,
which make Amateur radio, astronomy, etc into a bad thing, while at the
same time giving us "professional" toilet bowl cleaners!

Now that being said, it is fairly shallow to avoid something due to the name.

<some snippage>

> >Perhaps he doesn't like the nerdy stereotype?
>
> I don't think this is a problem with him, per se, except as
> the term "nerd" might apply to someone who is not really
> top-flight at what he is doing.

Interesting again! Around my parts, to be called a nerd is a compliment
(mostly) meaning a person who is exceedingly proficient in thier work,
often to the detriment of their social and personal life. The kind of
person who will stay at work all night to tweak the last little bit of
performance out of what they are doing.

>
> >What does he want the ARS to be?
>
> I don't think he has any idea, really, except that he thinks
> it is somehow not in tune with his view of himself. For me,
> this is a marketing problem for Ham Radio and NOT a
> problem with my friend.

I think what needs done is to share with him the different aspects of the ARS and see what he thinks. I'd certainly skip the political aspects of Ham radio, unless he thinks that is interesting. If he is interested, then okay. But if he doesn't want to become a ham, how are you gonna stop him? (apologies to Mr Berra)

- Mike -

2430. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 12:55:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCA9FB8.8DC35D16@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41696

Bill Sohl wrote:

> >
> > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > fast can the fastest typist
> > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > typists?
>
> Because the "smart" thing to do is to prepare the file "off-the-air"
> and then send it all at once instead of typying in real-time on the air.
>

Why, of course it is, Bill! Been there and done that hundreds of times, in a professional setting. But hey, this is amateur radio, and we're hams, and most of us with experience know that the best laid plans are likely to see all that snazzy hi-data rate gear stored somewhere where we happen to NOT be when the ship hits the sand. Thus, if I happen to have a little key in my pocket, and there is a HF rig available, and perchance an operator on the other end similarly qualified, guess what- We can communicate! *Without* a 56k circuit!

Amazing, isn't it?

2431. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 12:57:39 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC94EC4.65DAE753@psu.edu>
Source record: 41698

ROFL!

- mike - KB3EIA -

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Society for Uncreative Radio Anachronism" There's just something about
> that that I don't like.

2432. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 13:09:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCAA2FE.98847383@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41699

mike coslo wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> > mike coslo wrote, about a fellow who views membership
> > in "amateur radio" as a downgrade:
> >
> > >What reasons does he give for his belief that it would
> > >be a downgrade?
> >
> > Well, his exact words had something to with "professional"
> > versus "amateur" and the fact that he felt that "amateur" did
> > not fit his view of himself. Now, to me, the word "amateur"
> > has a different connotation BUT that does not cut any ice
> > with those to whom it has an, er, unfortunate spin.
>
> Interesting. Amateur *has* been transmuted by marketing forces into
> something other than what it actually means. To be an "amateur" is quite
> a compliment actually. It's kind of like mediocre, which means average,
> but has been transmuted into poor.

The word 'amateur' is derived from the French and actually means "for the love of", which in the case of radio would mean that amateur radio operators love radio for its own sake.

Of course that leaves out the likes of Loose Lennie.

But of course you're right-it has been transmuted into a entirely different meaning by those who don't know. Vale's friend might benefit from being informed of the correct definition, as it appears he loves radio.

2433. Re: Manual & Schematic needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 14:08:28 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <wbdy8.6695$8p3.540327@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41753
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"John Miles" <jmiles@pop.removethistomailme.net> wrote

> Search on the correct spelling (Tektronix) and you'll likely have better
> luck. Besides eBay, have a look at the manual resources listed at
> http://www.reprise.com/host/tektronix/home/default.asp. This is not a
> particularly rare bird, so it shouldn't be too tough to come up with a
> manual for it.

Thanks, John.

(I nevar wuz to gud at speling.)

73, de Hans K0HB

2434. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 14:11:22 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <9vnicu44o7va47vafbvorcd8hf9s72iupt@4ax.com>
Source record: 41752

On Fri, 26 Apr 2002 12:29:32 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> On 25 Apr 2002 10:53:19 -0700, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) wrote:
>>
>> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<ht9ecu8uuh7fhgi18vnptplkr5mhu5c8dh@4ax.com>...
>> >> On 24 Apr 2002 14:32:31 -0700, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) wrote:
>> >>

>> Just look at it as a lesson in role reversal.
>
>Way to go Bob! Right on!
>
>Dick
>

Piss off little boy....we're not on the repeater right now.

2435. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 14:33:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426103313.11738.00006973@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 41755

>I have run in to, or of course, the
>attempt to parallel ham radio to CB

Well whats wrong that parallel, theres very little difference anymore.

2436. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 14:36:26 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <KBdy8.6770$8p3.545007@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41756
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"speaker kone" <batterscakes@hotmail.com> wrote

> I just found a link to a private WEBSITE which has
> what appears to be, reproductions of the ARRL's
> Official Tax Return filings, in .PDF format,
> for FY-1993 to 2000.

While ARRL did show positive total results for the years
he's talking about, it was all from realized gains on securities
transactions. When you exclude those and consider the drop
in the value of their securities, unfortunately ARRL had losses
from operations in those years. KR4UQ seems to have some
sort of ax to grind and, like any good Unabasher,
will interpret the numbers to fit his argument.

He also seems to lack an understanding of the difference
between the 501c(3) side of the house and the for-profit side.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2437. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 14:43:19 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uciopm6pd0ip80@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41754

mike coslo wrote:

>Interesting. Amateur *has* been transmuted by marketing
>forces into something other than what it actually means. To
>be an "amateur" is quite a compliment actually. It's kind of
>like mediocre, which means average, but has been trans-
>muted into poor. thank heavens for marketing forces, which
>make Amateur radio, astronomy, etc into a bad thing, while
>at the same time giving us "professional" toilet bowl cleaners!

The negative connotation with "amateur" is a problem, no doubt,
and there may not be any real answer for it, at the higher levels.
Both "amateur astronomy" and "amateur radio" started early in
this century on the East Coast, at a time when there was very
little in the way of commercial product and everybody made
everything themselves, more or less. No one was worried
about what was going to happen down the road because, well,
they were too busy doing other things. Now, with "progress,"
we have commercial product, organization, turf to defend . . all
the wonderful accoutrements of modernity. And, with the end
of the Baby Boomers in sight, we have to worry about the
future and the numbers. Troubles never end!

>Now that being said, it is fairly shallow to avoid something
>due to the name.

I don't view it that way. It's an objection to be overcome and if
you don't take it seriously and instead denigrate the "customer,"
for having the objection, well, guess what.

> Interesting again! Around my parts, to be called a nerd is a
>compliment (mostly) meaning a person who is exceedingly
>proficient in thier work . . .

Not around here!

> . . . often to the detriment of their social and personal life.

Now, that perception exists here!

>The kind of person who will stay at work all night to tweak the
>last little bit of performance out of what they are doing.

Around here it's more the person who has no life at all and
who HAS to stay at work because, well, why GO home?

>I think what needs done is to share with him the different aspects
>of the ARS and see what he thinks. I'd certainly skip the political

>aspects of Ham radio, unless he thinks that is interesting. If he is
>interested, then okay. But if he doesn't want to become a ham,
>how are you gonna stop him? (apologies to Mr Berra)

My view on recruiting is that when anyone shows ANY interest
at all, especially someone who has value, you pick up on that
and see what you can do. What most people respond to is
YOUR positive attitude toward THEM and not, immmediately,
to the thing you're recruiting for. So, I try to communicate some-
thing like "Hey, that's interesting about you. Do you mess with this
radio stuff for fun? I've got this project that . . ."

And then you hope for the best!

Val Germann
KC0MUB

2438. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 14:43:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC9679C.D806E3C5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41757

KC8PMX wrote:
> Unfortunately Cecil..... you're gonna have to change your callsign. I am
> sure people here can come up with a ton of dirty connotations!!!! :) :) :)

When I was in high school the standard phonetics were even dirty.
"David Xray Peter". Of course, most hams came back with "David's
Xrayed Peter".
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

2439. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 14:50:08 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <AOdy8.6820$8p3.547356@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41758

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> >The kind of person who will stay at work all night to tweak the
> >last little bit of performance out of what they are doing.
>
> Around here it's more the person who has no life at all and
> who HAS to stay at work because, well, why GO home?

Whoa! What a nice healthy gratuitous slap at "work ethic"!

On the other hand, it might occur to you to wonder if
Jesus actually said "The geek shall inherit the earth", but was
just misquoted? Then you'll think of Bill Gates. Then you'll
start to worry.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2440. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 14:54:23 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <zSdy8.51644$QC1.3722169@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41759

>>> The words "infinitely variable" are an exaggeration.

>> I'll bet they're not, especially when Dick doesn't
>> want another ham to copy his sending.

> Okay, as long as we agree that we are talking about
> the code Dick sends if he doesn't want another ham
> to copy his sending, and not a widespread problem in
> Amateur Radio as a whole, I am content to accept
> "infinitely variable" as a reasonable approximation
> of how you see it.

> The question I have, though, if it truly is not an
> exaggeration, is how often the "infinitely variable"
> timing gets as long as a minute or more between
> characters in your perception of Dick's sending?

Yeah! Kinda like that mysterious radio signal that was
picked up by the Australian navy in the movie "On the Beach".

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

...-.-

2441. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 14:54:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC96A24.BF01D543@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41760

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bob Brock wrote:
> > In an unmoderated ng, they don't have those pseudo rules and
> > regulations to beat people over the head with. In an unmoderated ng,
> > they can't claim ownership of the frequency or repeater with any
> > validity. In short, they can't control what people say and it is a
> > control and an ego issue.
>
> Way to go Bob! Right on!

Uhhhhhhhh Dick, he is describing you.
```

2442. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 15:01:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC96BB4.761A9559@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41761

K7JEB wrote:
> Yeah! Kinda like that mysterious radio signal that was
> picked up by the Australian navy in the movie "On the Beach".

Ever wonder where the AC power was coming from?

2443. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 16:11:40 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ucitvirq4nrde5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41762

K0HB wrote:

>Whoa! What a nice healthy gratuitous slap at
>"work ethic"!
>
>On the other hand, it might occur to you to wonder if
>Jesus actually said "The geek shall inherit the earth",
>but was just misquoted? Then you'll think of Bill Gates.
>Then you'll start to worry.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Sorry, no rising to bait anymore. Find other fish now.

Val

2444. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 17:00:14 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC9879F.90F0C3D4@psu.edu>
Source record: 41764

Dick Carroll wrote:

<some snippage>

> The word 'amateur' is derived from the French and actually means "for the love of",
> which in the case of radio would mean that amateur radio operators love radio for its own
> sake.
>
> Of course that leaves out the likes of Loose Lennie.

Yeah, I'm not exactly sure what his interest is! A sad case tho'.

- Mike KB3EIA -

> But of course you're right-it has been transmuted into a entirely different meaning by
> those who don't know. Vale's friend might benefit from being informed of the correct
> definition, as it appears he loves radio.

2445. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 17:01:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCAD948.D6D2057@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41763

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Bob Brock wrote:
> > > In an unmoderated ng, they don't have those pseudo rules and
> > > regulations to beat people over the head with. In an unmoderated ng,
> > > they can't claim ownership of the frequency or repeater with any
> > > validity. In short, they can't control what people say and it is a
> > > control and an ego issue.
> >
> > Way to go Bob! Right on!
>
> Uhhhhhhhh Dick, he is describing you.

Nope. You -to a T. That is, after Kim.

2446. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 17:07:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC9893D.256489AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41765

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Bob Brock wrote:
> > > > In an unmoderated ng, they don't have those pseudo rules and
> > > > regulations to beat people over the head with. In an unmoderated ng,
> > > > they can't claim ownership of the frequency or repeater with any
> > > > validity. In short, they can't control what people say and it is a
> > > > control and an ego issue.
> > >
> > > Way to go Bob! Right on!
> >
> > Uhhhhhhhh Dick, he is describing you.
>
> Nope. You -to a T. That is, after Kim.

It is not I who draws my self esteem from my Morse code ability. It is not
I who wants to force my favorite mode requirement upon all HF hams.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

2447. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 17:59:04 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC99568.67855D27@psu.edu>
Source record: 41766

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:

>
> >Now that being said, it is fairly shallow to avoid something
> >due to the name.
>
> I don't view it that way. It's an objection to be overcome and if
> you don't take it seriously and instead denigrate the "customer,"
> for having the objection, well, guess what.

To me it is like Nike sneakers or more what some people may think if you *don't* wear them. I'm in the hobby because I enjoy it, not because someone may think it is cool or something.

I'd still be doing this no matter what they called it.

And it isn't as black and white as me denigrating someone. If I were to think of reasons to avoid a hobby, the name is near the bottom of the list of reasons to avoid it. I'm suspicious of his reasons right from the start.

I guess if the activities we do isn't interesting to him, it will be hard to get him interested.

I notice that you have mostly centered on the more technical portions of the hobby. Don't forget to mention public service work to him also. Our public service season has just started up, and I enjoy working this aspect of the hobby. It gets me out into the fresh air, the charities are grateful to us for the help, and there is the occasional emergency when we prove our worth.

- mike KB3EIA -

2448. Re: Manual & Schematic needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 18:08:46 UTC
From: Roy Lewallen <w7el@eznec.com>
Message-ID: <3CC997AE.48AAA51E@eznec.com>
Source record: 41767
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I tried responding to K0HB by email, but the mail bounced.

Roy Lewallen, W7EL

2449. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 18:53:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BED85AA.458C36B7@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41768

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Bob Brock wrote:
> > > > > In an unmoderated ng, they don't have those pseudo rules and
> > > > > regulations to beat people over the head with. In an unmoderated ng,
> > > > > they can't claim ownership of the frequency or repeater with any
> > > > > validity. In short, they can't control what people say and it is a
> > > > > control and an ego issue.
> > > >
> > > > Way to go Bob! Right on!
> > >
> > > Uhhhhhhhh Dick, he is describing you.
> >
> > Nope. You -to a T. That is, after Kim.
>
> It is not I who draws my self esteem from my Morse code ability. It is not
> I who wants to force my favorite mode requirement upon all HF hams.

Where in Bob's remarks did you find any of that nonsense? Or mine either, for
that matter. I don't force anything on anybody, you are the meister at that. WRT
ham radio rules, it's the FCC. So crawl back under your rock.

2450. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 19:16:17 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ucj8pg36om1bd6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41769

mike coslo wrote, about the fellow who looks at amateur
radio as a step down, and about a comment I made that
Mr. Coslo's attitude, as expressed in a previous message,
might be considered denigrating toward someone viewing
amateur radio in that way:

>To me it is like Nike sneakers or more what some people
>may think if you *don't* wear them. I'm in the hobby because
>I enjoy it, not because someone may think it is cool or
>something.
>
> I'd still be doing this no matter what they called it.
>
> And it isn't as black and white as me denigrating someone.
>If I were to think of reasons to avoid a hobby, the name is
>near the bottom of the list of reasons to avoid it. I'm suspicious
>of his reasons right from the start.

Well, you see, there we are, right where we were to start, in
that you can't recruit people that you're suspicious of. It just
can't be done.

> I guess if the activities we do isn't interesting to him, it will be
>hard to get him interested.

But you see he has told me he IS interested . . . which is why
I'm putting some effort into his recruitment!

> I notice that you have mostly centered on the more technical
>portions of the hobby. Don't forget to mention public service
>work to him also. Our public service season has just started
>up, and I enjoy working this aspect of the hobby. It gets me
>out into the fresh air, the charities are grateful to us for the
>help, and there is the occasional emergency when we prove
>our worth.

All in good time!

Val

2451. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 19:29:39 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <aac9r3$2ltn$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 41771

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>In article <20020424062358.20540.00003466@mb-mn.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>writes:
>
>>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3c@fast.net
>>
>>>Whoa ... going in the wrong direction again ... how about like SS
>>>100W max, anything over 1W requires APC ???
>>
>>The only real effect of that rule in SS has been to ensure that hams do not
>>use
>>more than 1 watt on SS.
>>
>>I don't think that the need for automatic power control has been established.
>>
>>IMHO, those capable of devising modes so new that they are not covered by
>>existing rules should have no problem at all doing what the present rules
>>require of all amateur communications -- manually adjusting the power level
>>to
>>the minimum necessary to achieve the desired communication.
>>
>>And the old "I desire to be loud" ploy doesn't cut it. :-)
>>
>I'm beginning to think that the whole APC requirement for the "experimental
>farm" is unnecessary regulation.

I also think the APC requirement just gets in the way.

First it presupposes the application. APC is straight forward when
two transceivers are maintaining a bi-directional point-to-point
relationship (and if you have built the hardware for automatic
control of transmitter power), but gets a lot harder if you have one
transmitter and many receivers and is impossible if some of the receivers
are silent. Demanding APC for higher power hence means that only
bi-directional point-to-point applications get to use higher power,
and condemns multipoint and silent receiver applications to lower power.
I don't know why one would want to penalize the latter type of applications,
these could be the ones that turn out to be interesting.

Second, while APC is possible for point-to-point applications it is
still a fiddly protocol and hardware thing which, in real life, usually
gets left until the end of the development process. While APC is useful
for allowing working applications to scale to many users, it is a
complexity that just gets in the way when you are trying to get the
application to work in the first place, which is what most of the

development process involves. If the point of amateur radio is to allow development of new things, rather than just the deployment of someone else's finished product, I think this is the last place you want an APC constraint.

Finally, I know fairly simple APC algorithms work okay at VHF and above where the channels have relatively benign characteristics, but at HF where the channels are awful, propagation can change quickly, data rates are low and communication turn-around times are long, it may be that finding APC algorithms that work stably and well is itself a development project waiting to be done. I don't think it would be good to burden all higher-power applications with the requirement to do this development work in addition to everything else necessary to do something new.

APC is good for production systems intended to scale to many users, but is rotten for one-off experiments that individuals construct in their basements. I hence think a hard requirement for APC is probably incompatible with the kind of applications it is desireable for the ARS to support.

Dennis Ferguson

2452. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 19:33:32 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CC9AB8C.99261F9F@psu.edu>
Source record: 41770

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote, about the fellow who looks at amateur
> radio as a step down, and about a comment I made that
> Mr. Coslo's attitude, as expressed in a previous message,
> might be considered denigrating toward someone viewing
> amateur radio in that way:

<some snippage here>

> >
> > And it isn't as black and white as me denigrating someone.
> >If I were to think of reasons to avoid a hobby, the name is
> >near the bottom of the list of reasons to avoid it. I'm suspicious
> >of his reasons right from the start.

>
> Well, you see, there we are, right where we were to start, in
> that you can't recruit people that you're suspicious of. It just
> can't be done.

Note that I said his "reasons" here, Val. Not suspicious of *him*.
There is a huge difference!

What could a possible reason be that a person says that they are
interested, but aren't going to get involved because of the name of a hobby?

Perhaps they really aren't all that interested after all. I know I've
been guilty of having blind spots in the past. I've been super
enthusiastic about something, and not been able to see that others may
not have been so excited as myself.

> > I guess if the activities we do isn't interesting to him, it will be
> >hard to get him interested.
>
> But you see he has told me he IS interested . . . which is why
> I'm putting some effort into his recruitment!

Well, here's the part where I get a little confused. Maybe he just
needs shaken off the fence, so to speak.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2453. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 20:27:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CC9B831.AEA6D1D7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41772

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Where in Bob's remarks did you find any of that nonsense? Or mine either, for
> that matter.

"It is a control and an ego issue."

2454. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 20:56:57 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <tajy8.6950$iU4.578062@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41773

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote

>
> Finally, I know fairly simple APC algorithms work okay at VHF and above
> where the channels have relatively benign characteristics, but at HF
> where the channels are awful, propagation can change quickly, data rates
> are low and communication turn-around times are long, it may be that
> finding APC algorithms that work stably and well is itself a development
> project waiting to be done. I don't think it would be good to burden
> all higher-power applications with the requirement to do this development
> work in addition to everything else necessary to do something new.
>

Dennis,

I think you have just made the case why APC _* should*_ be part of these "pioneer" bands. You have identified a problem which begs for some tinkering and experimenting. Who better than us to take that bull by the horns?

73, Hans, K0HB

2455. Re: Speaking of Rules Interpretation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 21:12:51 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0204261312.2bf2fcbf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 41774
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"D. Stussy" wrote in message news:...
> On 25 Apr 2002, Carl Zager wrote:
> >"b. The RACES Officer is a General Class Amateur, or higher,
> >thoroughly knowledgeable of FCC Rules and Regulations and familiar
> >with the functions of the Amateur Radio Relay League (ARRL) and the
> >Amateur Radio Emergency Services of the ARRL. Individuals with strong
> >organizational abilities, good verbal and written communications
> >skills, and experience in emergency center operations are ideal
> >candidates."
>
> FEMA may have that requirement, but the FCC does not.

You know, it's real easy to understand how some threads get so mangled
and abusive.

An amateur radio station is licensed by the FCC. Current RACES
stations are licensed by the FCC. Currently, FEMA
guidelines/regulations require that the RACES Officer be a General
class or higher Amateur Radio Operator, which brings them into
compliance with FCC rules about appropriately licensed control
operators. There may very well be RACES stations without an Amateur
RACES Officer, reflecting some earlier thinking on the part of the FCC
and FEMA -- I don't know. All of the hams I know who are a part of
RACES cooperative between ARS and a civil agency report that the RACES
Officer is the official control operator of the RACES station, a
General or higher class ham.

> >Further, the "RACES station" as defined by the FEMA and referenced by
> >the FCC is licensed to the civil defense organization/agency. Perhaps
> >that's why we have thought that RACES was the agency rather than the
> >cooperation.
>
> That's what the FCC effectively said when they issued RACES station licenses.

I lost the antecedent to "That's." As I read the FCC and FEMA rules,
it seems that the FCC was issuing the license to the "cooperative," in
the name of the civil agency.

Could it be that the FCC has decided to stop issuing RACES station
licenses for the very reason that some civil agencies are operating
those amateur stations without a licensed control operator? Could it
be that some ARS groups don't have a General/Advanced/Extra acceptable
to the civil agency? Could it be that in some areas cooperation
between the agencies and ARS have broken down? Could anything like
that happen?

>
> How FEMA defines RACES and how the FCC defines RACES don't necessarily match.

I think current FEMA regulations and FCC rules do match. It is past
practice that was out of joint.
>
> There is no such official organization as ARES. That is the ARRL's delusion.
> >
> >It is possibly a confusion over what is RACES that we have been
> >discussing. RACES is not the civil defense organization -- it is a
> >cooperative effort between the civil defense organization and the ARS,
> >under the auspices of FEMA and local or State government Emergency
> >Management operations. Without the ARS, there is no RACES, only the
> >civil defense organization. Without the civil defense/FEMA/government
> >participation, there is no RACES, but there could be ARES.

I'll stick by the above. The last sentence says "...there could
be ARES. If ARES is not an official organization with national and
local memoranda of understanding with non-governmental agencies, such
as the Red Cross and the Salvation Army -- then so be it. ARES is a
delusion.

2456. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 21:17:56 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <8ujy8.52142$QC1.3763636@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41775

>> K7JEB wrote:
>> Yeah! Kinda like that mysterious radio signal that was
>> picked up by the Australian navy in the movie "On the Beach".

> W5DXP replied and asked:
> Ever wonder where the AC power was coming from?

That was explained by inference. The transmitter was located
at an oil refinery which was still running. I deduce from that
that there was a diesel generator somewhere, probably fed from
the refinery's product, that kept the automation up. I wonder
how long it would take a couple-megawatt, power-generation
station to go through 100 million gallons of diesel fuel?

Of course the *real* irony would have been to have the
transmitter running off of the output of an automated
nuclear power plant. But then, they wouldn't have had
a window open with a shade in it and a Coke bottle on
the desk and .....

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

...-.-

2457. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 22:58:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pYky8.216$u_7.13785250@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41776

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uci0dd3la7g61a@corp.supernews.com...
>
> mike coslo wrote, about a fellow who views membership
> in "amateur radio" as a downgrade:
>
> >What reasons does he give for his belief that it would
> >be a downgrade?
>
> Well, his exact words had something to with "professional"
> versus "amateur" and the fact that he felt that "amateur" did
> not fit his view of himself. Now, to me, the word "amateur"
> has a different connotation

I thought you said a month ago that the word "amateur" had to go?

BUT that does not cut any ice
> with those to whom it has an, er, unfortunate spin.

I wonder who that could be?

> > Status? respect?
>
> Sure, those things are involved. When someone is on the
> outside looking in, well, he gets a different view.

Val, if you follow the drift in other threads, being licensed 15 years is
still "on the outside looking in."

> >Perhaps he doesn't like the nerdy stereotype?
>
> I don't think this is a problem with him, per se, except as
> the term "nerd" might apply to someone who is not really
> top-flight at what he is doing.
>
>
> >What does he want the ARS to be?
>
> I don't think he has any idea, really, except that he thinks
> it is somehow not in tune with his view of himself. For me,
> this is a marketing problem for Ham Radio and NOT a
> problem with my friend.

Actually, you wanted to change this before you ever mentioned this "friend,"
so its not really your friends problem.

> >What do you want it to be?
>
> Been around the block on this one; don't care to go there
> again. Check with the Big Boys about that.

Then why keep bringing it up?

> >How do you want us to "upgrade" our image? is perhaps
> >the most important question.
>
> Been around the block on that one, too. Don't care to go
> there again.

Yet here we are discussing it again.

2458. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:06:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <v3ly8.221$W6.14016831@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41779

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ucitvirq4nrde5@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Sorry, no rising to bait anymore. Find other fish now.
>
> Val

You're too busy chumming the waters.

2459. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:06:50 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <e4ly8.47872$Rw2.3734984@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41778

>> Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>> ... I don't think it would be good to burden
>> all higher-power applications with the requirement
>> to do this development work (APC) in addition to
>> everything else necessary to do something new.

> Hans, K0HB, replied:

> Dennis,
> I think you have just made the case why APC _* should*_
> be part of these "pioneer" bands. You have identified
> a problem which begs for some tinkering and experimenting.
> Who better than us to take that bull by the horns?

I thought we were working on our recovery from the decades-
long GOOD IDEA that amateur radio operators _* should*_
be proficient in Morse code operation and that proficiency
* should* be incorporated into FCC regs and ITU treaties.

Beware of government regulators with GOOD IDEAS in their
heads and the words _* should*_ and Mandatory on their lips!

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2460. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:06:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CC9DD8D.EF188B9F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41780

>
> >Is Riley ever wrong?
>
> You can ask him that, too. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Well, a few years ago he said that using phonetics for
IDing wasn't legal, but a week later he said that phonetics
were fine, as they were a widely known "encoding
scheme" for HF.

73 de Whiskey Alpha Two India Sierra Echo

2461. Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:14:34 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ubly8.7549$8p3.608332@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41781

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote

>
> I thought we were working on our recovery from the decades-
> long GOOD IDEA that amateur radio operators _* should*_
> be proficient in Morse code operation and that proficiency
> _* should*_ be incorporated into FCC regs and ITU treaties.
>

The amateur bands exist because it is considered in the public interest for several reasons. None of those reasons have anything to do with having a place for 60-year-old geezers to yak about their lumbago. I think it is time for the Commission to turn up the wick on the hams promise to "advance the art".

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2462. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:19:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hgly8.226$uX7.13597042@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41782

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020425204921.16837.00005594@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> The majority of "manually" sent Morse encoding is done with an
electronic
> >> keyer.
>
> >Is that anything like an A/D device?
>
> If you really don't know the difference between a keyer and an
> analog-to-digital converter, I don't think I can help you. If you do know
the
> difference, but asked the question anyway, I don't think I can help you
with
> that, either.

You're no help at all. Why do you think the majority of manually sent code
is cleaned up with a keyer?

2463. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:25:04 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ucjnc0qth33cd1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41777

mike coslo wrote:

>Well, here's the part where I get a little confused.
>Maybe he just needs shaken off the fence, so to
>speak.

Such is possible, no doubt. I really would like to
have this guy as a club member and I'm willing to
take a long-term view. So, perhaps "shaken" off
the fence will be more like "enticed" off the fence!

Here's hoping!

Val Germann
KC0MUB

**

2464. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:28:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <joly8.229$zg.14609605@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41783

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCA9FB8.8DC35D16@townsqr.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > >
> > > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > > fast can the fastest typist
> > > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > > typists?
> >
> > Because the "smart" thing to do is to prepare the file "off-the-air"
> > and then send it all at once instead of typying in real-time on the air.
> >
>
> Why, of course it is, Bill! Been there and done that hundreds of times,
in a
> professional setting. But hey, this is amateur radio, and we're hams, and
most
> of us with experience know that the best laid plans are likely to see all
that
> snazzy hi-data rate gear stored somewhere where we happen to NOT be when
the
> ship hits the sand.

Its obvious that you've no intention to use the best available modes.

Thus, if I happen to have a little key in my pocket, and
> there is a HF rig available, and perchance an operator on the other end
> similarly qualified, guess what- We can communicate! *Without* a 56k
circuit!
>
> Amazing, isn't it?

You sure are.

2465. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:34:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Ptly8.231$Ej.14801321@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41784

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CC9DD8D.EF188B9F@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > >Is Riley ever wrong?
> >
> > You can ask him that, too. :-)
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Well, a few years ago he said that using phonetics for
> IDing wasn't legal, but a week later he said that phonetics
> were fine, as they were a widely known "encoding
> scheme" for HF.
>
> 73 de Whiskey Alpha Two India Sierra Echo

I think that Riley has done a lot of good with enforcement, especially in light of no enforcement prior to that. But I've read some of his notices and it sounds like he shoots from the hip on occassion. Nothing wrong with that when he catches it early and corrects it.

2466. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:37:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aacogb$rn6$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41785

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCA98AF.E6C4014D@townsqr.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >> Okay, offer us one tiny shred of evidence that is more than
speculation
> > >> that Cross did something different than what he felt was in the
public
> > >> interest because he was afraid Carl would call him a Luddite.
> > >>Just one tiny real piece of proof.
> > >
> > > You're saying that all Carl's raging and ranting is totally ignored,
> > >ignored, even when he
> > >later shows up for an ex parte party. Sure it is.
> >
> > That is your tiny shred of evidence?
>
> For sure it's more than your assumptions to the contrary.

Yes Dick, the FCC staffers must have been so afraid
when we showed up for the ex parte.

What a pathetic joke. What do you (Dick) think
an exparte meeting is? Do you think its a screaming
match, a school yard shouting match?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2467. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:40:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Gzly8.233$7n.15019248@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41786

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426032956.27486.00005204@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 04/25/02 19:16 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020425191605.23265.00000999@mb-ck.aol.com>
>
> >No, "CKB." The "Lowfer" band at 160-190 KHz was already being
> >used over 30 years ago...by licensed amateurs.
>
> Wow! Talk about misdirection!
>
> Yes, by "licensed amateurs"...but not as Amateur licensees...not in
the
> United States, anyway. Even YOU can operate there, Lennie.
>
> Nice try at spin, Your Geezerness.

Steve, I'll bet they used good amateur practices instead of leaving it at
the door as so many do here.

Brian

2468. Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-26 23:54:04 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <wMly8.7630$8p3.583819@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41787

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote

> If a new mode has sufficient merit to capture enough market
> share in competition with the rest of the available choices the
> results will be obvious.

Are you suggesting that a "national park" for experimenters, consisting of perhaps 5% of the spectrum below 220MHz, is a poor use of our resources? Hell, we've got many times more than that reserved for FM repeaters so you can phone patch your wife to see if you should get bred (did I spell that right) on the way home from work!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2469. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:12:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <K1my8.253$Ny.15741272@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41788

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426074819.27399.00000904@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <lo0y8.12280$Ti7.355248191@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020425080646.26511.00000496@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >> In article <iiKx8.11802$fu7.328902134@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>,
"Brian
> >P
> >> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands,
Brian?
> >> >> Or even on one of those bands?
> >> >>
> >> >>What's your point?
> >> >>
> >> >> Your credibility.
> >> >>
> >> >What is wrong with my credibility?
> >>
> >> On the subject of the use of the non-phone amateur HF band segments,
you
> >have
> >> little to none.
> >
> >Why is that?
>
> Because you won't tell us what recent experience you have with the bands
in
> question. It's
> like a strict vegetarian spouting off about the differences in taste of
grades
> of beef.

Rest assured, I'm not a strick vegetarian.

> >> >Do you have an accusation to make?
> >>
> >> Just an observation: You talk about the use of various subbands and
modes
> >in
> >> amateur radio, but you are evading

> >> simple questions:
> >
> >They're my priveleges we're talking about.
>
> No, your experience or lack thereof.

No, my priveleges.

> >Why shouldn't I be able to comment?
>
> You can comment all you like. Your credibility is what doesn't exist.

Then we'll let the FCC worry about my credibility.

> >> When was the last time you operated in one of those subbands, Brian?
> >> Or even on one of those bands?
> >>
> >> They are not trick questions.
> >
> >Why do you need to know?
>
> To know whether you have any recent experience. Methinks you are just
trolling
> and blowing smoke.

You do?

> >> >> You have talked about the conditions on various HF bands, but you
give
> >no
> >> >> indication of actually having used those bands.
> >>
> >> >I have.
> >>
> >> But not when, or how often, or with what equipment.
> >
> >Are you from the FCC?
> >
> Nope. You don;t have to answer the questions.

You're catching on. Slow but steady.

> >> Example: I was on 80 meter CW less than a week ago. Made a few good
> >contacts.
> >> When's the last time
> >> you were on 80 CW?
> >>
> >> It's a simple question. No tricks.
> >
> >I'll open my logs to the FCC. Not that I'm required to keep any.
>
> Sounds to me like there's nothing for you to record in them anyway.

The Great Karnac speaks.

> >> >> Which poll are you talking about? I'm referring to the one asking
about
> >> >> "refarming" the Novice bands.
> >> >
> >> >The "rarely or never" poll in which the ARRL concluded there was no
> >reason
> >> >to change anything.
> >>
> >> Wrong poll. I'm talking about the refarming poll. Was on the ARRL
website
> >and
> >> in QST.
> >
> >OK. You weren't specific.
>
> Look at the subject line.

Subject line doesn't say anything about a poll.

> >> >> >> > They need to lead, not follow or take another poll. Or just
get
> >out
> >> >> >> > of the way.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> The ARRL BoD thinks giving lots more privs to Tech Pluses and
> >Novices
> >> >> >> is lead. They also think turning the Novice subbands over to
'phone
> >is
> >> >> >> leading. I agree with the first part but not the second.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Putting the Novices in the General CW portion of the band 25+ years
> >ago
> >> >is
> >> >> >Lead.
> >> >>
> >> >> I was a ham 25 years ago. Were you?
> >> >
> >> >Here we go again. "I've got more time in the chow hall..."
> >>
> >> It's a simple fact that I have been an active ham for three and half
> >decades,
> >> using a variety of bands, modes and equipment. It's called
qualifications.
> >
> >Let me go look in Part 97 for "qualifications."
>
> More evasion. Says it all.

You're trying to play, "I'm more of a ham than you are." I don't play, but it speaks a lot about you.

> >I was an ARRL member before I held a license. The ARRL wasn't worried about
> >my "qualifications." I've been to the FCC website, and missed the part
> >about commenting without "qualifications." But Jim demands my
> >qualifications.
> >
> >Who are you to demand anything?
>
> I don't demand a thing. You can refuse to answer any and all questions. But
> when someone says
> they know about the use of certain bands but won't tell anything about their
> recent use of those
> bands, they cannot expect to be taken seriously.

I refuse your demand. Darn, there goes my credibility. Now the FCC will reject my comments.

> >> > The FCC is not issuing any more Novice or Tech+ licenses.
> >> >Why?
> >>
> >> - Less admin work.
> >> - Administrative cluelessness.
> >> - Desire to purge the database of SKs.
> >> - Lowered requirements for all licenses means FCC sees no reason for new
> >> licenses in those license classes.
> >> - Tech Plus has become "Tech-with-HF".
> >> - Few new Novices in recent years.
> >
> >And I was thinking that the "Novice" idea was a just faliure over the last
> >several decades. Its just less work for the FCC.
>
> Yup.

So in the 1960's when people were actually applying for those licenses, the FCC not only administered the exam, but did all that paperwork. But in 1999, all they had to do was the occassional new applicant and a few more renewals. But you say that is just too much work.

Just how long did you work at the FCC to know all this?

> >> >> The ARRL BoD proposed instant upgrading of all existing Novices and
> >Tech
> >> >Pluses
> >> >> to General way back in 1998. FCC said no.
> >> >
> >> >Who the

> >>
> >> [expletive deleted]
>
> >> >wants an instant upgrade?
> >>
> >> All the pre-1987 Tech Pluses who got Generals after restructuring, for
> >one.
> >
> >Nothing instant about it. They met the requirements years earlier.
>
> Then why did the restructuring make them show up at VE sessions and pay
the fee
> to get Generals?

And I thought you said it was instant. You mean they had to stand in a
line?

> >> >Just stop the divisions and segregation in the band.
> >>
> >> Which means what? No more subbands by license class? No more subbands
by
> >mode?
> >
> >By License class.
>
> I see. You want full access but you don't want to take any more written
exams
> either.

Jim, after the FCC gives me the go ahead to operate 1,500 watts at one
frequency, just how many more written exams will satisfy the FCC that I can
operate safely 1khz lower in frequency?

Bad question. Instead, just what will it take to satisfy N2EY? Because
that's what's really going on here.

> >Their might actually be some rationale for "by mode."
>
> Thee is.

What mode exam did the Technician take to be able to operate CW on 144.010
Mhz?

> >> >If the Novices had been in the General CW portion
> >> >of the band they might have had a chance.
> >>
> >> Then why did the FCC reject the ARRL idea, and the AH0A petition to do
> >just
> >> that?
> >
> >In what decade did the FCC reject this ARRL idea? the AH0A petition?
>

> Both were rejected in the last few years. You weren't paying attention.

Help me out here. I don't recall the ARRL placing this item in the
Restructuring comments.

> >> > I didn't say phone, did I?
> >>
> >> You said "stop the divisions and segregation in the band".
> >
> >Look Jim, if the Novices were in with the General CW band in the late
70's
> >and early 80's this discussion might not be taking place.
>
> "If is for children, spinning daydreams". Did you petition the FCC to do
that
> way back then? If not, your just griping.

And I thought you just said "If is for children..."

> > To suggest it in
> >the waning years of the 20th century as any kind of fix is absurd.
>
> Not at all.

Yes it is.

> > You just want more fone.
>
> Not me!
>
> You obviously have not read my proposal, nor Hans'.

Then I bow down to your great proposal, Extra Jim.

2470. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:14:47 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <X3my8.255$Zz.15819076@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41789

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426081821.09510.00005376@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 04/26/02 07:48 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020426074819.27399.00000904@mb-mr.aol.com>
>
> >>Why do you need to know?
> >
> >To know whether you have any recent experience. Methinks you are just
> >trolling
> >and blowing smoke.
>
> My bets are on trolling. If you think he's clueless and uncivil
here, you
> should see what he sends folks directly!
>
> He's the midwest version of Uncle Lennie, but WITH a license. RSVP
for a
> copy, if you'd like.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, how could there be any version of Len with a license? You're whole argument rests on him not having a license. You just don't make sense.

2471. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:16:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CC9EE0F.823CC97C@adelphia.net>
Source record: 41790

Mysterian wrote:

> Jesus moves in mysterious ways.

But what does he thihnk about the CW testing requirement?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2472. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:17:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CC9EE1D.702382ED@adelphia.net>
Source record: 41791

Mysterian wrote:

> Jesus moves in mysterious ways.

But what does he think about the CW testing requirement?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2473. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:22:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Mamy8.257$tv.15533356@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41792

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:wMly8.7630$8p3.583819@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote
>
> > If a new mode has sufficient merit to capture enough market
> > share in competition with the rest of the available choices the
> > results will be obvious.
>
> Are you suggesting that a "national park" for experimenters, consisting of
> perhaps 5% of the spectrum below 220MHz, is a poor use of our resources?
> Hell, we've got many times more than that reserved for FM repeaters so you
> can phone patch your wife to see if you should get bred (did I spell that
> right) on the way home from work!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Oh man, wait till Jim deletes your expletives.

2474. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:36:14 UTC
From: K0CKB <k0ckb@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <2omy8.7706$8p3.637457@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41793

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

> > Are you suggesting that a "national park" for experimenters, consisting
of
> > perhaps 5% of the spectrum below 220MHz, is a poor use of our resources?
> > Hell, we've got many times more than that reserved for FM repeaters so
you
> > can phone patch your wife to see if you should get bred (did I spell
that
> > right) on the way home from work!
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> Oh man, wait till Jim deletes your expletives.
>

Oh man, wait till HB gets home from work!

CKB

2475. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:41:31 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <%smy8.52440$QC1.3787114@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41794

> The amateur bands exist because it is considered
> in the public interest for several reasons. None
> of those reasons have anything to do with having a
> place for 60-year-old geezers to yak about their
> lumbago.

Well, ya know, lumbago today, earthquake relief comms
tomorrow. I think I'd rather have the geezers on the
air with fresh finals - just in case.

> I think it is time for the Commission
> to turn up the wick on the hams promise to "advance
> the art".

Yeah, that's the ticket. Beat that innovation out
of their worthless hides.

0.13 * :-)

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

...-.-

2476. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:45:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426204549.21592.00000877@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 41795

In article <3CC9879F.90F0C3D4@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> <some snippage>
>
>> The word 'amateur' is derived from the French and actually means "for the
>love of",
>> which in the case of radio would mean that amateur radio operators love
>radio for its own sake.
>>
>> Of course that leaves out the likes of Loose Lennie.
>
> Yeah, I'm not exactly sure what his interest is! A sad case tho'.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Now, now, Mike. There you go climbing a Missouri Molehill again.
It ain't no Everest he piled up. :-)

I don't think you can love radio for its own sake. My little Icom doesn't
have any sake spigot on it even though it was made in Japan. The
best sake comes from a little bottle. Lachaim!

2477. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:45:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426204549.21592.00000876@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 41800

In article <8ujy8.52142$QC1.3763636@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>>> K7JEB wrote:
>>> Yeah! Kinda like that mysterious radio signal that was
>>> picked up by the Australian navy in the movie "On the Beach".
>
>> W5DXP replied and asked:
>> Ever wonder where the AC power was coming from?
>
>That was explained by inference. The transmitter was located
>at an oil refinery which was still running. I deduce from that
>that there was a diesel generator somewhere, probably fed from
>the refinery's product, that kept the automation up. I wonder
>how long it would take a couple-megawatt, power-generation
>station to go through 100 million gallons of diesel fuel?
>
>Of course the *real* irony would have been to have the
>transmitter running off of the output of an automated
>*nuclear* power plant. But then, they wouldn't have had
>a window open with a shade in it and a Coke bottle on
>the desk and .....

:-) If you want "accuracy" in the moom pitchas, then I recommend
a later one called "Independence Day." :-)

Ain't it a beach?

2478. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:45:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426204550.21592.00000878@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 41798

In article <3CCAA2FE.98847383@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>mike coslo wrote:
>
>> Valentine Germann wrote:
>> >
>> > mike coslo wrote, about a fellow who views membership
>> > in "amateur radio" as a downgrade:
>> >
>> > >What reasons does he give for his belief that it would
>> > >be a downgrade?
>> >
>> > Well, his exact words had something to with "professional"
>> > versus "amateur" and the fact that he felt that "amateur" did
>> > not fit his view of himself. Now, to me, the word "amateur"
>> > has a different connotation BUT that does not cut any ice
>> > with those to whom it has an, er, unfortunate spin.
>>
>> Interesting. Amateur *has* been transmuted by marketing forces into
>> something other than what it actually means. To be an "amateur" is quite
>> a compliment actually. It's kind of like mediocre, which means average,
>> but has been transmuted into poor.
>
> The word 'amateur' is derived from the French and actually means "for the
>love of",
>which in the case of radio would mean that amateur radio operators love radio
>for its own sake.

You speak French, Dickie? :-)

The DERIVATION of the word "amateur" is from the Latin "amare"
which means "to love." [see also modern Italian and "amore" which
is closer to the Latin]

The inference seems to be your own about "love." My dictionary has
two meanings: 1. a nonprofessional, engaged in an activity not for
money; 2. one who is somewhat unskilled.

Nearly all the radio services in Title 47 CFR are commercial in
nature. The FCC had to use some descriptor for non-commercial
radio services and it chose "amateur" as in "not for pecuniary
reasons (no money for services of communications)."

>Of course that leaves out the likes of Loose Lennie.

Why, Dickie?

Is it because I gave up a nice career start as a professional
illustrator to go into radio-electronics and successfully completed
a career in that? Why would someone go into a relative unknown
work area when they were already gifted with a different aptitude?

Or aren't you just commenting the way you do because you are
just pissed over not being able to win any convincing arguments
about a hobby activity that you, personally, see as something
glorious, profound, noble, good, and true? :-)

>But of course you're right-it has been transmuted into a entirely different
>meaning by
>those who don't know. Vale's friend might benefit from being informed of the
>correct
>definition, as it appears he loves radio.

Valentine's friend might try writing the Rosicrucians for the
revelations. They used to advertise in many magazines for
folks to contact them for all the "secrets to everything" and
general enlightenment. :-)

Illiterate? Write for free help!

2479. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:45:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426204551.21592.00000879@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 41799

In article <KBdy8.6770$8p3.545007@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"speaker kone" <batterscakes@hotmail.com> wrote
>
>> I just found a link to a private WEBSITE which has
>> what appears to be, reproductions of the ARRL's
>> Official Tax Return filings, in .PDF format,
>> for FY-1993 to 2000.
>
>While ARRL did show positive total results for the years
>he's talking about, it was all from realized gains on securities
>transactions. When you exclude those and consider the drop
>in the value of their securities, unfortunately ARRL had losses
>from operations in those years. KR4UQ seems to have some
>sort of ax to grind and, like any good Unabasher,
>will interpret the numbers to fit his argument.

...and, the ARRL is true-blue, noble, kind, generous, above
reproach, etc., etc.

:-)

I don't know if those returns are real or not, but judging from the
stampings and other marks, they appear to be okay.

For FY2000, the ARRL has 17 employees making over $50,000
per year (Jon Bloom reported as getting just a bit over $70,000).
Booth, Freret, Imlay billed the ARRL for $105,122 worth of legal
thingies and $60,060 was billed from Chwat & Co. for lobbying
the gubmint. Executive VP Dave Sumner is shown as receiving
$124,875.20 in compensation plus $6,610.97 in employee
benefit contributions and an expense account of almost $7K.
[your membership dollars at work]

With 111 total employees and $11.6 million in reported total
revenue received, we are talking real money flow.

>He also seems to lack an understanding of the difference
>between the 501c(3) side of the house and the for-profit side.

Well, I'm sure you can look down from Mt. Olympus and inform
us ordinary folk just EXACTLY how it all hangs...or you can put
yourself on a pedastel higher than the gods of accounting to say
little and just sneer at those who dare challenge Big Brother. :-)

2480. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:45:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426204552.21592.00000880@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 41796

In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

><Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>> OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
>>> fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
>>>
>>> If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
>>
>>Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
>
>It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
>used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
>OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
>are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
>International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
>is 0 encoding.

Heh, I don't think any amateurs are going to be able to manually key something at 4 GHz bit rates. :-)

"Farnsworth spacing" it ain't!

2481. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:45:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426204553.21592.00000881@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 41797

In article <3z0y8.12284$2D7.355723673@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> For all your fuming, fussing, and desperate attempts at misdirection, HB
>> proved you wrong. Everything after that is nothing more than
>> keyboard-masturbation on your part.
>>
>> This would be a good time to learn to laugh at yourself. Or, develop
>> multiple personalities! That way you won't be laughing at you, you'll be
>> laughing with you.
>>
>> CKB
>
>"Keyboard masturbation?"
>
>Hans has got one swingin' wife!

Or he has a rather severe multiple personality disorder. He may be channeling good ol Jack Mehoff in "upper NY state" or that other guy who was "activated into duty" from under a bridge. Those guys can give him tips on How To Do It. :-)

2482. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:50:43 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <DBmy8.7734$8p3.639756@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41701

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:%smy8.52440$QC1.3787114@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > The amateur bands exist because it is considered
> > in the public interest for several reasons. None
> > of those reasons have anything to do with having a
> > place for 60-year-old geezers to yak about their
> > lumbago.
>
> Well, ya know, lumbago today, earthquake relief comms
> tomorrow. I think I'd rather have the geezers on the
> air with fresh finals - just in case.
>
> > I think it is time for the Commission
> > to turn up the wick on the hams promise to "advance
> > the art".

Fair enough Jim,

We'll let the geezers with lumbago keep 95% for earthquake preparedness, and
we'll turn over 5% of the bands below 222MHz to pioneers to tinker with
something new and exciting for *this* century.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2483. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:50:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <OBmy8.271$4U.17076268@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41702

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426204550.21592.00000878@mb-fa.aol.com...
> In article <3CCAA2FE.98847383@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:

> > The word 'amateur' is derived from the French and actually means "for
the
> >love of",
> >which in the case of radio would mean that amateur radio operators love
radio
> >for its own sake.
>
> You speak French, Dickie? :-)

40/8?

2484. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 00:55:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <PFmy8.274$Pz.15808913@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41703

"K0CKB" <k0ckb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:2omy8.7706$8p3.637457@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> > > Hell, we've got many times more than that reserved for FM repeaters so
> you
> > > can phone patch your wife to see if you should get bred (did I spell
> that
> > > right) on the way home from work!
> > >
> > > With all kind wishes,
> > >
> > > de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > Oh man, wait till Jim deletes your expletives.
>
> Oh man, wait till HB gets home from work!
>
> CKB

Oh man, so this is what he does at work?

2485. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:00:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <AKmy8.277$XX.17315999@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41704
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Mysterian" <Mysterian2001@alt.net> wrote in message
news:aacoth$e5c$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> In http://www.cnn.com/2002/LAW/04/26/death.penalty.order/index.html, a
> federal judge has finally seen the barbaric wrongness of the US death
> penalty and said that he may outlaw it.
>
> Jesus moves in mysterious ways. I will pray that this Christian judge
> prevails.

Jesus is possible because of the death penalty. He was put to death via
crucificion. Jim won't let me play "what if..." so we'll leave it there.

2486. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:06:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426210636.29664.00000894@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 41705

In article <K1my8.253$Ny.15741272@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020426074819.27399.00000904@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <lo0y8.12280$Ti7.355248191@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian

>> I see. You want full access but you don't want to take any more written
exams
>> either.
>
>Jim, after the FCC gives me the go ahead to operate 1,500 watts at one
>frequency, just how many more written exams will satisfy the FCC that I can
>operate safely 1khz lower in frequency?
>
>Bad question. Instead, just what will it take to satisfy N2EY? Because
>that's what's really going on here.

NOTHING will satisfy N2EY unless you think like he does, do as
he does, but, above all, fall down and cherish Judge Roy Bean
as all should. Oh, and have a set of chassis punches ready so
you can "design and build a rig from scratch." :-)

>> >Their might actually be some rationale for "by mode."
>>
>> Thee is.
>
>What mode exam did the Technician take to be able to operate CW on 144.010
>Mhz?

Thee have a good answer... :-)

>> "If is for children, spinning daydreams". Did you petition the FCC to do
that
>> way back then? If not, your just griping.
>
>And I thought you just said "If is for children..."

Thee is correct. :-)

2487. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:06:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426210637.29664.00000895@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 41706

In article <aacogb$rn6$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:3CCA98AF.E6C4014D@townsqr.com...
>> W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>> >
>> > >> Okay, offer us one tiny shred of evidence that is more than
>speculation
>> > >> that Cross did something different than what he felt was in the
>public
>> > >> interest because he was afraid Carl would call him a Luddite.
>> > >>Just one tiny real piece of proof.
>> > >
>> > > You're saying that all Carl's raging and ranting is totally ignored,
>> > >ignored, even when he
>> > >later shows up for an ex parte party. Sure it is.
>> >
>> > That is your tiny shred of evidence?
>>
>> For sure it's more than your assumptions to the contrary.
>
>Yes Dick, the FCC staffers must have been so afraid
>when we showed up for the ex parte.
>
>What a pathetic joke. What do you (Dick) think
>an exparte meeting is? Do you think its a screaming
>match, a school yard shouting match?

I venture that he saw you and Carl posing in front of the FCC
building and thought you two were "men in black" and got
overly nervous. [you know how fidgity some alien beings are]
:-)

2488. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:12:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <cWmy8.285$p_.17463579@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41707

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:ugshcukhqjr4cs0mo9roq4757e4bnupi3q@4ax.com...

> Just look at it as a lesson in role reversal.

Bob, thanks for the does of reality. Brian

2489. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:15:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bZmy8.287$C21.17728938@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41708

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CC9B831.AEA6D1D7@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Where in Bob's remarks did you find any of that nonsense? Or mine
either, for
> > that matter.
>
> "It is a control and an ego issue."

It's about to get ugly again.

2490. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:33:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zdny8.299$4b1.18264316@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41709

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426210636.29664.00000894@mb-bk.aol.com...
> In article <K1my8.253$Ny.15741272@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020426074819.27399.00000904@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >> In article <lo0y8.12280$Ti7.355248191@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>,
"Brian
>
> >> I see. You want full access but you don't want to take any more written
> exams
> >> either.
> >
> >Jim, after the FCC gives me the go ahead to operate 1,500 watts at one
> >frequency, just how many more written exams will satisfy the FCC that I
can
> >operate safely 1khz lower in frequency?
> >
> >Bad question. Instead, just what will it take to satisfy N2EY? Because
> >that's what's really going on here.
>
> NOTHING will satisfy N2EY unless you think like he does, do as
> he does, but, above all, fall down and cherish Judge Roy Bean
> as all should. Oh, and have a set of chassis punches ready so
> you can "design and build a rig from scratch." :-)

I wonder. Chassis punches, huh? I've used a 3/4" wood bit to make a hole
for an NMO.

> >> >Their might actually be some rationale for "by mode."
> >>
> >> Thee is.
> >
> >What mode exam did the Technician take to be able to operate CW on
144.010
> >Mhz?
>
> Thee have a good answer... :-)

Lets just bring it all under the microscope and try to make some meaning of
it.

> >> "If is for children, spinning daydreams". Did you petition the FCC to
do
> that
> >> way back then? If not, your just griping.
> >
> >And I thought you just said "If is for children..."
>
> Thee is correct. :-)

I don't think Jim likes me.

2491. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:38:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <diny8.325$Y82.56136952@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41710

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426103313.11738.00006973@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >I have run in to, or of course, the
> >attempt to parallel ham radio to CB
>
> Well whats wrong that parallel, theres very little difference anymore.

And you're living proof.

2492. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:47:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca0331_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41711

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424220652.26511.00000484@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3cc6d4e7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c@fast.net>
> writes:
>> So a single interfering carrier 20 dB above the desired signal wipes out
the
> desired signal.

Not necesssarily ... there are ways to deal with such things.

However, since a CW carrier is the "best" jammer, that could
be one of the reasons Hans suggested that CW not be allowed
there ...
(Note: I am still NOT advocating a restriction, in the rules, on CW)

> But in that same 25 kHz bandwidth, at least fifty 12 wpm CW/Morse signals
could
> coexist with no significant interference, even is some were 20 dB above
others
> (and decent receiver selectivity was used).

And VFO (synthesizer) phase noise was REALLY good, etc., etc.

And, using the digital systems proposed in strawman form independently
by Gary Coffman and myself more than 2 years ago, hundreds of digital
signals at 20 wpm Morse equivalent transfer rates could coexist there ...

Carl - wk3c

2493. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:48:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7sny8.329$S12.55694698@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41712

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020425030640.27437.00004552@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 04/24/02 13:35 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020424133540.06459.00000833@mb-mo.aol.com>
>
> >It's so nice of you to tell us that an itinerant portrait painter was
> >working on "digital electronics" as early as 1840. Thank you.
>
> And the problem with that concept is...?!?!
>
> Another painter was working on concepts of aviation and astronomics
in the
> 1500's. Seems no one has a problem with HIS finidings.
>
> Steve

The National Traffic Safety Board would be extremely busy if we still used
his flying machine.

2494. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:49:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Xsny8.331$Te2.56502322@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41713

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020425030640.27437.00004552@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 04/24/02 13:35 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020424133540.06459.00000833@mb-mo.aol.com>
>
> >It's so nice of you to tell us that an itinerant portrait painter was
> >working on "digital electronics" as early as 1840. Thank you.
>
> And the problem with that concept is...?!?!
>
> Another painter was working on concepts of aviation and astronomics
in the
> 1500's. Seems no one has a problem with HIS finidings.
>
> Steve

Another painter gave us the Gypsy Moth.

2495. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:55:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020426215536.01774.00002110@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41714

In article <ubly8.7549$8p3.608332@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>The amateur bands exist because it is considered in the public interest for
>several reasons. None of those reasons have anything to do with having a
>place for 60-year-old geezers to yak about their lumbago. I think it is
>time for the Commission to turn up the wick on the hams promise to "advance
>the art".
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

I totally agree. I think that the FCC rules should be changed to require mode-specific activity logs from each licensed amateur radio station, and that they should reflect at least one half of the total activity being in some mode other than AM/FM/SSB voice. Any digital mode or CW would suffice. It is a known fact that amateurs who are actively involved in modes other than voice modes are more likely to be technically involved radio amateurs.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2496. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 01:57:57 UTC
From: George McCouch <geomac@hopkinsville.net>
Message-ID: <geomac-7FE62F.20575726042002@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41715

In article <3cc3758a_1@newsa.ev1.net>,
"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote:

> A recent outburst here has evoked in me a rash of thoughts to consider all
> day. I download this newsgroup, for whatever reason, each evening and know
> full well there is nothing of any substance on it, certainly nothing that
> interests me.
>
> I allow myself to be engaged by reprehensible thoughts from reprehensible
> people. I allow myself to get caught up in petty meandering about what was
> meant to be said; and know full well the main defense is simply against
> another for their challenge only through their dislike of something I said,
> and not necessarily that what I said was all that important; or wrong. I
> allow myself the anger that I have always been able to ignore or overcome,
> simply. I get extremely angry at injustices and choose to get wrapped up in
> how wrong someone is while I, myself, am just as wrong for the way in which
> I respond to them.
>
> I will no longer participate in this newsgroup and am actually seriously
> considering dropping ham radio altogether. While this newsgroup is
> insignificant in terms of being representative of ham radio, I have no
> passion for a hobby in which people enjoy nothing but constant challenges
> with each other--and it seems to be that more than anything else lately.
> Perhaps the FCC is a governmental business, but the people have decided that
> the ARS is a proving ground for how much more important one is than the
> other; rather than the supposed "fraternity" to which many endear the hobby.
> If a fraternity means constant hazing, then leave me out.
>
> This is my last post, my last time to logon to the newsgroup. So, any
> responses will truly not be seen by me. If you plan to make them for my
> benefit, then you may as well not bother. You brothers have probably been
> at it for years, and you'll probably be at it for many more.
>
> This recent exchange, and the fact that tempers can flare so very much as to
> threaten each other personally really concerns me. I hope you will all
> fight your strongest fights, blare your loudest words, but leave out
> personal affronts and assaults toward personal lives...that is way, way too
> much folks. And, trade the semantics for real issues, huh? You all scare
> me when you act like that. Goodbye.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim,
If you are reading this......
I do not post much anymore but still read this group on a regular basis.

Have always enjoyed your posts and will miss them.

73
George W3GEO

2497. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:33:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020426223349.01774.00002112@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41716

In article <3CC9B831.AEA6D1D7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> Where in Bob's remarks did you find any of that nonsense? Or mine either,
>for
>> that matter.
>
>"It is a control and an ego issue."

Cecil:

Incorrect. It is/was "a control and an ego issue" only to the weak-minded,
impatient, lazy whiners who were/are too lazy to learn and be tested on
a practical communications skill at a useful proficiency level. To the rest
of us, it was a matter of supporting the concept of retaining the requirement
in order to retain the basic, essential communications capability that
amateurs can exploit when they know how to employ the Morse/CW mode.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2498. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:33:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020426223349.01774.00002111@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41717

In article <hgly8.226$uX7.13597042@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>You're no help at all. Why do you think the majority of manually sent code
>is cleaned up with a keyer?

Brian:

Funny you should ask. I basically learned how to send CW by using an Iambic keyer. I practiced off-the-air with it extensively, and as a result, have trained my ear to produce perfectly formed CW characters even when using my trusty old WWII-vintage Lionel J-38 straight key. I love to "send" to my TNC and watch the characters form perfectly on my computer screen! I just wish more of my fellow CW operators used keyers on-the-air.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2499. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:33:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020426223350.01774.00002113@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41718

In article <3CC9893D.256489AB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Nope. You -to a T. That is, after Kim.

Kim who?

>It is not I who draws my self esteem from my Morse code ability. It is not
>I who wants to force my favorite mode requirement upon all HF hams.

Cecil:

For whom is Morse code their "favorite" mode? It certainly isn't mine.
I do enjoy Morse/CW, but my all-around favorite mode is good, ole-
fashion' Baudot RTTY, especially on a good day with a wide-open
band and strong, virtually error-free signals. AMTOR would be my
next favorite choice, but there are very few hams out there using it
for keyboard-to-keyboard QSO's. On a good day, I can copy 20
WPM CW with no problem, and can copy call signs and contest
exchanges at up to 30 WPM during Field Day. But 20 WPM
average copying ability is dismally poor in comparison to the
standards set by military and commercial CW operators. You
couldn't get out of Air Force Morse Operator school if you only
copy 20 WPM. However, 20 WPM, as slow as it is, was a perfectly
reasonable and highly achievable standard for an Extra class
license in the AMATEUR Radio Service. Nobody here wanted to
"force" this requirement on other hams, since it is a requirement
which was proven to be readily achievable by prospective hams of
all ages, both sexes, and from all walks of life. The only reason it
was done away with is because today's hams are interested only
in the most consumer-oriented, instantly-gratifying mode available
to hams: HF phone.

Nobody wants to have the truth told about them when, in reality,
all they are as a ham is a dumbed-down glorified CB'er. Unfortunately,
this is about all we'll have left in the ARS pretty soon. With my
marginal 20 WPM (average) CW ability, it will be no problem for
me to maintain my "self esteem" among future hams. However,
without a requirement to learn and be tested in Morse/CW at a
useful proficiency level, the future hams will have no way to develop
any self-esteem of their own, when all they are doing, for the most
part, is shouting each other down on the HF phone bands.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2500. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:38:29 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CCA0F06.9479820@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41719

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020424220652.26511.00000484@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > In article <3cc6d4e7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3c@fast.net>
> > writes:
> >> So a single interfering carrier 20 dB above the desired signal wipes out
> the
> > desired signal.
>
> Not necesssarily ... there are ways to deal with such things.
>
> However, since a CW carrier is the "best" jammer, that could
> be one of the reasons Hans suggested that CW not be allowed
> there ...
> (Note: I am still NOT advocating a restriction, in the rules, on CW)
>
> > But in that same 25 kHz bandwidth, at least fifty 12 wpm CW/Morse signals
> could
> > coexist with no significant interference, even is some were 20 dB above
> others
> > (and decent receiver selectivity was used).
>
> And VFO (synthesizer) phase noise was REALLY good, etc., etc.
>
> And, using the digital systems proposed in strawman form independently
^^^^^^^^
> by Gary Coffman and myself more than 2 years ago, hundreds of digital
> signals at 20 wpm Morse equivalent transfer rates could coexist there ...

And we are all still looking at the patent office for the
Coffman system or the Stevenson System. How's the hardware
development going? ;-)

73,
Clay N4AOX

2501. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:39:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca0f50_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41720

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426000707.13101.00001028@mb-ct.aol.com...

> Another point of the "experimental farm" idea is that the widening of the
> 'phone bands is not a good idea, IMO.

Agreed ... the phone bands would be OK of folks acted more civily.

Last weekend I tried to work the SETI League QSO party, just
for fun and to talk to other folks interested in SETI.

Started calling "CQ SETI" at the start of the 24 hour window
on 14.204 (1% of the H line freq) ... and worked a few
stations over the course of about a half an hour. All of a sudden
some inconsiderate LIDs in/around the Orlando, FL area came
up 40 db over S9, 700 Hz above me at 14.204.7 ... and start
shooting the breeze. No "Is the frequency in use?" or nothing.

I politely said "The frequency is in use." and signed my call
a couple of times and they simply ignored me ...

The LIDs were W4RHE, KF4IC, and K1RON ...

Now I would give them the benefit of the doubt that
they might not have been able to hear me, but they were
all 30-40 dB over S9 and while I'm not running legal limt
and a beam, my station is not THAT bad, either ... there
is no doubt in my mind that they could hear me and simply
didn't give a damn.

To make them even bigger lids, they were talking more or less
"local" on 20m and obviously using very high power (bragging
about their amps and big towers/beams) ... these guys could
use an APC requirement.

Carl - wk3c

2502. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:41:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aad3apreg1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41721

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426204552.21592.00000880@mb-fa.aol.com...
> In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
(Dennis
> Ferguson) writes:
>
> ><Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>> OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
> >>> fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
> >>>
> >>> If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
> >>
> >>Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
> >
> >It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
> >used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
> >OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
> >are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
> >International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
> >is 0 encoding.

Yea, and we sent multiple signals at the same time using
different "colors" (i.e. different optical wavelengths).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2503. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:49:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 41724

In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
>used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
>OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
>are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
>International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
>is 0 encoding.
>
Interesting.

It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of commercial fixed point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or other radiated-RF means today. And the percentage is dropping.

The real communications revolution of the past 20 years has been fiber optics. Both the internet and lowcost long distance telephones are largely made possible by the fiber revolution. Fiber optics offer enormous bandwidth, low time delay, high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune to RFI, EMI and EMP. Fibers can be installed anywhere copper cables can go - on poles, underground, and under the sea. Terrestrial microwave and satellites simply cannot compete except in special situations.

From a historical point of view, we have come full circle.

The first telecom revolution was the widespread acceptance of the electric telegraph about 150 years ago. Before then, almost all information travelled only as fast as transportation could carry a messenger or a letter. Communications facilities available to President Andrew Jackson had more in common with those available to Julius Casear than they did with those available to President Abraham Lincoln.

The telegraph conquered most of the land area in Western developed countries, then proceeded to cross the oceans. Radio was hampered in its early development because it was at first considered merely a telegraph system without wires. It took years to get the term "radio" accepted universally instead of "wireless telegraphy" or simply "wireless".

Yet everything old is new again. Fiber optics has more in common with the telegraph than with radio. Many fibers follow railroad rights-of-way, just as the telegraph did. As Dennis points out, the signaling method used on the fibers is on-off keying.

And the companies selling us new radio technology call it "wireless" as if it's a new term.

--

Doing techno-prediction is a risky game, but if current trends continue, RF's communications role will change drastically in the years to come. Cheap and universal fiber communication will replace RF in all but mobile/portable applications and specialties like the military, hams and the developing world.

Just my opinion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2504. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:49:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426224930.06141.00000163@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 41722

In article <20020425064916.06846.00005554@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Do you think that Cross even knows what Carl says on
>rec.radio.amateur.policy?

I have never met either Mr. Cross or Mr. Stevenson.

I have read much of what Mr. Stevenson has written here over the past 5 years.

I don't think Mr. Stevenson would behave the same way in an exparte or other official communication with the FCC as he has sometimes behaved here.

I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy

Just some observations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2505. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:49:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426224931.06141.00000165@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 41723

In article <8ujy8.52142$QC1.3763636@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>>> K7JEB wrote:
>>> Yeah! Kinda like that mysterious radio signal that was
>>> picked up by the Australian navy in the movie "On the Beach".
>
>> W5DXP replied and asked:
>> Ever wonder where the AC power was coming from?
>
>That was explained by inference. The transmitter was located
>at an oil refinery which was still running. I deduce from that
>that there was a diesel generator somewhere, probably fed from
>the refinery's product, that kept the automation up. I wonder
>how long it would take a couple-megawatt, power-generation
>station to go through 100 million gallons of diesel fuel?

Let's do some approximate numbers....

Let's say they have a 2 megawatt backup diesel plant. Such a setup might
consist of a single 3000 hp prime mover turning an alternator at 900 rpm.
Depending on the load, such a setup might use 1-2 gallons per hour upwards.

Say they left a lot of lights and other stuff running, and the plant is using
10 gallons per hour. It would take 100,000 hours, or more than 11 years, to go
through 1 million gallons at that rate. The prime mover would probably fail
from lack of lube oil in less than that time. However, such a plant could
easily run for several months with no attention.

>Of course the *real* irony would have been to have the
>transmitter running off of the output of an automated
>*nuclear* power plant.

HAW! that's a good one!

but why would a refinery have a nuke plant?

>But then, they wouldn't have had
>a window open with a shade in it and a Coke bottle on
>the desk and .....
>
Exactly

73 de Jim, N2EY

2506. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:49:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020426224931.06141.00000164@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 41725

In article <aac9r3$2ltn$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>I also think the APC requirement just gets in the way.

>First it presupposes the application. APC is straight forward when
>two transceivers are maintaining a bi-directional point-to-point
>relationship (and if you have built the hardware for automatic
>control of transmitter power), but gets a lot harder if you have one
>transmitter and many receivers and is impossible if some of the receivers
>are silent. Demanding APC for higher power hence means that only
>bi-directional point-to-point applications get to use higher power,
>and condemns multipoint and silent receiver applications to lower power.
>I don't know why one would want to penalize the latter type of applications,
>these could be the ones that turn out to be interesting.

Excellent point. Particularly when one of the primary goals of the "experimental farm" idea is for tuners-by to hear the strange noises and try to decode them.
>
>Second, while APC is possible for point-to-point applications it is
>still a fiddly protocol and hardware thing which, in real life, usually
>gets left until the end of the development process. While APC is useful
>for allowing working applications to scale to many users, it is a
>complexity that just gets in the way when you are trying to get the
>application to work in the first place, which is what most of the
>development process involves. If the point of amateur radio is
>to allow development of new things, rather than just the deployment
>of someone else's finished product, I think this is the last place
>you want an APC constraint.

Which means that most of the development will happen without it.
>
>Finally, I know fairly simple APC algorithms work okay at VHF and above
>where the channels have relatively benign characteristics, but at HF
>where the channels are awful, propagation can change quickly, data rates
>are low and communication turn-around times are long, it may be that
>finding APC algorithms that work stably and well is itself a development
>project waiting to be done. I don't think it would be good to burden
>all higher-power applications with the requirement to do this development
>work in addition to everything else necessary to do something new.

End result is you're either going to suffer low reliability, or set up the APC to assume worst case and run more power.
>
>APC is good for production systems intended to scale to many users, but

>is rotten for one-off experiments that individuals construct in their
>basements. I hence think a hard requirement for APC is probably
>incompatible with the kind of applications it is desireable for the ARS
>to support.

Ya sold me, Dennis. I'm now thinking that for the "experimental farm" proposal, it's an unnecessary complication to the regs.

Thanks

73 de Jim, N2EY

2507. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:51:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca1243_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41726

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE79EEB.F8A91DD0@townsqr.com...
> What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> fast can the fastest typist type? Why do we need 56k circuits fo
> 60 word per minute typists?

Dick,

Your problem is that your imagination is always bounded
by the limits of human ability to do thing manually.

You don't see capable of grasping the concept that there
could be other uses for that higher bandwidth.

Nor do you seem capable of grasping the concept that
being able to "burst" data at higher rates than it is generated
at allows more than one station to time-share a channel.

It is really sad at how limited your imagination is ... it
must REALLY SUCK to be stuck in your limited world.
(But I imagine your myopia provides you a degree of
protection in that you can't see far enough beyond your
nose to even begin to realize just how pitifully limited your
world IS.)

Carl - wk3c

2508. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:52:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aad3uf$k8b$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41728

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCA9FB8.8DC35D16@townsqr.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > >
> > > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > > fast can the fastest typist
> > > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > > typists?
> >
> > Because the "smart" thing to do is to prepare the file "off-the-air"
> > and then send it all at once instead of typying in real-time on the air.
>
> Why, of course it is, Bill! Been there and done that hundreds of times,
in a
> professional setting. But hey, this is amateur radio, and we're hams, and
most
> of us with experience know that the best laid plans are likely to see all
that
> snazzy hi-data rate gear stored somewhere where we happen to NOT be when
the
> ship hits the sand.

The key word is "preparation." Either you do it, or not.

> Thus, if I happen to have a little key in my pocket, and
> there is a HF rig available, and perchance an operator on the other end
> similarly qualified, guess what- We can communicate! *Without* a 56k
circuit!
>
> Amazing, isn't it?

It's amazing that you think preparation doesn't cover 99.9% of the
incidents. What you want/expect is for EVERY HF ham to
learn a mode just in case YOU happen to be unprepared to
the point that you need to communicate but have no other
means but morse.

IF you and others want to voluntarily maintain a morse
knowledge then just do it. What I oppose is your demand
that ALL hams must take that same path...just to be a ham on HF.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2509. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:53:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <0poy8.358$wU2.59047078@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41727

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426224930.06141.00000163@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <20020425064916.06846.00005554@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >Do you think that Cross even knows what Carl says on
> >rec.radio.amateur.policy?
>
> I have never met either Mr. Cross or Mr. Stevenson.
>
> I have read much of what Mr. Stevenson has written here over the past 5
years.
>
> I don't think Mr. Stevenson would behave the same way in an exparte or
other
> official communication with the FCC as he has sometimes behaved here.

Would you demand to know Mr. Cross' last Novice contact?

> I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
>
> Just some observations.

You've observed Mr. Cross not reading rec.radio.amateur.policy?

2510. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 02:58:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Stoy8.359$EX2.59243654@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41729

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020426223349.01774.00002111@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <hgly8.226$uX7.13597042@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >You're no help at all. Why do you think the majority of manually sent
code
> >is cleaned up with a keyer?
>
> Brian:
>
> Funny you should ask. I basically learned how to send CW by using
> an Iambic keyer. I practiced off-the-air with it extensively, and as a
> result, have trained my ear to produce perfectly formed CW characters
> even when using my trusty old WWII-vintage Lionel J-38 straight key.

Ed, is it possible for Larry to produce -perfectly- formed Morse characters
with a WWII vintage Lionel J-38 straight key?

Please put his signal on a recording scope and examine it.

> I love to "send" to my TNC and watch the characters form perfectly
> on my computer screen! I just wish more of my fellow CW operators
> used keyers on-the-air.

Why? If you can produce perfect Morse with a clunky J-38, they should be
able to do so as well.

2511. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:02:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2xoy8.364$5J2.58347717@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41730

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020426223349.01774.00002112@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <3CC9B831.AEA6D1D7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> Where in Bob's remarks did you find any of that nonsense? Or mine
either,
> >for
> >> that matter.
> >
> >"It is a control and an ego issue."
>
> Cecil:
>
> Incorrect. It is/was "a control and an ego issue" only to the
weak-minded,
> impatient, lazy whiners who were/are too lazy to learn and be tested on
> a practical communications skill at a useful proficiency level.

You make Cecil's point. Thanks, I knew we could count on you.

2512. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:04:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca1523_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41731

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE84AC0.C3F10C09@townsqr.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > >typists?
> >
> > A picture is worth a thousand words...
>
> Since when do you need a 56k circuit for a picture? You
> don't, unless for some strange reason you demand Internet
> download speeds.

Most people do ... why SHOULD we sit around waiting
for a picture to Slowwwwwly appear when technology is
available to make it snap onto the screen NOW?

But I guess that your viewpoint shouldn't surprise me,
since you seem to prefer doing things the slowest, hardest
way possible ... my preference is to work smart, not hard,
you seem to prefer the opposite way ... one could possibly
infer from that that you're strong, but dumb??? :-)

> Seems to me like dedication of resources
> far beyond any rational need, at least in this era.
> If the goal is to duplicate the Internet that becomes a
> different matter. As well as a huge limitation on usage of
> those resources. I can't imagine a ham radio that would
> allow all users of our spectrum to have the communications
> capability of the Internet on ham radio. I don't think
> that's technically feasable.

See ... you can't even begin to conceive of what's possible.

That's your fundamental problem, Dick ... you can't conceive
of what's possible with today's technology (your inability to
grasp the value of a 56k circuit ...), let alone what will be
possible in the near future with a little applied creativity
(hint ... we're doing 54 Megabits/second in channels spaced
20 MHz on centers NOW ... yes, up in the higher UHF bands
where more spectrum is available, not at HF ... but it IS well
within the reach of hams and we could also do much better on
HF than what's common now ..)

Carl - wk3c

2513. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:05:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Tzoy8.366$H_2.59404648@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41732

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020426223350.01774.00002113@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <3CC9893D.256489AB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >> Nope. You -to a T. That is, after Kim.
>
> Kim who?
>
> >It is not I who draws my self esteem from my Morse code ability. It is
not
> >I who wants to force my favorite mode requirement upon all HF hams.
>
> Cecil:
>
> For whom is Morse code their "favorite" mode? It certainly isn't mine.

Good grief.

2514. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:13:36 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca1763_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41733

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE7AC57.254086EC@townsqr.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > If we find ourselves sharing more and more of our bands with more and
more
> > users, spectrally efficient modes that operate well in the presence of
noise
> > will become very important to us. And even if there is no one else on
the
> > band, being able to hear and use signals that are deeper into thermal
noise
> > would be an improvement.
>
> I certainly have no argument with any of that and have repeatedly said as
much. Why
> do you join Carl in insisting I do?

WHEN have you said anything like that, Dick? You're the one who's
always saying, in effect, "Don't need any improvements in technology."

Just today, you claimed that it was "unnecessary and irrational" to
prefer a 56k circuit for receiving a picture, compared to something
else (which you implied would be much slower).

> > Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted your
> > attitude in 1914, it would not exist today.
>
> Nonsense! The early days of radio desperately needed all the technical
improvement
> they could get and they did get it. Today is a different situation
entirely, and
> surely you know that.

What? In the early days we needed technical improvement, but today is a
different situation entirely????? Do you even REALIZE what you just said?

Carl - wk3c

2515. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:23:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca19ae$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41734

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3AE8573A.B4BE5867@townsqr.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >
> > >There hasn't been a new HF mode developed or adopted in ham radio yet
> > >which needed any setaside spectrum space to "flourish", every one of
> > >'em has sucessfully duked it out with modes which were already in use
> > >in the same space going back to AM, then ssb, and more recently PSK31.
> >
> > If you give a listen to the commercial bands around our bands, you will
hear
> > all sorts of signals that are not permitted on our bands under the
current
> > rules. The limitations on modulation modes and data rates preclude the
> > development of new HF modes in ham radio that could "flourish" in a
setaside
> > spectrum place.
>
> And it is curious indeed that current and former FCC officials would urge
us to
> do that which rules at best make difficult, to adopt the modern modes and
> modulations that we are at least hampered, or at worst prevented from
using on
> our bands. Why wouldn't one wonder what is going on?

Dick apparently subscribes to the "The FCC is setting us up to fail,
so that they can auction our bands off to commercial interests."
conspiracy theory. The funny part is that the other part of that theory
is that those of us who want to eliminate Morse testing and modernize
ham radio rules to permit, encourage, and promote more modern
technologies are somehow "co-conspirators" in this fantasy conspiracy.

ROTFLMAO!

Carl - wk3c

2516. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:27:41 UTC
From: "Stephen C. Robbins" <srobbinsNOSPAMDUDES@netacc.net>
Message-ID: <3cca1a89$1@news.netacc.net>
Source record: 41735

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3CC9EE1D.702382ED@adelphia.net...
> Mysterian wrote:
>
> > Jesus moves in mysterious ways.
>
> But what does he think about the CW testing requirement?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I am CERTAIN that Jesus is all for CW testing and feels that 21 wpm should
be the requirement to cross through the pearly gates :-)

Steve

2517. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:28:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aad6b1$4dt$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41739

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
(Dennis
> Ferguson) writes:
>
> >It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
> >used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
> >OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
> >are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
> >International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
> >is 0 encoding.
> >
> Interesting.
>
> It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of commercial
fixed
> point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or other radiated-RF means
> today. And the percentage is dropping.

I'd be surprised if it was even 10% at all.

> The real communications revolution of the past 20 years has been fiber
optics.
> Both the internet and lowcost long distance telephones are largely made
> possible by the fiber revolution. Fiber optics offer enormous bandwidth,

1.6T (i.e. 1.6 Terrabits/sec capacity for a single fibre is available today)

> low time delay,

The time delay for fibre (i.e. speed of light in the fibre)
isn't any better (actually its worse) than RF in space or cable.
The advantage of less delay is only in comparison to
satellite connections which include 50,000 miles of space propogation vs
perhaps only 10,000 miles of terrestial connectivity.

> high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune to RFI,
> EMI and EMP. Fibers can be installed anywhere copper cables can go - on
poles,
> underground, and under the sea. Terrestrial microwave and satellites
simply
> cannot compete except in special situations.
>
> From a historical point of view, we have come full circle.
>

> The first telecom revolution was the widespread acceptance of the electric
> telegraph about 150 years ago. Before then, almost all information
travelled
> only as fast as transportation could carry a messenger or a letter.
> Communications facilities available to President Andrew Jackson had more
in
> common with those available to Julius Casear than they did with those
available
> to President Abraham Lincoln.
>
> The telegraph conquered most of the land area in Western developed
countries,
> then proceeded to cross the oceans. Radio was hampered in its early
development
> because it was at first considered merely a telegraph system without
wires. It
> took years to get the term "radio" accepted universally instead of
"wireless
> telegraphy" or simply "wireless".
>
> Yet everything old is new again. Fiber optics has more in common with the
> telegraph than with radio. Many fibers follow railroad rights-of-way, just
as
> the telegraph did. As Dennis points out, the signaling method used on the
> fibers is on-off keying.
>
> And the companies selling us new radio technology call it "wireless" as if
it's
> a new term.

Wireless is relatively new to the current "end user" of the service. We
have
actually flipped the use of RF vs hard wiring (fibre). In the past,
wireless (radio) was depended on for long distance and everything local was
wired. Today, wireless is a huge growth area with the "wireless" involving
the connection from user (i.e. cellphone) to a base unit and
the rest of the connectivity is then all "hard wired" via fibre.

> --
> Doing techno-prediction is a risky game, but if current trends continue,
RF's
> communications role will change drastically in the years to come. Cheap
and
> universal fiber communication will replace RF in all but mobile/portable
> applications and specialties like the military, hams and the developing
world.
>
> Just my opinion.
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim,

Good overview. I injected a couple of things above for clarity.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2518. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:30:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca1b5d_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41737

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:tajy8.6950$iU4.578062@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Finally, I know fairly simple APC algorithms work okay at VHF and above
> > where the channels have relatively benign characteristics, but at HF
> > where the channels are awful, propagation can change quickly, data rates
> > are low and communication turn-around times are long, it may be that
> > finding APC algorithms that work stably and well is itself a development
> > project waiting to be done. I don't think it would be good to burden
> > all higher-power applications with the requirement to do this
development
> > work in addition to everything else necessary to do something new.
> >
>
> Dennis,
>
> I think you have just made the case why APC _* should*_ be part of these
> "pioneer" bands. You have identified a problem which begs for some
> tinkering and experimenting. Who better than us to take that bull by the
> horns?
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

I agree with Hans ... this is an area where hams could potentially
truly contribute to the state of the art ...

Carl - wk3c

2519. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:32:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca1bd8_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41738

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:ubly8.7549$8p3.608332@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote
>
> >
> > I thought we were working on our recovery from the decades-
> > long GOOD IDEA that amateur radio operators _* should*_
> > be proficient in Morse code operation and that proficiency
> > _* should*_ be incorporated into FCC regs and ITU treaties.
> >
>
> The amateur bands exist because it is considered in the public interest
for
> several reasons. None of those reasons have anything to do with having a
> place for 60-year-old geezers to yak about their lumbago. I think it is
> time for the Commission to turn up the wick on the hams promise to
"advance
> the art".
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Right on Hans! Take the geezers and hold their feet to the fire :-)

I'm up to the challenge ... too bad Dick and so many others can't
see the value in it.

Carl - wk3c

2520. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:33:01 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ko6kcuo5esvft2id2219vpgh2tm3kls0fg@4ax.com>
Source record: 41736

On Sat, 27 Apr 2002 01:12:40 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>
>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:ugshcukhqjr4cs0mo9roq4757e4bnupi3q@4ax.com...
>
>> Just look at it as a lesson in role reversal.
>
>Bob, thanks for the does of reality. Brian
>

You're welcome. It's an everyday thing on VHF-FM. What's sad is that
I wrote all of that and it was immediately misinterpreted even after I
listed numerous examples.

Oh well...I tried.

2521. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:33:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aad6b1$4dt$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41740

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:0poy8.358$wU2.59047078@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020426224930.06141.00000163@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <20020425064916.06846.00005554@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI)
> > writes:
> >
> > >Do you think that Cross even knows what Carl says on
> > >rec.radio.amateur.policy?
> >
> > I have never met either Mr. Cross or Mr. Stevenson.
> >
> > I have read much of what Mr. Stevenson has written here over the past 5
> years.
> >
> > I don't think Mr. Stevenson would behave the same way in an exparte or
> other
> > official communication with the FCC as he has sometimes behaved here.
>
> Would you demand to know Mr. Cross' last Novice contact?
>
> > I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
> >
> > Just some observations.
>
> You've observed Mr. Cross not reading rec.radio.amateur.policy?

Even if Mr. Cross did read RRAP, as an FCC staffer, do you
think he (Mr. Cross) would be "intimidated" by anyone because
of what that "anyone" may have written in RRAP?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2522. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:37:05 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <B1py8.53013$QC1.3814391@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41741

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
(Dennis
> Ferguson) writes:
>
> >It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
> >used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
> >OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
> >are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
> >International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
> >is 0 encoding.
> >
> Interesting.
>
> It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of
commercial fixed
> point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or other radiated-RF means
> today. And the percentage is dropping.
>
> The real communications revolution of the past 20 years has been fiber
optics.
> Both the internet and lowcost long distance telephones are largely made
> possible by the fiber revolution. Fiber optics offer enormous bandwidth,
low
> time delay, high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune
to RFI,
> EMI and EMP. Fibers can be installed anywhere copper cables can go - on
poles,
> underground, and under the sea. Terrestrial microwave and satellites
simply
> cannot compete except in special situations.
>
> From a historical point of view, we have come full circle.
>
> The first telecom revolution was the widespread acceptance of the
electric
> telegraph about 150 years ago. Before then, almost all information
travelled
> only as fast as transportation could carry a messenger or a letter.
> Communications facilities available to President Andrew Jackson had more
in
> common with those available to Julius Casear than they did with those
available

> to President Abraham Lincoln.
>
> The telegraph conquered most of the land area in Western developed
countries,
> then proceeded to cross the oceans. Radio was hampered in its early
development
> because it was at first considered merely a telegraph system without wir
es. It
> took years to get the term "radio" accepted universally instead of
"wireless
> telegraphy" or simply "wireless".
>
> Yet everything old is new again. Fiber optics has more in common with
the
> telegraph than with radio. Many fibers follow railroad rights-of-way,
just as
> the telegraph did. As Dennis points out, the signaling method used on
the
> fibers is on-off keying.
>
> And the companies selling us new radio technology call it "wireless" as
if it's
> a new term.
>
> --
>
> Doing techno-prediction is a risky game, but if current trends continue,
RF's
> communications role will change drastically in the years to come. Cheap
and
> universal fiber communication will replace RF in all but mobile/portable
> applications and specialties like the military, hams and the developing
world.
>
> Just my opinion.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

And a good one it be. In fact fiber development parallels telegraphy development so closely as to be almost eerie; same basic engineering problems, power, repeaters, multiple channels. You are, of course, aware that Sprint was Southern Pacific Railroad INTernal communications before bypassing the telco was legal. St. Louis in my years there was the end of Sprint and the beginning of MCI which was originally STL to Chi so we were the only place to be able to call coast to coast without Ma Bell. How things have changed.

2523. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:38:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca1d28_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41742

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020424220651.26511.00000482@mb-fy.aol.com...
>
> I'm beginning to think the power limit thing should just be dropped. Allow
full
> power on all the subbands after reallocation to the experimental farm.

Jim, NO, PLEASE ... anything worth developing won't require 1500 W pep.
Give the "brute force" boys an inch and they'll use both of them ... we want
and need to concentrate on "elegant" not "brute force."

Carl - wk3c

2524. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:40:59 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <f5py8.8031$8p3.667216@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41743

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote

>
> Right on Hans! Take the geezers and hold their feet to the fire :-)
>

Actually, you overstate my case, Carl. I've no problem with geezers and lumbago nets. I'll be a geezer someday and CKB will have no recreational use for me.

Rather than hold the geezers "feet to the fire", all I'm asking for is a small "park" free of geezers, so the pioneers can "exuberantly play radio in the ether" to steal a quote from K1ZZ.

73, Hans, K0HB

2525. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:41:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCA1E02.FF4F8E85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41744

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I basically learned how to send CW by using
> an Iambic keyer. I practiced off-the-air with it extensively, and as a
> result, have trained my ear to produce perfectly formed CW characters
> even when using my trusty old WWII-vintage Lionel J-38 straight key.

You really expect us to believe that you send "perfect" CW, Larry?
Your dashes are *exactly* three dots long?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2526. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:50:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCA200A.2F6A6FE8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41745

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >"It is a control and an ego issue."
>
> Incorrect. It is/was "a control and an ego issue" only to the weak-minded,
> impatient, lazy whiners who were/are too lazy to learn and be tested on
> a practical communications skill at a useful proficiency level. To the rest
> of us, it was a matter of supporting the concept of retaining the requirement
> in order to retain the basic, essential communications capability that
> amateurs can exploit when they know how to employ the Morse/CW mode.

Larry, it is abundantly apparent that the basic problem was equating Morse code skill with knowledge of electronics. It is abundantly apparent that they are not equal and attempting to equate them was a gross perversion from which the ARS may never recover.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2527. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:52:46 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <igpy8.8044$8p3.636278@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41746

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
> You really expect us to believe that you send "perfect" CW, Larry?
> Your dashes are *exactly* three dots long?
>

Of course! In accordance with the N0iMD directive for only precise sterile Morse -- no personality allowed. A good Republican wouldn't deviate from standards, doncha know?!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2528. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:56:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCA2178.AAB84BA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41747

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> With my
> marginal 20 WPM (average) CW ability, it will be no problem for
> me to maintain my "self esteem" among future hams. However,
> without a requirement to learn and be tested in Morse/CW at a
> useful proficiency level, the future hams will have no way to develop
> any self-esteem of their own, when all they are doing, for the most
> part, is shouting each other down on the HF phone bands.

Egads Larry, do you believe that Albert Einstein had no self esteem
because he didn't know Morse code? Do you believe that George Bush
has no self esteem because he doesn't know Morse code? When are you
going to wake up to the real world? Ham radio is a minor part of
any mentally healthy person's life and Morse code is a minor part
of ham radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2529. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 03:59:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca2230_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41748

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020425080646.26511.00000496@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <iiKx8.11802$fu7.328902134@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >Who the
>
> [expletive deleted]
>
> >wants an instant upgrade?
>
> All the pre-1987 Tech Pluses who got Generals after restructuring, for
one.

You mean us guys who passed the same written test as Generals
but didn't get privs because we only copied 5 wpm and not 13?

There was no "freebie" in granting Generals to "old techs" once
the code requirement dropped to 5 wpm ...

NCI and the NCVECs both told the FCC "No freebies",
it was the ARRL who wanted to give freebies (presumably
to make some folks feel grateful in hopes they'd sent in their
subscription, er membership, $$$)

> >Just stop the divisions and segregation in the band.
>
> Which means what? No more subbands by license class? No more subbands by
mode?

I could live without subbands by license class ... that is the norm
in most of the world and doesn't seem to really cause any demonstrable
problems.

While most of the world seems to do just fine without subband by mode
restrictions, I'm not so sure that we Americans are ready for that. Just
listening to the behavior that I hear from so many on the phone bands
(and I mean people who passed fast code tests, not some new thing
that's happened since the test was dropped to 5 wpm), I don't really
want to see that "Ugly American" phenomenon spread to the entirety
of the bands at the expense of all of the other modes and the digital
techniques that are our future.

> >Instead you now have a dead license class because of a dead idea.

Reducing the number of license classes need not result in a wake ...
we didn't NEED 6 classes of license in the first place ... the loss

of Tech+ is no cause for mourning ... those folks still have the
same privs (or have already upraded) ... that there will be no more
Novices or Advanceds issues is not a loss either ...

> >> The 200 W power limit has to do with written testing.
> >
> >Really? Correct me if I'm wrong (and you will), but weren't the old,
> >bonifide Extras limited in power in some of those segments?
>
> All US hams were limited in power in those subbands to provide a "level
playing
> field". It was not always that way. Dumb rule, actually.

Actually, the rule was put there to keep higher class lids from
simply stomping the novices into the dust with their CA kilowatts
and making the band essentially unusable for novices.

And, since high power isn't really NECESSARY, it's not a bad idea
in that sense either ... I frankly wouldn't care if they dropped the power
limit for ALL of our bands to 100-250 Watts ... as I've said before, there's
much more to be gained with better modulation and coding schemes and
better antennas than with the 10 dB or so difference from the typical
"barefoot" HF rig and the legal limit ...

Carl - wk3c

2530. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 04:06:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427000658.27399.00000927@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41750

In article <3cca0f50_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020426000707.13101.00001028@mb-ct.aol.com...

>> Another point of the "experimental farm" idea is that the widening of the
>> 'phone bands is not a good idea, IMO.
>
>Agreed ... the phone bands would be OK of folks acted more civily.

One of the reasons I operate almost all CW.
>
>Last weekend I tried to work the SETI League QSO party, just
>for fun and to talk to other folks interested in SETI.

Kewl.
>
>Started calling "CQ SETI" at the start of the 24 hour window
>on 14.204 (1% of the H line freq) ... and worked a few
>stations over the course of about a half an hour.

Using USB, I presume...

>All of a sudden
>some inconsiderate LIDs in/around the Orlando, FL area came
>up 40 db over S9, 700 Hz above me at 14.204.7 ... and start
>shooting the breeze. No "Is the frequency in use?" or nothing.
>
>I politely said "The frequency is in use." and signed my call
>a couple of times and they simply ignored me ...
>
>The LIDs were W4RHE, KF4IC, and K1RON ...

I don;t know any of them. Must not be CW ops.
>
>Now I would give them the benefit of the doubt that
>they might not have been able to hear me, but they were
>all 30-40 dB over S9 and while I'm not running legal limt
>and a beam, my station is not THAT bad, either ... there
>is no doubt in my mind that they could hear me and simply
>didn't give a damn.

Lessee, if you're running 100 W and a vertical and they have 1500 W and 20 db
of effective antenna gain (!!) you might be 35-40 dB below them - max. So you
would be S9 there, worst-case.

However, consider this:

If they were 40 over to you, they might be 60 or more dB over to each other. With slow AGC they might not hear an S9 signal.

But that doesn't excuse not listening first, nor doing the "frequency in use?" thing. Nor the fact they could have dropped power 20 dB and been blowing each other's rigs off the desk.

More reasons I'm mostly on CW. A simple "didit...dit" and anybody on frequency will pipe up.

>To make them even bigger lids, they were talking more or less
>"local" on 20m and obviously using very high power (bragging
>about their amps and big towers/beams) ...

That's the biggest lidism, right there - use of the wrong band for the purpose. What time of day was this?

>these guys could
>use an APC requirement.

Nah. Just some common sense. Technology alone won't cure bad habits.

I don't encounter that sort of problem on 14.020.4

73 de Jim, N2EY

2531. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 04:06:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427000659.27399.00000928@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 41749

In article <3cca0331_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020424220652.26511.00000484@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <3cc6d4e7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3c@fast.net>
>> writes:
>>> So a single interfering carrier 20 dB above the desired signal wipes out
>the
>> desired signal.
>
>Not necesssarily ... there are ways to deal with such things.

Like I wrote - adjust the phasing control on the crystal filter to put the
notch on the interfering carrier...
>
>However, since a CW carrier is the "best" jammer, that could
>be one of the reasons Hans suggested that CW not be allowed
>there ...

Nope.

Hans originally wanted NO existing modes on the "reservation". He wanted it to
be for new/experimental work only. Purity of mode essence and such.

>(Note: I am still NOT advocating a restriction, in the rules, on CW)

Understood.
>
>> But in that same 25 kHz bandwidth, at least fifty 12 wpm CW/Morse signals
>could
>> coexist with no significant interference, even is some were 20 dB above
>others
>> (and decent receiver selectivity was used).
>
>And VFO (synthesizer) phase noise was REALLY good, etc., etc.

Phase noise of '50s era VFOs is plenty good enough.
>
>And, using the digital systems proposed in strawman form independently
>by Gary Coffman and myself more than 2 years ago, hundreds of digital
>signals at 20 wpm Morse equivalent transfer rates could coexist there ...

Proposed but not implemented.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2532. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 04:09:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCA2474.DD144D88@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41801

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> What? In the early days we needed technical improvement, but today is a
> different situation entirely????? Do you even REALIZE what you just said?

Dick worships Amish Ham Radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2533. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 04:24:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cca27fe_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41802

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020426204551.21592.00000879@mb-fa.aol.com...

> For FY2000, the ARRL has 17 employees making over $50,000
> per year (Jon Bloom reported as getting just a bit over $70,000).
> Booth, Freret, Imlay billed the ARRL for $105,122 worth of legal
> thingies and $60,060 was billed from Chwat & Co. for lobbying
> the gubmint.

With some of the lame things they're asking those guys to do
(some, but not all ...), it's probably a good thing they didn't
get $165k worth of results.

> Executive VP Dave Sumner is shown as receiving
> $124,875.20 in compensation plus $6,610.97 in employee
> benefit contributions and an expense account of almost $7K.
> [your membership dollars at work]

Damn ... thanks for telling me that, Len ... I'm going to have
to ask for a raise ... Dave's making almost as much as I do ...
but then again, he doesn't get stock options :-)

However, I find $7k unbelievable for Dave's expenses ...
considering he spent time in Istanbul for WRC-2000
(If I recall he came home for Dayton or something in
the middle of the WRC, then went back ...)

Thus, I can't believe $7k ... my last expense report (a few
trips to Washington last month and business class
airfare r/t to Sydney, Australia for the IEEE 802
meeting) was over $10k and that's just one ... I file
about one report a month so that AMEX gets paid often
enough to keep them happy ...

Now, to write myself a note about that raise ...

Carl - wk3c

2534. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 04:48:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427004847.04302.00001027@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 41805

In article <20020426215536.01774.00002110@mb-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I totally agree. I think that the FCC rules should be changed to require
>mode-specific activity logs from each licensed amateur radio station,
>and that they should reflect at least one half of the total activity being
>in some mode other than AM/FM/SSB voice. Any digital mode or
>CW would suffice. It is a known fact that amateurs who are actively
>involved in modes other than voice modes are more likely to be
>technically involved radio amateurs.

Yes, Larrie, you tellum Macro Boy.

We all know you hate voice with a passion.

We all know you are one of the best 1930s radio amateurs to
exist in the year 2002...except you seem to be a total technical
moron on how anything but on-off keying works.

Now go hock another loogie in your splatoo duties while
specializing your paratransit.

2535. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 04:48:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427004850.04302.00001028@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 41806

In article <20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis
>Ferguson) writes:
>
>>It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
>>used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
>>OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
>>are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
>>International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
>>is 0 encoding.
>>
>Interesting.
>
>It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of commercial
>fixed point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or other radiated-RF means
>today. And the percentage is dropping.

...and your source for this?

>The real communications revolution of the past 20 years has been fiber optics.
>Both the internet and lowcost long distance telephones are largely made
>possible by the fiber revolution. Fiber optics offer enormous bandwidth, low
>time delay, high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune to
>RFI, EMI and EMP. Fibers can be installed anywhere copper cables can go - on
>poles, underground, and under the sea. Terrestrial microwave and satellites
simply
>cannot compete except in special situations.

Some points not considered -

While the fiber itself is immune to known radiation threats, the
terminus of the fiber is NOT immune. There terminals of the
fiber circuit link are electronic and therefore require RFI, EMI,
EMP shielding (as needed). While military electronics is
designed to withstand EMP, very little of commercial terminal
electronics is so designed.

Optical fiber cables are as susceptible to physical damage in
their cable lay as copper-conductor cables.

"Optical pumping" of certain optical fiber material eliminates the
need for amplifiers to bring the normally-quite-lossy (by comparison
to copper) signal levels up above the noise. That is a distinct
advantage over copper-conductor circuits.

You CANNOT take advantage of long optical fiber circuits without
being able to digitize the signal to be sent. That means digital
electronics, high-speed A/D and D/A multiplexers, something
totally foreign to the analog-only OOK CW ham.

The typical throughput on the UK-through-Med-around-India-
around-SE Asia to Japan undersea optical fiber cable is 4 GBPS
in two circuits. That bit rate alone is twice as high as highest-
band ready-built off-the-shelf ham equipment.

>From a historical point of view, we have come full circle.

From already-known history of communications, you are going
around in circles. Some points -

>The first telecom revolution was the widespread acceptance of the electric
>telegraph about 150 years ago. Before then, almost all information travelled
>only as fast as transportation could carry a messenger or a letter.

No. OPTICAL semaphore systems were already in use in
Europe and the UK for about two centuries before. That was
on land. Various forms of flag and torch (night) were in use
ship-to-ship.

>Communications facilities available to President Andrew Jackson had more in
>common with those available to Julius Casear than they did with those
>available to President Abraham Lincoln.

Neither Julius Caesar nor Orange Julius was president of the
USA. Please try to confine your analogues to some common
geography.

>The telegraph conquered most of the land area in Western developed countries,
>then proceeded to cross the oceans. Radio was hampered in its early
>development because it was at first considered merely a telegraph system
>without wires.

Early radio WAS nothing more than "a telegraph system without
wires."

Early radio could ONLY communicate by on-off coding schemes.
Radio needed the vacuum tube to communicate an analog signal
that was not on-off.

The very early Fessenden "AM" experiment was with a rotary
VLF generator using a water-cooled microphone.

AM and even SSB were actually pioneered ON wire circuits.

>It took years to get the term "radio" accepted universally instead of
"wireless
>telegraphy" or simply "wireless".

Don't quibble over certain words which are geographic and
ethnocentric.

The first accepted radio communication occurred in 1896. The first US radio regulatory agency was created in 1912. That's a span of only 16 years for "acceptance." From essentially nothing to having a government agency regulating it is a quite rapid "acceptance."

>Yet everything old is new again. Fiber optics has more in common with the >telegraph than with radio.

Ignorant nonsense. At 4 GBPS bit rate, MANY THOUSANDS of separate communication circuits can coexist without interference. That includes ANY mode desired...simple POTS to already-time-multiplexed whatevers to video channels. Whatever mix is desired. No problem. The "telegraph" couldn't possibly come close to such throughput.

>Many fibers follow railroad rights-of-way, just as the telegraph did.

Sorry, wrong again. The optical fiber cable runs have the same physical characteristics as copper-conductor cable runs. MOST cable runs are underground or under water. Both types, optical or copper. In addition, both types can be elevated on poles or use terminal equipment to transfer signals to RF/microwave links for economically-infeasible geographic obstacles.

The old telegraph lines couldn't possibly be installed with as much physical versatility as optical fiber cable circuits.

>As Dennis points out, the signaling method used on the >fibers is on-off keying.

That was a slightly-sarcastic commentary on OOK.

Let's look at the circuit throughput at 4 GBPS on a single optical fiber run. Assume, for worst-case conditions, 20 bits for an analogue of any signal being sampled (that includes framing and synchronization). That allows a Nyquist-sample maximum of 200 MHz for the full bandwidth. That full bandwidth can be time-multiplexing of up to 30 video channels or 50 thousand POTS (Plain Old Telephone System) circuits.

The throughput of a modern optical fiber cable circuit is so much faster than plain old (very old) telegraphy that it shouldn't even be done by any thinking communicator-engineer.

>And the companies selling us new radio technology call it "wireless" as if >it's a new term.

It is, but you are just quibbling on old-fashioned word use. The present-day electronic industry use of WIRELESS is an outgrowth of applying short-range radio links to LANs (Local Area Networks). That resulted in the WLAN or Wireless Local Area Network. That also required some regulated EM spectrum allocation which, in turn, allowed such things as digital cordless telephones, and a great many different control and measuring appliances. The

"bluetooth" short-range radio control/measure/linkage system is a good example of modern electronics that is in the broad industry category of "wireless." There are three other "wireless" linkage standards vying for acceptance.

>Doing techno-prediction is a risky game, but if current trends continue, RF's
>communications role will change drastically in the years to come.

Why are you so behind the times?!?

ALREADY, at the end of last year, one in four US citizens was a subscriber to a cellular telephone. Hello? A cellphone is a little two-way radio that is tied into the telephone system. Is 80 MILLION cellphone subscriptions enough to indicate any revolution in personal communications?!? There are OVER 300 million cellphone subscribers in the world NOW.

The only "limitation" on geosynchronous communications satellites is the "space parking lot" is already, repeat ALREADY, full. In North America, there are no less than 56 commsats in geo-sync orbits visible to the 48 contiguous states, 58 commsats counting Alaska and Hawaii. Have you checked out the circuit capability of those birds? That was as of last summer (and the press run of the neat little Blonder-Tongue CATV reference book).

Have you felt any pulse of the microwave radio industry? I doubt it. It is going full-bore on NON-cellular-phone applications. If you do some cross-country driving you can SEE the dishes. You can also see all the antennas which are NOT amateur, not cellphone, used for all sorts of communications.

> Cheap and
>universal fiber communication will replace RF in all but mobile/portable
>applications and specialties like the military, hams and the developing
>world.
>
>Just my opinion.

Yes, we know. We also know that you aren't any Thomas White as historian of radio. We KNOW that you champion OOK CW on HF...and probably oil those old Greenlee chassis punches every year in hopes of reinventing radio with tubes and things.

Start reading some periodicals besides ham magazines. There's a whole world of RADIO out there that has developed, still developing, and no end in sight for either fiber or radio communications. Look and learn. Some of the techniques may be applicable to amateur radio.

2536. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 04:48:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427004851.04302.00001029@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 41803

In article <7sny8.329$S12.55694698@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >It's so nice of you to tell us that an itinerant portrait painter was
>> >working on "digital electronics" as early as 1840. Thank you.
>>
>> And the problem with that concept is...?!?!
>>
>> Another painter was working on concepts of aviation and astronomics
>in the 1500's. Seems no one has a problem with HIS finidings.
>>
>> Steve
>
>The National Traffic Safety Board would be extremely busy if we still used
>his flying machine.

No problem. The NTSB would stay on the surface. Da Vinci's
"helicopter" had a vertical-axis screw. Wouldn't have created any
lift. Likewise Da Vinci's "ornithopter." :-)

However, I'm still trying to decode "astronomics." :-)

Yon commenter got mixed up between astrology and gastronomics.
He probably got an ulcer from flapping his arms so much in here.
:-)

2537. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 04:48:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427004852.04302.00001030@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 41804

In article <aad3apreg1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020426204552.21592.00000880@mb-fa.aol.com...
>> In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
>(Dennis
>> Ferguson) writes:
>>
>> ><Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> >>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>> OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
>> >>> fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
>> >>>
>> >>> If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
>> >>
>> >>Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
>> >
>> >It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
>> >used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
>> >OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
>> >are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
>> >International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
>> >is 0 encoding.
>
>Yea, and we sent multiple signals at the same time using
>different "colors" (i.e. different optical wavelengths).

Errr...Bill, you were starting off with "my" quote and it was Dennis'
you are quoting. :-)

Present-day use of different optical wavelength is fairly well
limited to only two main spectral lines. One of them is the
"pump" energy that causes the amplification (increase in
optical signal) of the other wavelength. That's a quantum
physics effect that has no electronic analogue. It also means
that very long undersea fiber comm cables do not need any
repeater-amplifiers along the undersea (or underground) run.

So far, the ITU-R limits allocations at about 300 GHz. Anything
above that is free game. 200 THz is quite a bit above the 300
GHz allocation limit. :-)

At 4 GBPS rate, you can have over 30 video channels or 50,000
POTS circuits or any combination thereof (and other types) all
on that single "color" (main spectral line). The main limitation

is not the fiber run but the terminal equipment to sort out all those different signals.

Right now about 120 TV channels and 40 music-voice-only channels are coursing down an ordinary coax cable in my neighborhood over AT&T broadband service. A little "set-top" box does the tuning and decoding. Beautiful S/N, no snow, no noise all channels.

2538. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:23:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427012310.27628.00000813@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 41808

In article <3cca27fe_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020426204551.21592.00000879@mb-fa.aol.com...
>
>> For FY2000, the ARRL has 17 employees making over $50,000
>> per year (Jon Bloom reported as getting just a bit over $70,000).
>> Booth, Freret, Imlay billed the ARRL for $105,122 worth of legal
>> thingies and $60,060 was billed from Chwat & Co. for lobbying
>> the gubmint.
>
>With some of the lame things they're asking those guys to do
>(some, but not all ...), it's probably a good thing they didn't
>get $165k worth of results.
>
>> Executive VP Dave Sumner is shown as receiving
>> $124,875.20 in compensation plus $6,610.97 in employee
>> benefit contributions and an expense account of almost $7K.
>> [your membership dollars at work]
>
>Damn ... thanks for telling me that, Len ... I'm going to have
>to ask for a raise ... Dave's making almost as much as I do ...
>but then again, he doesn't get stock options :-)
>
>However, I find $7k unbelievable for Dave's expenses ...
>considering he spent time in Istanbul for WRC-2000
>(If I recall he came home for Dayton or something in
>the middle of the WRC, then went back ...)
>
>Thus, I can't believe $7k ... my last expense report (a few
>trips to Washington last month and business class
>airfare r/t to Sydney, Australia for the IEEE 802
>meeting) was over $10k and that's just one ... I file
>about one report a month so that AMEX gets paid often
>enough to keep them happy ...
>
>Now, to write myself a note about that raise ...

Carl, I'll lay this one on you. On those tax returns for
FY2000, the preparer was the ARTHUR ANDERSEN
branch office in Hartford.

Can anyone spell "creative accounting?" :-)

Quod erat demonstrandum.

...and then sum.

2539. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:23:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427012311.27628.00000814@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 41809

In article <f5py8.8031$8p3.667216@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Rather than hold the geezers "feet to the fire", all I'm asking for is a
>small "park" free of geezers, so the pioneers can "exuberantly play radio in
>the ether" to steal a quote from K1ZZ.

Oh? The "pioneers" aren't playing radio now? Oh, my!

Geez, here was this 1930s-era Big Brother org and all these
1930s morsemen beeping their little hearts out "on the bands."

Yes, and there is still "experimentation" on the 60m band to
"test it for compatibility" with amateur radio! A half century
after it was already proved beyond reasonable doubt... :-)

Relax, have a little ether...

2540. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:23:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427012312.27628.00000815@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 41807

In article <3cca1d28_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>Jim, NO, PLEASE ... anything worth developing won't require 1500 W pep.
>Give the "brute force" boys an inch and they'll use both of them ...

Give a man an inch and he thinks he's a ruler... :-)

2541. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:32:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE00D2.17FF29E0@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41810

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Where in Bob's remarks did you find any of that nonsense? Or mine either, for
> > that matter.
>
> "It is a control and an ego issue."

Which describes you quite well, despite your attempts to cover it.

2542. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:32:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE04FD.DF285535@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41811

Clay N4AOX wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > And, using the digital systems proposed in strawman form independently
> ^^^^^^^^
> > by Gary Coffman and myself more than 2 years ago, hundreds of digital
> > signals at 20 wpm Morse equivalent transfer rates could coexist there ...
>
> And we are all still looking at the patent office for the
> Coffman system or the Stevenson System. How's the hardware
> development going? ;-)

Yep. Ten years down the road Carl will still be talking digital and working SSB.

2543. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:32:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE063D.D650A13D@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41812

N2EY wrote:

>
> I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy

I wouldn't. He's a FCC employee, but he's also an active ham. Wouldn't surprise me if he wants to keep up on things in many different ways.

2544. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:32:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE0EC0.460C8B16@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41813

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3AE79EEB.F8A91DD0@townsqr.com...
> > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > fast can the fastest typist type? Why do we need 56k circuits fo
> > 60 word per minute typists?
>
> Dick,
>
> Your problem is that your imagination is always bounded
> by the limits of human ability to do thing manually.
>

You dumbshit, you're so full of it your eyes have turned brown! I was cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC SEND AND RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!

You and Cecil are so damn stupid you are SURE that because I believe hams should know how to use radiotelegraphy that's all I ever do or ever did. Hey, when you gonna actually DO something digital??? Ever??? Yep, ten years down the road you'll still be blowing your foghorn Digital but you'll still be yakking on SSB!!! Cheerio!

> at allows more than one station to time-share a channel.
>
> It is really sad at how limited your imagination is ... it
> must REALLY SUCK to be stuck in your limited world.

You'd really know about "Suck" for sure. But you're gonna have to find someone else, sorry.

>
> (But I imagine your myopia provides you a degree of
> protection in that you can't see far enough beyond your
> nose to even begin to realize just how pitifully limited your
> world IS.)
>

Yep, my world is sure a mess. Got a full privilege ham radio license at age 14, the Extra a few years later, been doing it *all* for so long I've forgotten a lot of it. Comes with the territory and longevity. Too bad you can't have some of that experience.

Oh, I should mention that your perfect system works FB in the lab, under controlled conditions where you get to pick what you want. Out in the real world where real-people hams live and don't just play

games they use what they find at hand when the instant need arises. That *might*, today, include a laptop computer to go with the HF rig they were fortunate enough to have in the car or wherever. On the other hand they might be lucky to have as much as a CW key to use. For sure the inventory of assets won't include any of your snazzy NASA or NSA style "burst" toys.

Live with the reality. Not that you'll ever accept it or like it. That's tough.

2545. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:32:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE1166.F7129801@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41814

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3CCA9FB8.8DC35D16@townsqr.com...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > >
> > > > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > > > fast can the fastest typist
> > > > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > > > typists?
> > >
> > > Because the "smart" thing to do is to prepare the file "off-the-air"
> > > and then send it all at once instead of typying in real-time on the air.
> > >
> > Why, of course it is, Bill! Been there and done that hundreds of times,
> in a
> > professional setting. But hey, this is amateur radio, and we're hams, and
> most
> > of us with experience know that the best laid plans are likely to see all
> that
> > snazzy hi-data rate gear stored somewhere where we happen to NOT be when
> the
> > ship hits the sand.
>
> The key word is "preparation." Either you do it, or not.
>

So you either carry a full complement of high tech equipment around with you
everywhere you go, just in case. Right. Remind me to trade my car for a bus or
tractor trailer with a portable tower mounted on the rear. Don't forget the
generator! Gotta stay ready!

>
> > Thus, if I happen to have a little key in my pocket, and
> > there is a HF rig available, and perchance an operator on the other end
> > similarly qualified, guess what- We can communicate! *Without* a 56k
> circuit!
> >
> > Amazing, isn't it?
>
> It's amazing that you think preparation doesn't cover 99.9% of the
> incidents.

So you sit on your butt in New Jersey waiting for whatever to happen, all fat, dumb, happy and "prepared". Gee, Bill, lots of us get around to distant places. I DO most of the time carry a laptop computer with me nowdays, but sometimes even that is a little to much extra. But bottom line I'll have an HF rig, and something to KEY it with. Sorry you won't be able to copy my CW message if and when I need to send it!

2546. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:32:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE15E4.D1FE094C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41815

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3AE84AC0.C3F10C09@townsqr.com...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > >
> > > >Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > > >typists?
> > >
> > > A picture is worth a thousand words...
> >
> > Since when do you need a 56k circuit for a picture? You
> > don't, unless for some strange reason you demand Internet
> > download speeds.
>
> Most people do ... why SHOULD we sit around waiting
> for a picture to Slowwwwwly appear when technology is
> available to make it snap onto the screen NOW?

Hey Dingaling, we're talking HF HAM RADIO, not the internet. Wake
up!

>
>
> But I guess that your viewpoint shouldn't surprise me,
> since you seem to prefer doing things the slowest, hardest
> way possible ... my preference is to work smart, not hard,

Your preference is to be a total ignoramus, again, and again and
again. Sky pie all the way!
There's no way you'll ever get internet quality access on HF ham
radio. Live with it! It's fact.

>
> you seem to prefer the opposite way ... one could possibly
> infer from that that you're strong, but dumb??? :-)

If practical meant anything to you it never shows even a hint.
You're actually dumb enough to think that hams would ever want
internet level data rates at HF. And you do nothing on HF but yak
on SSB! Fantastic!

> > Seems to me like dedication of resources
> > far beyond any rational need, at least in this era.

> > If the goal is to duplicate the Internet that becomes a
> > different matter. As well as a huge limitation on usage of
> > those resources. I can't imagine a ham radio that would
> > allow all users of our spectrum to have the communications
> > capability of the Internet on ham radio. I don't think
> > that's technically feasable.
>
> See ... you can't even begin to conceive of what's possible.
>

Show us where you can get 56k data rates within any reasonable bandwidth on HF, much less within any rule the FCC might even feasibly write. You can't do it. You're full of hot air and SSB.

>
> That's your fundamental problem, Dick ... you can't conceive
> of what's possible with today's technology (your inability to
> grasp the value of a 56k circuit ...)

I'll say it again- a 56K circuit on any ham band is of very limited value under any conceivable circumstance. We can do all we will ever need to do with much less involvement.

You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward" nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere, just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended widespread interest in the mode.

You don't show common sense enough to know that even on the internet the 56k circuits aren't al lthat fast, and it isn't the fault of the 56k hardware either. So you'll make that fly on HF radio? Not a chance. You're a wildeyed dreamer.

2547. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:32:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE1959.679C2719@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41816

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3AE7AC57.254086EC@townsqr.com...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > If we find ourselves sharing more and more of our bands with more and
> more
> > > users, spectrally efficient modes that operate well in the presence of
> noise
> > > will become very important to us. And even if there is no one else on
> the
> > > band, being able to hear and use signals that are deeper into thermal
> noise
> > > would be an improvement.
> >
> > I certainly have no argument with any of that and have repeatedly said as
> much. Why
> > do you join Carl in insisting I do?
>
> WHEN have you said anything like that, Dick? You're the one who's
> always saying, in effect, "Don't need any improvements in technology."
>

Well Buddy, I hate to bust your bubble but we DON'T "need" them! But you do
only SSB on ham radio, so you already know that!
Would we adopt some of them, and use them? Probably, after they passed muster,
the test of hams using them and finding them to be useful and attractive
additions to their activities.
Don't look now, but the landscape is littered with discarded "better ideas".
And if you think any significant numbers of hams are going to jump on the
bandwagon on the strength of your pronouncements, you better reconsider.

>
> Just today, you claimed that it was "unnecessary and irrational" to
> prefer a 56k circuit for receiving a picture, compared to something
> else (which you implied would be much slower).
>

Of course the context was HAM RADIO, and HF in particular. But you already know
that.

>
> > > Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted your
> > > attitude in 1914, it would not exist today.
> >

> > Nonsense! The early days of radio desperately needed all the technical
> improvement
> > they could get and they did get it. Today is a different situation
> entirely, and
> > surely you know that.
>
> What? In the early days we needed technical improvement, but today is a
> different situation entirely????? Do you even REALIZE what you just said?

OF COURSE I realize what I said!!! And it is 100% accurate!!!
I should have realized it would be asking far too much of you to expect you to know any history of radio.

2548. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 05:32:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE1AF8.7652F414@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41817

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3AE8573A.B4BE5867@townsqr.com...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> > >
> > > >There hasn't been a new HF mode developed or adopted in ham radio yet
> > > >which needed any setaside spectrum space to "flourish", every one of
> > > >'em has sucessfully duked it out with modes which were already in use
> > > >in the same space going back to AM, then ssb, and more recently PSK31.
> > >
> > > If you give a listen to the commercial bands around our bands, you will
> hear
> > > all sorts of signals that are not permitted on our bands under the
> current
> > > rules. The limitations on modulation modes and data rates preclude the
> > > development of new HF modes in ham radio that could "flourish" in a
> setaside
> > > spectrum place.
> >
> > And it is curious indeed that current and former FCC officials would urge
> us to
> > do that which rules at best make difficult, to adopt the modern modes and
> > modulations that we are at least hampered, or at worst prevented from
> using on
> > our bands. Why wouldn't one wonder what is going on?
>
> Dick apparently subscribes to the "The FCC is setting us up to fail,
> so that they can auction our bands off to commercial interests."
> conspiracy theory.

No conspiracy of any sort is -or ever was- needed nor necessary. Just read a bit of history on the allocations of frequency spectrum since the early days of radio. The trend is clear, and actually for anyone well versed in the radio industry there is really no doubt about it. What happened to you? Did you have a little deficiency in that area as well?

> The funny part is that the other part of that theory
> is that those of us who want to eliminate Morse testing and modernize
> ham radio rules to permit, encourage, and promote more modern
> technologies are somehow "co-conspirators" in this fantasy conspiracy.
>

You deny that NCI is a conspiracy?

>
> ROTFLMAO!
>

Since you're all ass it'll take a while.

2549. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:00:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE7652.4524AFE7@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41818

K0HB wrote:

> "Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Finally, I know fairly simple APC algorithms work okay at VHF and above
> > where the channels have relatively benign characteristics, but at HF
> > where the channels are awful, propagation can change quickly, data rates
> > are low and communication turn-around times are long, it may be that
> > finding APC algorithms that work stably and well is itself a development
> > project waiting to be done. I don't think it would be good to burden
> > all higher-power applications with the requirement to do this development
> > work in addition to everything else necessary to do something new.
> >
>
> Dennis,
>
> I think you have just made the case why APC _* should*_ be part of these
> "pioneer" bands. You have identified a problem which begs for some
> tinkering and experimenting. Who better than us to take that bull by the
> horns?

That's not what I got out of it. Quite the opposite, in fact. Some seem to have no idea how the HF bands actually work, and assume that anytime they hear someone using high power that he's "abusing" the minimum power rule. Some do, but as often as not high power is needed to complete the desired communication.

2550. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:01:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Jqwy8.748$cH4.30446850@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41819

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:aad6b1$4dt$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:0poy8.358$wU2.59047078@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020426224930.06141.00000163@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > > In article <20020425064916.06846.00005554@mb-mf.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com
> > (W1RFI)
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Do you think that Cross even knows what Carl says on
> > > >rec.radio.amateur.policy?
> > >
> > > I have never met either Mr. Cross or Mr. Stevenson.
> > >
> > > I have read much of what Mr. Stevenson has written here over the past
5
> > years.
> > >
> > > I don't think Mr. Stevenson would behave the same way in an exparte or
> > other
> > > official communication with the FCC as he has sometimes behaved here.
> >
> > Would you demand to know Mr. Cross' last Novice contact?
> >
> > > I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > >
> > > Just some observations.
> >
> > You've observed Mr. Cross not reading rec.radio.amateur.policy?
>
> Even if Mr. Cross did read RRAP, as an FCC staffer, do you
> think he (Mr. Cross) would be "intimidated" by anyone because
> of what that "anyone" may have written in RRAP?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Welp, when Jim starts telling him that the validity of his work was in
question because of his record in the Novice subbands...

2551. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:03:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE76F9.E939D657@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41820

K0HB wrote:

> "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote
>
> >
> > I thought we were working on our recovery from the decades-
> > long GOOD IDEA that amateur radio operators _* should*_
> > be proficient in Morse code operation and that proficiency
> > _* should*_ be incorporated into FCC regs and ITU treaties.
> >
>
> The amateur bands exist because it is considered in the public interest for
> several reasons. None of those reasons have anything to do with having a
> place for 60-year-old geezers to yak about their lumbago.

When you get lumbago maybe you can keep quiet about it then? (I thought you
were already a 60 year old geezere)

> I think it is
> time for the Commission to turn up the wick on the hams promise to "advance
> the art".

Ah, that wasn't a promise at all, just one of *several* bases and purposes
for the existence of ham radio. Only Carl and Cecil "promise". And then decline
to deliver.

2552. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:03:29 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <lswy8.8723$8p3.721333@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41821

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

>
> You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward"
> nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere,
> just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a
> joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet
> radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended
> widespread interest in the mode.
>

In other words, we could have used a better packet system?

73, Hans, K0HB

2553. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:04:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qtwy8.749$Te5.32129232@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41822

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE063D.D650A13D@townsqr.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
>
> I wouldn't. He's a FCC employee, but he's also an active ham. Wouldn't
surprise me
> if he wants to keep up on things in many different ways.

He must be impressed with you by now.

2554. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:06:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_uwy8.750$qc5.32009330@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41823

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3cca1763_2@news7.fast.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3AE7AC57.254086EC@townsqr.com...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > If we find ourselves sharing more and more of our bands with more and
> more
> > > users, spectrally efficient modes that operate well in the presence of
> noise
> > > will become very important to us. And even if there is no one else on
> the
> > > band, being able to hear and use signals that are deeper into thermal
> noise
> > > would be an improvement.
> >
> > I certainly have no argument with any of that and have repeatedly said
as
> much. Why
> > do you join Carl in insisting I do?
>
> WHEN have you said anything like that, Dick? You're the one who's
> always saying, in effect, "Don't need any improvements in technology."
>
> Just today, you claimed that it was "unnecessary and irrational" to
> prefer a 56k circuit for receiving a picture, compared to something
> else (which you implied would be much slower).
>
> > > Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted
your
> > > attitude in 1914, it would not exist today.
> >
> > Nonsense! The early days of radio desperately needed all the technical
> improvement
> > they could get and they did get it. Today is a different situation
> entirely, and
> > surely you know that.
>
> What? In the early days we needed technical improvement, but today is a
> different situation entirely????? Do you even REALIZE what you just said?
>
> Carl - wk3c

I wonder if Bill Cross is reading this?

2555. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:14:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tCwy8.752$2i5.32290836@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41824

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE1959.679C2719@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > WHEN have you said anything like that, Dick? You're the one who's
> > always saying, in effect, "Don't need any improvements in technology."
>
> Well Buddy, I hate to bust your bubble but we DON'T "need" them!

Holy Cow!

> But you do only SSB on ham radio, so you already know that!
> Would we adopt some of them, and use them? Probably, after they passed
muster,
> the test of hams using them and finding them to be useful and attractive
> additions to their activities.
> Don't look now,

Larry? Is that you?

> but the landscape is littered with discarded "better ideas".
> And if you think any significant numbers of hams are going to jump on the
> bandwagon on the strength of your pronouncements, you better reconsider.

If you said "Hams' from my generation...," I could buy into your argument.
Actuarial tables will fix that

> > Just today, you claimed that it was "unnecessary and irrational" to
> > prefer a 56k circuit for receiving a picture, compared to something
> > else (which you implied would be much slower).
> >
>
> Of course the context was HAM RADIO, and HF in particular. But you already
know
> that.

So in the HF experimentor's zone proposed by Hans, no improvement in speed
is desired?

> > > > Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted
your
> > > > attitude in 1914, it would not exist today.
> > >
> > > Nonsense! The early days of radio desperately needed all the technical
> > improvement
> > > they could get and they did get it. Today is a different situation
> > entirely, and

> > > surely you know that.
> >
> > What? In the early days we needed technical improvement, but today is a
> > different situation entirely????? Do you even REALIZE what you just
said?
>
> **OF COURSE** I realize what I said!!! And it is 100% accurate!!!
> I should have realized it would be asking far too much of you to expect
you to
> know any history of radio.

Time to close down the patent office. Everything has already been invented.

2556. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:18:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE7A70.83D29CCC@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41825

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

. All of a sudden

> some inconsiderate LIDs in/around the Orlando, FL area came
> up 40 db over S9, 700 Hz above me at 14.204.7 ... and start
> shooting the breeze. No "Is the frequency in use?" or nothing.
>
> I politely said "The frequency is in use." and signed my call
> a couple of times and they simply ignored me ...
>
> The LIDs were W4RHE, KF4IC, and K1RON ...
>
> Now I would give them the benefit of the doubt that
> they might not have been able to hear me, but they were
> all 30-40 dB over S9 and while I'm not running legal limt
> and a beam, my station is not THAT bad, either ... there
> is no doubt in my mind that they could hear me and simply
> didn't give a damn.
>
> To make them even bigger lids, they were talking more or less
> "local" on 20m and obviously using very high power (bragging
> about their amps and big towers/beams) ... these guys could
> use an APC requirement.

I hope you know that on 20 meters the skip zone normally starts within a few miles. (If you had done much mobile work you'd know it) It's very much a possibility that they were far enough away from each other that they did need higher power to make the desired communication. And if you happened be positioned where you were off the side of their yagis which very easily could have all been pointed east and west, you were in a deep null, and it's very much a possibility or even a likelihood that they never heard any hint of your low powered signal. In the Orlando area there are almost certainly small lots and antenna size limitations, so it is entirely possibile they didn't have antennas for bands lower in frequency than 20 meters.

Yet you automatically brand them as "LIDS" with no knowledge, only your preconceived notions of their situations and what they were doing. You just heard them talk about amps and yagis and "ASS-UMED".

This is why the FCC virtually never attempts to enforce the rule on minimum power needed to complete the desired communication. Most of the time it is virtually impossible for anyone to determine with accuracy that the rule is actually being violated. But you try.

2557. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:20:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <blwy8.753$Vj5.32391265@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41827

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:igpy8.8044$8p3.636278@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> >
> > You really expect us to believe that you send "perfect" CW, Larry?
> > Your dashes are *exactly* three dots long?
> >
>
> Of course! In accordance with the N0iMD directive for only precise
sterile
> Morse -- no personality allowed. A good Republican wouldn't deviate from
> standards, doncha know?!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Human written code is full of personality, but the 1's are one, and the 0's
are zero, not 1 +/- .001 and 0 +/- .001 respectively.

So Larry sends perfect code?

2558. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:21:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427082133.00489.00006221@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41828

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/27/02 00:48 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020427004851.04302.00001029@mb-bh.aol.com>

>However, I'm still trying to decode "astronomics."

Oooops...I made a mistake...meant "astronautics".

See, Lennie...It isn't so hard to admit you made a mistake.

Now, which radio service was created for "strictly recreational" purposes?

SR

2559. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:21:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEE7B4A.3C12FD3B@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41829

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >"It is a control and an ego issue."
> >
> > Incorrect. It is/was "a control and an ego issue" only to the weak-minded,
> > impatient, lazy whiners who were/are too lazy to learn and be tested on
> > a practical communications skill at a useful proficiency level. To the rest
> > of us, it was a matter of supporting the concept of retaining the requirement
> > in order to retain the basic, essential communications capability that
> > amateurs can exploit when they know how to employ the Morse/CW mode.
>
> Larry, it is abundantly apparent that the basic problem was equating Morse code
> skill with knowledge of electronics.

Clear to you code haters. Not to anyone else. The qualifications were and are separate parts of the whole. The only people who ever complain about the code qualification are those who just didn't want the license badly enough to do it.

> It is abundantly apparent that they are not
> equal and attempting to equate them was a gross perversion from which the ARS may
> never recover.

Your opinion and you're entitled to it. You are not entitled to label everone who disagrees with it as you wish without challenge. You may get far more negative response than you wished.

2560. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:22:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427082233.00489.00006222@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41830

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/27/02 01:23 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020427012312.27628.00000815@mb-bj.aol.com>

>Give a man an inch and he thinks he's a ruler..

Give Lennie an inch and he MIGHT be a man.....

2561. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:25:35 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3Nwy8.754$2m5.32499981@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41826

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE1166.F7129801@townsqr.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3CCA9FB8.8DC35D16@townsqr.com...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > > > > fast can the fastest typist
> > > > > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > > > > typists?
> > > >
> > > > Because the "smart" thing to do is to prepare the file "off-the-air"
> > > > and then send it all at once instead of typying in real-time on the
air.
> > >
> > > Why, of course it is, Bill! Been there and done that hundreds of
times,
> > in a
> > > professional setting. But hey, this is amateur radio, and we're hams,
and
> > most
> > > of us with experience know that the best laid plans are likely to see
all
> > that
> > > snazzy hi-data rate gear stored somewhere where we happen to NOT be
when
> > the
> > > ship hits the sand.
> >
> > The key word is "preparation." Either you do it, or not.
> >
>
> So you either carry a full complement of high tech equipment around with
you
> everywhere you go, just in case. Right. Remind me to trade my car for a
bus or
> tractor trailer with a portable tower mounted on the rear. Don't forget
the
> generator! Gotta stay ready!

There Dick goes to extreme's again. What a goof.

2562. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:32:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xTwy8.755$rl5.32468040@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41831

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE0EC0.460C8B16@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3AE79EEB.F8A91DD0@townsqr.com...
> > > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > > fast can the fastest typist type? Why do we need 56k circuits fo
> > > 60 word per minute typists?
> >
> > Dick,
> >
> > Your problem is that your imagination is always bounded
> > by the limits of human ability to do thing manually.
> >
>
> You dumbshit, you're so full of it your eyes have turned brown!

Wait till Jim delete's your expletives.

> I was cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC
> SEND AND RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!

This must be some kind of proof that you have more time in the chow hall.
Besides, the M28s were junked a quarter of a century ago. Even hams don't
want them anymore.

> You and Cecil are so damn stupid you are SURE that because I believe
> hams should know how to use radiotelegraphy that's all I ever do or
> ever did.

We've heard of your struggles with other modes. Just do what's comfortable
for you.

2563. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:35:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dWwy8.756$qn5.32573775@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41832

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020427004847.04302.00001027@mb-bh.aol.com...
> In article <20020426215536.01774.00002110@mb-cg.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >I totally agree. I think that the FCC rules should be changed to require
> >mode-specific activity logs from each licensed amateur radio station,
> >and that they should reflect at least one half of the total activity
being
> >in some mode other than AM/FM/SSB voice. Any digital mode or
> >CW would suffice. It is a known fact that amateurs who are actively
> >involved in modes other than voice modes are more likely to be
> >technically involved radio amateurs.
>
> Yes, Larrie, you tellum Macro Boy.
>
> We all know you hate voice with a passion.
>
> We all know you are one of the best 1930s radio amateurs to
> exist in the year 2002...except you seem to be a total technical
> moron on how anything but on-off keying works.
>
> Now go hock another loogie in your splatoo duties while
> specializing your paratransit.

Len, len, len. Now he'll be spitting on his patrons and claim you made him
do it. You gotta cut this stuff out.

2564. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:37:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xYwy8.757$Qm5.32541062@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41833

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020427012311.27628.00000814@mb-bj.aol.com...
> In article <f5py8.8031$8p3.667216@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K0HB"
> <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >Rather than hold the geezers "feet to the fire", all I'm asking for is a
> >small "park" free of geezers, so the pioneers can "exuberantly play radio
in
> >the ether" to steal a quote from K1ZZ.
>
> Oh? The "pioneers" aren't playing radio now? Oh, my!
>
> Geez, here was this 1930s-era Big Brother org and all these
> 1930s morsemen beeping their little hearts out "on the bands."
>
> Yes, and there is still "experimentation" on the 60m band to
> "test it for compatibility" with amateur radio! A half century
> after it was already proved beyond reasonable doubt... :-)
>
> Relax, have a little ether...

I cracked up when Ed defended that experiment.

2565. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:43:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <J1xy8.762$7t5.32872723@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41834

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020427004851.04302.00001029@mb-bh.aol.com...
> In article <7sny8.329$S12.55694698@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

> No problem. The NTSB would stay on the surface. Da Vinci's
> "helicopter" had a vertical-axis screw. Wouldn't have created any
> lift. Likewise Da Vinci's "ornithopter." :-)

Who investigates airplane crashes?

2566. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 12:54:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Acxy8.767$cx5.33086697@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41835

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE7B4A.3C12FD3B@townsqr.com...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >"It is a control and an ego issue."
> > >
> > > Incorrect. It is/was "a control and an ego issue" only to the
weak-minded,
> > > impatient, lazy whiners who were/are too lazy to learn and be tested
on
> > > a practical communications skill at a useful proficiency level. To
the rest
> > > of us, it was a matter of supporting the concept of retaining the
requirement
> > > in order to retain the basic, essential communications capability that
> > > amateurs can exploit when they know how to employ the Morse/CW mode.
> >
> > Larry, it is abundantly apparent that the basic problem was equating
Morse code
> > skill with knowledge of electronics.
>
> Clear to you code haters. Not to anyone else.

Huh?

> The qualifications were and are
> separate parts of the whole. The only people who ever complain about the
code
> qualification are those who just didn't want the license badly enough to
do it.

I did it. And I can still say that Morse Code has nothing to do with a
knowledge of electronics.

> > It is abundantly apparent that they are not
> > equal and attempting to equate them was a gross perversion from which
the ARS may
> > never recover.
>
> Your opinion and you're entitled to it. You are not entitled to label
everone who
> disagrees with it as you wish without challenge. You may get far more

negative
> response than you wished.

I agree with Cecil. I disagree with you.

2567. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 13:05:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Fmxy8.771$QB5.33322193@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41836

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:lswy8.8723$8p3.721333@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward"
> > nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere,
> > just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a
> > joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet
> > radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended
> > widespread interest in the mode.
>
> In other words, we could have used a better packet system?
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

More, better, faster? Dick won't get it.

2568. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 13:12:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccaa3e0_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41837

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:igpy8.8044$8p3.636278@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> >
> > You really expect us to believe that you send "perfect" CW, Larry?
> > Your dashes are *exactly* three dots long?
> >
>
> Of course! In accordance with the N0iMD directive for only precise
sterile
> Morse -- no personality allowed. A good Republican wouldn't deviate from
> standards, doncha know?!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans and Cecil,

I would grant that Larry sends pretty darned good code, based on his quasi-religious enthusiasm for the mode. Not 100% perfect in the purely technical sense, since, as humans, we are not capable of total perfection in such things, but quite good.

Larry's problem is not his ability to send good Morse, but his attitude towards those "knuckle-draggers" (his term, not mine) who don't exhibit his propensity towards the mode.

Carl - wk3c

2569. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 13:40:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccaaa4f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41838

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3CCA0F06.9479820@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > And, using the digital systems proposed in strawman form independently
> ^^^^^^^^
> > by Gary Coffman and myself more than 2 years ago, hundreds of digital
> > signals at 20 wpm Morse equivalent transfer rates could coexist there
...
>
> And we are all still looking at the patent office for the
> Coffman system or the Stevenson System. How's the hardware
> development going? ;-)
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

Clay,

Nothing jumps out at me from my recollection of Gary's proposal, or mine, that would likely be patentable ... there's the "obvious to anyone skilled in the art" aspect to patentability. That's part of the problem ... how they would work and the value of what Gary and I each proposed SHOULD have been obvious to many hams ... that that was NOT the case indicates that too many are NOT "skilled in the art." However, just because something may not be patentable, doesn't mean it's not "good stuff" with potentially high utility.

Frankly, I haven't done any development on that proposal ... first, I moved into a newly-constructed house and am still in the process of organizing the office, workshop, electronics lab, and ham shack. Second, the "We don't want no stinking, reliable digital systems, we LIKE to have to work hard to dig the weak ones out of the noise because we insist on using less capable methods." response here was, frankly so nauseatingly backward that it pushed that idea down the priority list a ways. Other things at higher speeds and higher frequencies have been more on my mind lately, but I still have an interest in more capable HF digital systems.

Carl - wk3c

2570. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 13:52:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <e2yy8.809$uU5.34321606@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41839

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3ccaa3e0_2@news7.fast.net...
> "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
> news:igpy8.8044$8p3.636278@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > You really expect us to believe that you send "perfect" CW, Larry?
> > > Your dashes are *exactly* three dots long?
> > >
> >
> > Of course! In accordance with the N0iMD directive for only precise
> sterile
> > Morse -- no personality allowed. A good Republican wouldn't deviate
from
> > standards, doncha know?!
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hans and Cecil,
>
> I would grant that Larry sends pretty darned good code, based on his
> quasi-religious enthusiasm for the mode. Not 100% perfect in the
> purely technical sense, since, as humans, we are not capable of total
> perfection in such things, but quite good.
>
> Larry's problem is not his ability to send good Morse, but his attitude
> towards those "knuckle-draggers" (his term, not mine) who don't exhibit
> his propensity towards the mode.
>
> Carl - wk3c

If he sends code that can be suitably copied by a computer, then it must be
pretty good.
```

2571. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 13:56:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccaae1c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41840

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020427000658.27399.00000927@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3cca0f50_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020426000707.13101.00001028@mb-ct.aol.com...
>
> >> Another point of the "experimental farm" idea is that the widening of
the
> >> 'phone bands is not a good idea, IMO.
> >
> >Agreed ... the phone bands would be OK of folks acted more civily.
>
> One of the reasons I operate almost all CW.
> >
> >Last weekend I tried to work the SETI League QSO party, just
> >for fun and to talk to other folks interested in SETI.
>
> Kewl.
> >
> >Started calling "CQ SETI" at the start of the 24 hour window
> >on 14.204 (1% of the H line freq) ... and worked a few
> >stations over the course of about a half an hour.
>
> Using USB, I presume...

That was the designated mode for the QSO party, so don't
draw and quarter me, OK? :-)

> >All of a sudden
> >some inconsiderate LIDs in/around the Orlando, FL area came
> >up 40 db over S9, 700 Hz above me at 14.204.7 ... and start
> >shooting the breeze. No "Is the frequency in use?" or nothing.
> >
> >I politely said "The frequency is in use." and signed my call
> >a couple of times and they simply ignored me ...
> >
[snipped callsigns ... will explain later]

> >Now I would give them the benefit of the doubt that
> >they might not have been able to hear me, but they were
> >all 30-40 dB over S9 and while I'm not running legal limt
> >and a beam, my station is not THAT bad, either ... there

> >is no doubt in my mind that they could hear me and simply
> >didn't give a damn.
>
> Lessee, if you're running 100 W and a vertical and they have 1500 W and 20
db
> of effective antenna gain (!!) you might be 35-40 dB below them - max. So
you
> would be S9 there, worst-case.
>
> However, consider this:
>
> If they were 40 over to you, they might be 60 or more dB over to each
other.
> With slow AGC they might not hear an S9 signal.

They were all in the Orlando area, using high power and high beams
on 20m to talk across town ... the guy who was strongest here (by a
barely perceptible margin) said he could see the antenna of one of
the others ...

The other problem was the "quick keying" without an opportunity for
anyone else to break in ... so the AGC might have had an effect as you
point out, but even with no AGC, they were so quick on the turn-around
that someone would have had a hard time breaking in most times.

> But that doesn't excuse not listening first, nor doing the "frequency in
use?"
> thing. Nor the fact they could have dropped power 20 dB and been blowing
each
> other's rigs off the desk.

Again, at least 2 of the stations can see each other's antennas ... so why
use
high power on 20m to talk across town when 2m simplex with a 5W HT
would probalby work just fine and not block an HF frequency over huge
areas of the earth??? To me, this is just bad practice (and probably a
violation of the minimum power rule) ... but what do I know, since I'm
an "Extra light" :-)

> >To make them even bigger lids, they were talking more or less
> >"local" on 20m and obviously using very high power (bragging
> >about their amps and big towers/beams) ...
>
> That's the biggest lidism, right there - use of the wrong band for the
purpose.
> What time of day was this?

0030Z

I heard one of them again today on 14.205 calling the group ...
same 40 over S9 ... gave him a call and he came right back to
me with a "good signal" report ... I discussed the incident of

last weekend with him and he professed that they didn't hear me. Maybe their extreme signal strengths to each other, combined with AGC and quick-keying did cause them to not hear me ... but, yes, using high power on 20m to talk across town is bad practice. I tried to diplomatically hint at that by asking why and the response was "Habit."

However, they did apologize and indicated that in the future they would listen a bit more and would certainly be willing to QSY a bit from their "normal" frequency for other stations already working close by ...

Carl - wk3c

Carl - wk3c

2572. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 14:00:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccaaf04_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41841

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE7A70.83D29CCC@townsqr.com...
>
> I hope you know that on 20 meters the skip zone normally starts within a
few
> miles. (If you had done much mobile work you'd know it) It's very much a
> possibility that they were far enough away from each other that they did
need
> higher power to make the desired communication. And if you happened be
> positioned where you were off the side of their yagis which very easily
could
> have all been pointed east and west, you were in a deep null, and it's
very
> much a possibility or even a likelihood that they never heard any hint of
your
> low powered signal. In the Orlando area there are almost certainly small
lots
> and antenna size limitations, so it is entirely possibile they didn't
have
> antennas for bands lower in frequency than 20 meters.
>
> Yet you automatically brand them as "LIDS" with no knowledge, only your
> preconceived notions of their situations and what they were doing. You
just
> heard them talk about amps and yagis and "ASS-UMED".
>
> This is why the FCC virtually never attempts to enforce the rule on
minimum
> power needed to complete the desired communication. Most of the time it is
> virtually impossible for anyone to determine with accuracy that the rule
is
> actually being violated. But you try.

Dick,

Using high power on 20m to talk across town (expecially when you can
actually SEE the antenna of at least one of the other stations), is simply
BAD PRACTICE ... such communications can and should be conducted
on something like 2m simplex, rather than blasting an HF band with
world-wide propagation with little regard for your effects on others.

You can try to excuse the behavior all you want because you dislike
the complaintant (me), but that doesn't change the fact that the behavior
is bad practice. Even an "Extra light" like me knows better.

Carl - wk3c

2573. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 14:02:46 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccaaf8b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41842

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE063D.D650A13D@townsqr.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > > I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
>
> I wouldn't. He's a FCC employee, but he's also an active ham. Wouldn't
surprise me
> if he wants to keep up on things in many different ways.

TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, Mr. Cross does NOT read r.r.a.p.

Carl - wk3c

2574. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 14:06:34 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <aaebc3$a0p$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 41844
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Wife beater "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> whined in message
news:lloyd.is.mysterian@houston-hunks.com...
>
> On 26 Apr 2002 23:46:57 GMT, Mysterian <Mysterian2001@alt.net> wrote:
>
> : Jesus moves in mysterious ways. I will pray that this Christian judge
> : prevails.
>
> Isn't that \ /

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit "Stagger Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically
admits he has no credibility by his own definition in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

Looks like this proves I wasn't mysterian after all, huh, fuckhead?

Utter fucking imbecile.

2575. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 14:07:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bgyy8.818$xX5.34482393@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41843

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3ccaae1c_1@news7.fast.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020427000658.27399.00000927@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > In article <3cca0f50_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3c@fast.net>
> > writes:
> > >Now I would give them the benefit of the doubt that
> > >they might not have been able to hear me, but they were
> > >all 30-40 dB over S9 and while I'm not running legal limt
> > >and a beam, my station is not THAT bad, either ... there
> > >is no doubt in my mind that they could hear me and simply
> > >didn't give a damn.
> >
> > Lessee, if you're running 100 W and a vertical and they have 1500 W and
20
> db
> > of effective antenna gain (!!) you might be 35-40 dB below them - max.
So
> you
> > would be S9 there, worst-case.
> >
> > However, consider this:
> >
> > If they were 40 over to you, they might be 60 or more dB over to each
> other.
> > With slow AGC they might not hear an S9 signal.
>
> They were all in the Orlando area, using high power and high beams
> on 20m to talk across town ... the guy who was strongest here (by a
> barely perceptible margin) said he could see the antenna of one of
> the others ...
>
> The other problem was the "quick keying" without an opportunity for
> anyone else to break in ... so the AGC might have had an effect as you
> point out, but even with no AGC, they were so quick on the turn-around
> that someone would have had a hard time breaking in most times.
>
> > But that doesn't excuse not listening first, nor doing the "frequency in
> use?"
> > thing. Nor the fact they could have dropped power 20 dB and been blowing
> each
> > other's rigs off the desk.
>

> Again, at least 2 of the stations can see each other's antennas ... so why
> use
> high power on 20m to talk across town when 2m simplex with a 5W HT
> would probalby work just fine and not block an HF frequency over huge
> areas of the earth??? To me, this is just bad practice (and probably a
> violation of the minimum power rule) ... but what do I know, since I'm
> an "Extra light" :-)

Jim might say they are highly credible 20M enthusiasts.

2576. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 14:11:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccab1ab_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41845

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE063D.D650A13D@townsqr.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
>
> I wouldn't. He's a FCC employee, but he's also an active ham. Wouldn't
surprise me
> if he wants to keep up on things in many different ways.

TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, Bill does NOT read r.r.a.p.

First, usenet has a (bad) reputation. *We* argue points here for the sake
of discussion (and perhaps to win converts to our point of view from the
nearly constant flow of newcomers)

Second, Bill is tasked with occasionally making determinations of what
best serves the public interest and the Commission's public policy goals
and legitimate regulatory interests. If it's not in the public record
(comments, etc. filed with the FCC), it simply doesn't count for anything.
(So why would he waste his valuable time reading things
that he can't legally or ethically consider in forming FCC rules?)

And again, the idea that Bill would be "afraid" that I might call him
a "Luddite" is perhaps the funniest thing I've heard in years.

Carl - wk3c

2577. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 14:35:53 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccab74e_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41846

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE1959.679C2719@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3AE7AC57.254086EC@townsqr.com...
> > > I certainly have no argument with any of that and have repeatedly said
as
> > much. Why
> > > do you join Carl in insisting I do?
> >
> > WHEN have you said anything like that, Dick? You're the one who's
> > always saying, in effect, "Don't need any improvements in technology."
> >
>
> Well Buddy, I hate to bust your bubble but we DON'T "need" them! But you
do
> only SSB on ham radio, so you already know that!

Once again, Dick, you have no way of knowing what I do (or don't do)
on ham radio, nor what I may be working on "in the lab."

> >
> > Just today, you claimed that it was "unnecessary and irrational" to
> > prefer a 56k circuit for receiving a picture, compared to something
> > else (which you implied would be much slower).
> >
>
> Of course the context was HAM RADIO, and HF in particular. But you already
know
> that.

So your assertion is that ham radio, must, of necessity always be grossly
limited and backward compared to "the real world." Yes, I've seen
you express that view on many occasions.

> > > > Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted
your
> > > > attitude in 1914, it would not exist today.
> > >
> > > Nonsense! The early days of radio desperately needed all the technical
> > improvement
> > > they could get and they did get it. Today is a different situation
> > entirely, and
> > > surely you know that.

> >
> > What? In the early days we needed technical improvement, but today is a
> > different situation entirely????? Do you even REALIZE what you just
said?
>
> **OF COURSE** I realize what I said!!! And it is 100% accurate!!!
> I should have realized it would be asking far too much of you to expect
you to
> know any history of radio.

While I'm not a nostalgia/history buff like Jim, I'm not totally ignorant of
the
history of amateur radio, either (and I am a member of QCWA) ... but the
point is STILL that YOUare asserting that "in the early days we needed
technical improvement, but today is a different situation entirely."

EXCUSE ME, but we STILL need technical improvement ... it's one of
our reasons for being ... and being satisfied with things that were novel
50 years (or much more) ago is NOT the way one "advances the radio art"
or "maintains a pool of (competent, useful) trained technicians and
electronics
experts."

Sorry, Dick ... you are incurably clueless.

Carl - wk3c

2578. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 15:49:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAC892.7CD28EA6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41847

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Where in Bob's remarks did you find any of that nonsense? Or mine either, for
> > > that matter.
> >
> > "It is a control and an ego issue."
>
> Which describes you quite well, despite your attempts to cover it.

That's rich, Dick. As a Libertarian, I advocate as little control of
government over citizens as is feasible. You OTOH, advocate a governmental
control program for Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2579. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 15:53:30 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <_Pzy8.8986$8p3.756909@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41848
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Mysterian" <Mysterian2001@alt.net> wrote

>
> Jesus moves in mysterious ways.
>

A long and wicked life followed by five minutes of perfect grace gets you into Heaven. An equally long life of decent living and good works followed by one outburst of taking the name of the lord in vain-- then have a heart attack at that moment and be damned for eternity. Is that the system?

Good luck on this one now!

2580. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 15:53:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAC98D.63516C17@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41849

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You dumbshit, you're so full of it your eyes have turned brown! I was
> cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC SEND AND
> RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!

Time to get rid of that ASR, Dick. Computers are much better.

> You and Cecil are so damn stupid you are SURE that because I believe
> hams should know how to use radiotelegraphy that's all I ever do or
> ever did.

Well, I was doing CW when you were still in diapers. (Too bad you
were nine years old at the time.)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2581. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 16:00:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCACB0D.1A419189@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41850

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Show us where you can get 56k data rates within any reasonable
> bandwidth on HF, much less within any rule the FCC might even
> feasibly write. You can't do it. You're full of hot air and SSB.

Uhhhhhhhh Dick, 56k data rates fit into the same bandwidth as SSB.
Do you think the HF problems will never be solved?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2582. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 16:02:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCACB7B.CE09914C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41851

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Don't look now, but the landscape is littered with discarded "better ideas".

Therefore, hams should stop experimenting? The landscape was littered
with discarded automobiles. Did that stop automobile development?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2583. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 16:06:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCACC9B.D2D011FE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41856

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You deny that NCI is a conspiracy?

"conspiracy - an evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan
formulated in secret by two or more persons."

What secret thing is NCI doing?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2584. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 16:07:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427120719.09489.00000899@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 41854

In article <3cca1d28_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020424220651.26511.00000482@mb-fy.aol.com...
>>
>> I'm beginning to think the power limit thing should just be dropped. Allow
>full
>> power on all the subbands after reallocation to the experimental farm.
>
>Jim, NO, PLEASE ... anything worth developing won't require 1500 W pep.

Then those who are developing the new modes won't use 1500 W.

>Give the "brute force" boys an inch and they'll use both of them ... we want
>and need to concentrate on "elegant" not "brute force."

Sure. But the way to do that is not to force it on people.

Dennis Ferguson's excellent posts have convinced me that there is no need for
an APC rule in the "experimental farm" idea. Your experiences on 14.204
confirmed that conviction.

The proof is in the doing. The developers of PSK31 did not need high power to
develop that mode. They did not need APC rules or a low power subband, either.
All they DID need was some flexibility and encouragement. That's what the
"experimental farm" is all about.

If you want APC rules, put that part in your comments to the FCC. I'm not going
to. I think it's unnecessary.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2585. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 16:07:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427120719.09489.00000898@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 41855

In article <3cca2230_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>You mean us guys who passed the same written test as Generals
>but didn't get privs because we only copied 5 wpm and not 13?

Yep. I was one of them in 1968.
>
>There was no "freebie" in granting Generals to "old techs" once
>the code requirement dropped to 5 wpm ...

Noboy said "freebie". Allow me to clarify.

All pre-March-21-1987 Tech Pluses, and those with unexpired CSCEs for old
Element 3B, have passed the necessary tests for a post-restructuring General.
It should have been a nobrainer for the FCC to do one or more of the following:

- allow those Tech Pluses to have General privileges if they have old license
documents to show they qualify
- allow those Tech Pluses to renew as Generals when the time comes or as part
of a vanity call application
- allow those Tech Pluses to upgrade by mail or online by sending in the
appropriate forms and documents
- have the FCC computer issue new Generals to all existing Tech Pluses who
qualified

All of these were suggested to the FCC. Yet the FCC insisted that all
qualifying Tech Pluses show up at VE sessions and pay a VE fee to get a license
they'd earned years before. Why?

>NCI and the NCVECs both told the FCC "No freebies",

Allowing the Tech Pluses listed above to get Generals without the VE session
hassle isn't a freebie.

>it was the ARRL who wanted to give freebies (presumably
>to make some folks feel grateful in hopes they'd sent in their
>subscription, er membership, $$$)

You mean the upgrading of existing Novices and Tech Pluses to General.

Your comments show an anti-ARRL bias that has no basis in fact. What would you
say to someone who claimed that the NCVEC and NCI stance was driven by a desire
to make existing hams "jump through a hazing hoop" of written exams, and gather
more $$$ at VE sessions, while protecting their status as having passed the old
writtens? ;-)

The ARRL idea of instant upgrades for existing Novices and post-1987 Tech Pluses was well-intentioned but would have produced some unpleasant consequences. Post-restructuring new hams and existing Techs would have complained (quite rightly!) about how those getting the upgrades bypassed one or two written tests. And because of the necesary delay between the R&O and its effective date, there would have been a rush to get a Novice or Tech Plus while the "sale" was on.

On the $$$ issue, ARRL's upgrade idea would have cost ARRL money, in the form of lesser sales of manuals to study for the license upgrades.

>> >Just stop the divisions and segregation in the band.

>> Which means what? No more subbands by license class? No more subbands by
>mode?
>
>I could live without subbands by license class ... that is the norm
>in most of the world and doesn't seem to really cause any demonstrable
>problems.

The norm in most of the world is far fewer hams per capita, and per square mile, too.
>
>While most of the world seems to do just fine without subband by mode
>restrictions, I'm not so sure that we Americans are ready for that. Just
>listening to the behavior that I hear from so many on the phone bands
>(and I mean people who passed fast code tests, not some new thing
>that's happened since the test was dropped to 5 wpm), I don't really
>want to see that "Ugly American" phenomenon spread to the entirety
>of the bands at the expense of all of the other modes and the digital
>techniques that are our future.

You've just proved my point.

Note that ALL of the folks you hear on the HF 'phone bands have passed multiple WRITTEN tests. But even before the restructuring, there were medical waivers. One cannot assume that any HF ham has passed more than a 5 wpm code test without more information.
>
>> >Instead you now have a dead license class because of a dead idea.
>
>Reducing the number of license classes need not result in a wake ...
>we didn't NEED 6 classes of license in the first place ... the loss
>of Tech+ is no cause for mourning ... those folks still have the
>same privs (or have already upraded) ... that there will be no more
>Novices or Advanceds issues is not a loss either ...

The whole point of the instant upgrade thing was to clean out those unnecessary classes. FCC obviously thought that cleaning them out was unnecessary.

In less than eight years, even if no other rules changes take place, there will be no more Tech Pluses, because the FCC is renewing them as Techs. Novice totals are below 40,000 and dropping slowly - more slowly than may have been expected, due to lots of upgrades in the grace period.

>> >> The 200 W power limit has to do with written testing.
>> >
>> >Really? Correct me if I'm wrong (and you will), but weren't the old,
>> >bonifide Extras limited in power in some of those segments?
>>
>> All US hams were limited in power in those subbands to provide a "level
>playing
>> field". It was not always that way. Dumb rule, actually.
>
>Actually, the rule was put there to keep higher class lids from
>simply stomping the novices into the dust with their CA kilowatts
>and making the band essentially unusable for novices.

Sure. Yet for the first half of the history of the Novice license, they had only 75 watts input while other hams had a kilowatt.

In my experience, non-Novices rarely if ever went into the Novice segments to work other non-Novices. They went there to work Novices. High power helped out the Novices, who often had less-than-ideal-receivers.
>
>And, since high power isn't really NECESSARY, it's not a bad idea
>in that sense either ... I frankly wouldn't care if they dropped the power
>limit for ALL of our bands to 100-250 Watts ... as I've said before, there's
>much more to be gained with better modulation and coding schemes and
>better antennas than with the 10 dB or so difference from the typical
>"barefoot" HF rig and the legal limit ...

There are situations on amateur HF/MF where 1500 W is more than justified and other situations where 15 watts is more than enough. 1500 W can be necessary at times.

Better antennas are always a good idea but not practical for many if not most hams.

I still find it surreal that you lecture us on "better modulation and coding schemes", Carl. Wish I had a buck for each time I've read that one.

What mode do you use most on HF amateur radio? ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2586. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 16:07:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427120721.09489.00000901@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 41852

In article <aad6b1$4dt$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Even if Mr. Cross did read RRAP, as an FCC staffer, do you
>think he (Mr. Cross) would be "intimidated" by anyone because
>of what that "anyone" may have written in RRAP?

Nope. At most, he might be dismayed at some of the behavior displayed here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2587. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 16:07:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427120721.09489.00000900@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 41853

In article <aad6b1$4dt$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
>(Dennis
>> Ferguson) writes:
>>
>> >It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
>> >used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
>> >OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
>> >are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
>> >International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
>> >is 0 encoding.
>> >
>> Interesting.
>>
>> It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of commercial
>fixed
>> point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or other radiated-RF means
>> today. And the percentage is dropping.
>
>I'd be surprised if it was even 10% at all.

Your info is probably more current than mine, Bill. Note that by specifying
"fixed point-to-point", we exclude such uses as cellphones.
>
>> The real communications revolution of the past 20 years has been fiber
>optics.
>> Both the internet and lowcost long distance telephones are largely made
>> possible by the fiber revolution. Fiber optics offer enormous bandwidth,
>
>1.6T (i.e. 1.6 Terrabits/sec capacity for a single fibre is available today)

And if you need another 1.6T, just pull another fibre through the duct.
>
>> low time delay,
>
>The time delay for fibre (i.e. speed of light in the fibre)
>isn't any better (actually its worse) than RF in space or cable.
>The advantage of less delay is only in comparison to
>satellite connections which include 50,000 miles of space propogation vs
>perhaps only 10,000 miles of terrestial connectivity.

You are correct, sir! I should have specified the comparison between
geosynchronous satellite link vs. fibre optic more clearly

And all comms through a geosynchronous satellite is subject to the 50,000 mile
delay, regardless of terrestrial distance covered.
>
>> high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune to RFI,
>> EMI and EMP. Fibers can be installed anywhere copper cables can go - on
>poles,
>> underground, and under the sea. Terrestrial microwave and satellites
>simply
>> cannot compete except in special situations.
>>
>> From a historical point of view, we have come full circle.
>>
>> The first telecom revolution was the widespread acceptance of the electric
>> telegraph about 150 years ago. Before then, almost all information
>travelled
>> only as fast as transportation could carry a messenger or a letter.
>> Communications facilities available to President Andrew Jackson had more
>in
>> common with those available to Julius Casear than they did with those
>available
>> to President Abraham Lincoln.
>>
>> The telegraph conquered most of the land area in Western developed
>countries,
>> then proceeded to cross the oceans. Radio was hampered in its early
>development
>> because it was at first considered merely a telegraph system without
>wires. It
>> took years to get the term "radio" accepted universally instead of
>"wireless
>> telegraphy" or simply "wireless".
>>
>> Yet everything old is new again. Fiber optics has more in common with the
>> telegraph than with radio. Many fibers follow railroad rights-of-way, just
>as
>> the telegraph did. As Dennis points out, the signaling method used on the
>> fibers is on-off keying.
>>
>> And the companies selling us new radio technology call it "wireless" as if
>it's
>> a new term.
>
>Wireless is relatively new to the current "end user" of the service.

In the USA, anyway. Just a matter of the marketing folks recycling an old term.

The results are often confounding, however, as some end users don;t realize
they are using radios when they use a cellphone or cordless phone.

>We have
>actually flipped the use of RF vs hard wiring (fibre). In the past,
>wireless (radio) was depended on for long distance and everything local was
>wired. Today, wireless is a huge growth area with the "wireless" involving
>the connection from user (i.e. cellphone) to a base unit and
>the rest of the connectivity is then all "hard wired" via fibre.

Good point! The result is that most of the distance is covered by fiber and the
"last mile" by RF.

But even that is changing. How long before we see each home or business wired
("fibred"?) with its own direct optical connection to the infrastructure, with
the end user providing whatever terminal equipment is needed for voice
telephone, data, entertainment, etc.? One fibre will do all that and much more.
>> --
>> Doing techno-prediction is a risky game, but if current trends continue,
>RF's
>> communications role will change drastically in the years to come. Cheap
>and
>> universal fiber communication will replace RF in all but mobile/portable
>> applications and specialties like the military, hams and the developing
>world.
>>
>> Just my opinion.
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim,
>
>Good overview. I injected a couple of things above for
>clarity.

They are greatly appreciated, Bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2588. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 16:54:06 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <OIAy8.53709$QC1.3895584@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41858

>>Of course the *real* irony would have been to have the
>>transmitter running off of the output of an automated
>>*nuclear* power plant.

> HAW! that's a good one!

> but why would a refinery have a nuke plant?

What I meant was to have the transmitter *at*
an automated nuclear plant. But then, why would
you have a manually-keyed radiotelegraphy
transmitter at a nuclear power plant - to stay
in touch with the uranium mine in the wilds of
the Belgian Congo?

I guess there really does have to be a willing
suspension of disbelief to make the multi-billion-
dollar film industry work - as LHA noted.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona
...-.-

2589. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 16:54:07 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <PIAy8.53710$QC1.3896750@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41857

> We'll let the geezers with lumbago keep 95% for earthquake
> preparedness, and we'll turn over 5% of the bands below
> 222MHz to pioneers to tinker with something new and
> exciting for *this* century.

Yeah, but you need the geezers with their lumbago (and
earthquake preparedness) to provide the *content* for
the new and exciting modes and systems. After all,
these new media will be unproven as to robustness under
conditions of lumbago discussion until sufficient
operating history is accumulated to provide confidence
in the reliability statistics out to at least the
3-sigma point. No, lumbago will have to be permitted
in that other 5% of the allocations so that any new mode
can be fully validated.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2590. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 17:23:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEEAA0A.A5E7012C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41859

K0HB wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> >
> > You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward"
> > nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere,
> > just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a
> > joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet
> > radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended
> > widespread interest in the mode.
> >
>
> In other words, we could have used a better packet system?

We would have *had* a better system if all the store-and-forward idiots
hadn't chased off all the sensible users.
Some of you seem to blithely assume that technology will solve all
problems and salve all wounds. But it can't place gray matter in the
empty space between the ears of the vacant eyed, nor can it undo the
damage caused by those same induhviduals.

2591. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 17:23:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEEAD2D.84D6BDBB@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41860

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3BEE7A70.83D29CCC@townsqr.com...
> >
> > I hope you know that on 20 meters the skip zone normally starts within a
> few
> > miles. (If you had done much mobile work you'd know it) It's very much a
> > possibility that they were far enough away from each other that they did
> need
> > higher power to make the desired communication. And if you happened be
> > positioned where you were off the side of their yagis which very easily
> could
> > have all been pointed east and west, you were in a deep null, and it's
> very
> > much a possibility or even a likelihood that they never heard any hint of
> your
> > low powered signal. In the Orlando area there are almost certainly small
> lots
> > and antenna size limitations, so it is entirely possibile they didn't
> have
> > antennas for bands lower in frequency than 20 meters.
> >
> > Yet you automatically brand them as "LIDS" with no knowledge, only your
> > preconceived notions of their situations and what they were doing. You
> just
> > heard them talk about amps and yagis and "ASS-UMED".
> >
> > This is why the FCC virtually never attempts to enforce the rule on
> minimum
> > power needed to complete the desired communication. Most of the time it is
> > virtually impossible for anyone to determine with accuracy that the rule
> is
> > actually being violated. But you try.
>
> Dick,
>
> Using high power on 20m to talk across town (expecially when you can
> actually SEE the antenna of at least one of the other stations), is simply
> BAD PRACTICE ... such communications can and should be conducted
> on something like 2m simplex, rather than blasting an HF band with
> world-wide propagation with little regard for your effects on others.
>
> You can try to excuse the behavior all you want because you dislike

> the complaintant (me), but that doesn't change the fact that the behavior
> is bad practice. Even an "Extra light" like me knows better.

IF that's all there is to the situation, I certainly agree. My point is that you are doing exactly what you always do- make false assumptions with too little knowledge and information. If two of them could see each others antennas, the third could have been at the edge of the skip zone requiring all three to run higher power to complete the desired communication and the yagi scenario could easily apply.
And demanding they do it on some other band is lame. Remember, there is NO requirement for hams to own any particular station equipment whatever. Maybe one of them doesn't have a two meter station.
Such situations occur all the time on HF. No doubt many or even most are preventable, but which ones? FCC knows there's no practical way to determine.

2592. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 17:23:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEEAD5C.5655861A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41861

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3BEE063D.D650A13D@townsqr.com...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
> >
> > I wouldn't. He's a FCC employee, but he's also an active ham. Wouldn't
> surprise me
> > if he wants to keep up on things in many different ways.
>
> TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, Mr. Cross does NOT read r.r.a.p.

Which means you don't know.

2593. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 17:23:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEEB439.CB036D19@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41862

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3BEE063D.D650A13D@townsqr.com...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
> >
> > I wouldn't. He's a FCC employee, but he's also an active ham. Wouldn't
> surprise me
> > if he wants to keep up on things in many different ways.
>
> TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, Bill does NOT read r.r.a.p.
>
> First, usenet has a (bad) reputation. *We* argue points here for the sake
> of discussion (and perhaps to win converts to our point of view from the
> nearly constant flow of newcomers)
>

So he is never apprised of anything that goes on here. Sure. Ignoring all
this just makes it go away.

>
> Second, Bill is tasked with occasionally making determinations of what
> best serves the public interest and the Commission's public policy goals
> and legitimate regulatory interests. If it's not in the public record
> (comments, etc. filed with the FCC), it simply doesn't count for anything.

Wrong. If it doesn't reside between his ears it doesn't count for anything. As
has been noted many times already, there is no obligation for FCC to
"consider" anything, or if it is considered, to give it any weight. That
decision is his to make, subject only to overrule should he make some really
blatant faux paux. In the regulatory environment of the day Political
Correctness gets at least as much consideration as any other factor. If you
don't believe that he knows all about that, dream on. He is after all a public
employee, and though the Commission is nominally "independent", you can be
sure that they WILL pay attention to the desires of the elected. One word from
some elected individual -for whatever reason- is enough to "make things
happen". The much demanded proof? Try the Medical Waivers.

>
> (So why would he waste his valuable time reading things
> that he can't legally or ethically consider in forming FCC rules?)
>
> And again, the idea that Bill would be "afraid" that I might call him

> a "Luddite" is perhaps the funniest thing I've heard in years.
>

Fear has nothing to do with it, and if you don't know what DOES, you're even dumber than you've shown yourself to be.

2594. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 17:23:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEEC18D.23EF9E46@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41863

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3BEE1959.679C2719@townsqr.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3AE7AC57.254086EC@townsqr.com...
> > > > I certainly have no argument with any of that and have repeatedly said
> as
> > > much. Why
> > > > do you join Carl in insisting I do?
> > >
> > > WHEN have you said anything like that, Dick? You're the one who's
> > > always saying, in effect, "Don't need any improvements in technology."
> > >
> >
> > Well Buddy, I hate to bust your bubble but we DON'T "need" them! But you
> do
> > only SSB on ham radio, so you already know that!
>
> Once again, Dick, you have no way of knowing what I do (or don't do)
> on ham radio, nor what I may be working on "in the lab."
>

You seem to do a fair job of describing your "activities". And of avoiding any questions about them that wouldn't show you in the light your desire. Nuff said.

And if you really believe we desperately "need" your sky pie dream gear, kindly inform us all as to WHY and WHAT FOR. To please a couple people in DC?? yeah, right.

>
> > >
> > > Just today, you claimed that it was "unnecessary and irrational" to
> > > prefer a 56k circuit for receiving a picture, compared to something
> > > else (which you implied would be much slower).
> > >
> >
> > Of course the context was HAM RADIO, and HF in particular. But you already
> know
> > that.
>
> So your assertion is that ham radio, must, of necessity always be grossly
> limited and backward compared to "the real world." Yes, I've seen

> you express that view on many occasions.

Again, give us a good description of the circumstances surrounding the need for hams to have instantly available a 56k instant graphics circuit on ham radio. To show disaster damage? You'd better get your butt on the scene FAST, the SKY-3 News chopper will have you scooped post haste. So I suppose we should all have broadcast quality video cameras and helicopters to fly them around with. Hey, gotta keep up with the "commercials", you know! Sounds to me like more sky pie.

Oh, it isn't a bad idea, just another of those "great" things that will come to very little, like Slow Scan TV. Sure, there's a few hams using it. It's never been much more than a novelty, of course. How many photos can one pass around before the novelty wears off?

>
> > > > > Ham radio has value without new technologies, but if it had adopted
> your
> > > > > attitude in 1914, it would not exist today.
> > > > >
> > > > > Nonsense! The early days of radio desperately needed all the technical
> > > improvement
> > > > > they could get and they did get it. Today is a different situation
> > > entirely, and
> > > > > surely you know that.
> > > >
> > > What? In the early days we needed technical improvement, but today is a
> > > different situation entirely????? Do you even REALIZE what you just
> said?
> >
> > **OF COURSE** I realize what I said!!! And it is 100% accurate!!!
> > I should have realized it would be asking far too much of you to expect
> you to
> > know any history of radio.
>
> While I'm not a nostalgia/history buff like Jim, I'm not totally ignorant of
> the
> history of amateur radio, either (and I am a member of QCWA) ... but the
> point is STILL that YOUare asserting that "in the early days we needed
> technical improvement, but today is a different situation entirely."
>

Read it again, this time for meaning, not to develop your prejudices. If you don't comprehend the vast differences between early radio and the equipment of today you're due some REAL education. The rig I first put on the air in the early spring of '57, crude as it was, was a few orders of magnitude better than the average beginners rig of the early years. The invention of the triode vacuum tube followed shortly by the development of the sensitive regenerative detector finally cured "coherer" receivers of their previous characteristic deafness. And what I have sitting on the desk now is just about that far ahead of the '57 rig. And it really doesn't need any help at all. So yes, indeed, the early days desperately needed all the improvement they could get, and today we really do

not. Hey, if it chaps your cheeks, learn to live with it, that's reality.

>
> EXCUSE ME, but we STILL need technical improvement ... it's one of
> our reasons for being ... and being satisfied with things that were novel
> 50 years (or much more) ago is NOT the way one "advances the radio art"
> or "maintains a pool of (competent, useful) trained technicians and
> electronics experts."

I never have said that improvement isn't a good thing, nor that newer, better modes won't be beneficial in the long run, all that is obvious. But this incessant demand that we DO something high tech, all the while handing out Extra class tickets on the strength of an "Extra in a Day" school just doesn't compute. If you can't find a serious conflict of purpose here you should take off the blinders.

>
>
> Sorry, Dick ... you are incurably clueless.
>

I don't need a clue, I have the solution. If you ever find your own clue let us know.

2595. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 17:49:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aaeogi$a4v$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41864

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020427004852.04302.00001030@mb-bh.aol.com...
> In article <aad3apreg1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020426204552.21592.00000880@mb-fa.aol.com...
> >> In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
> >(Dennis
> >> Ferguson) writes:
> >>
> >> ><Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>> OOK CW is simply turning on, turning off a carrier wave. It barely
> >> >>> fits into the same bandwagon as "digital modes."
> >> >>>
> >> >>> If it pleases you to think of OOK CW as "digital," enjoy.
> >> >>
> >> >>Len, that's what two-state digital gates do - turn on and off.
> >> >
> >> >It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
> >> >used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
> >> >OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
> >> >are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
> >> >International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
> >> >is 0 encoding.
> >
> >Yea, and we sent multiple signals at the same time using
> >different "colors" (i.e. different optical wavelengths).
>
> Errr...Bill, you were starting off with "my" quote and it was Dennis'
> you are quoting. :-)
>
> Present-day use of different optical wavelength is fairly well
> limited to only two main spectral lines. One of them is the
> "pump" energy that causes the amplification (increase in
> optical signal) of the other wavelength.

The company I work for sends multiple wavelengths
in the same fibre now. Our 400G product can have
40 different wavelengths (colors) each operating at
10Gig (10x40 = 400G). That product is several years old and
is able to now carry 1.6T of total throughput.

This is, of course, the domain of carriers and not the
local delivery to individual customers. The 400G/800G/1.6T
equipment is typically set up in a ring architecture between
multiple cities. A typical ring might be NYC, Philadelphia,
Washington DC, Pittsburg and back to NYC. A break
in the ring and the traffic is simply routed around the ring
in the other direction.

> That's a quantum
> physics effect that has no electronic analogue. It also means
> that very long undersea fiber comm cables do not need any
> repeater-amplifiers along the undersea (or underground) run.

Yu are quite correct that undersea fiber routes add a whole
set of additional issues because of the inability to easily
access repeaters if they fail. Undersea routes require
VERY high reliability.

> So far, the ITU-R limits allocations at about 300 GHz. Anything
> above that is free game. 200 THz is quite a bit above the 300
> GHz allocation limit. :-)
>
> At 4 GBPS rate, you can have over 30 video channels or 50,000
> POTS circuits or any combination thereof (and other types) all
> on that single "color" (main spectral line).

Agreed. And then, as I described above, we take the individual
"color" and mux it together with other colors (i.e. wavelengths).
We do that quite routinly for terrestial routes where repeaters can be
easily placed for maintenance access and repair access.

> The main limitation
> is not the fiber run but the terminal equipment to sort out all those
> different signals.

Agree completely. It also then involves repeater and amplifier
placements.

> Right now about 120 TV channels and 40 music-voice-only
> channels are coursing down an ordinary coax cable in my
> neighborhood over AT&T broadband service. A little "set-top"
> box does the tuning and decoding. Beautiful S/N, no snow,
> no noise all channels.

Yep...buy for clarification, my comments are directed at the
carrier level, not the "last mile" of delivery technology.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2596. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 17:56:38 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <qDBy8.9133$8p3.775437@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41865

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Some of you seem to blithely assume that technology will solve all
> problems and salve all wounds.

I don't know who this "some of you" are. I make no such assumption, and haven't made any such claim here. I haven't asked anyone to change their preferred "ham radio lifestyle", and I won't.

All I have suggested is that the ARRL "refarming" proposal is poorly conceived, and advanced the notion that perhaps those little reservations might make a good place for pioneers and experimenters. You seem to hold that notion in some disdain. That puzzles me.

73, Hans, K0HB

2597. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:06:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aaepmcuap1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41866

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020427120721.09489.00000900@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <aad6b1$4dt$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >> In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
> >(Dennis
> >> Ferguson) writes:
> >>
> >> >It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
> >> >used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
> >> >OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
> >> >are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
> >> >International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
> >> >is 0 encoding.
> >> >
> >> Interesting.
> >>
> >> It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of
> >> commercial fixed point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or
> >> other radiated-RF means today. And the percentage is dropping.
> >
> >I'd be surprised if it was even 10% at all.
>
> Your info is probably more current than mine, Bill.
> Note that by specifying
> "fixed point-to-point", we exclude such uses as cellphones.

Agreed.

> >> The real communications revolution of the past 20 years has been fiber
> >optics.
> >> Both the internet and lowcost long distance telephones are largely made
> >> possible by the fiber revolution. Fiber optics offer enormous
bandwidth,
> >
> >1.6T (i.e. 1.6 Terrabits/sec capacity for a single fibre is available
today)
>
> And if you need another 1.6T, just pull another fibre through the duct.

In reality the fiber is already there. Typically a multi-fiber
cable is run with spare fibers then available for growth of

capacity.

> >> low time delay,
> >
> >The time delay for fibre (i.e. speed of light in the fibre)
> >isn't any better (actually its worse) than RF in space or cable.
> >The advantage of less delay is only in comparison to
> >satellite connections which include 50,000 miles of space propogation vs
> >perhaps only 10,000 miles of terrestial connectivity.
>
> You are correct, sir! I should have specified the comparison between
> geosynchronous satellite link vs. fibre optic more clearly
>
> And all comms through a geosynchronous satellite is subject to the
> 50,000 mile delay, regardless of terrestrial distance covered.

Agree completely.

> >> high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune to RFI,
> >> EMI and EMP. Fibers can be installed anywhere copper cables can go - on
> >> poles underground, and under the sea. Terrestrial microwave and
satellites
> >> satellites simply cannot compete except in special situations.
> >>
> >> From a historical point of view, we have come full circle.
> >>
> >> The first telecom revolution was the widespread acceptance of the
electric
> >> telegraph about 150 years ago. Before then, almost all information
> >> travelled only as fast as transportation could carry a messenger or
letter.
> >> Communications facilities available to President Andrew Jackson had
more
> >> in common with those available to Julius Casear than they did with
those
> >> available to President Abraham Lincoln.
> >>
> >> The telegraph conquered most of the land area in Western developed
> >> countries then proceeded to cross the oceans.
> >> Radio was hampered in its early development because it was
> >> at first considered merely a telegraph system without wires. It
> >> took years to get the term "radio" accepted universally instead of
> >> "wireless telegraphy" or simply "wireless".
> >>
> >> Yet everything old is new again.
> >> Fiber optics has more in common with the
> >> telegraph than with radio.
> >> Many fibers follow railroad rights-of-way, just as the
> >> telegraph did. As Dennis points out, the signaling method used
> >> on the fibers is on-off keying.
> >>

> >> And the companies selling us new radio technology call it "wireless"
> >> as if it's a new term.
> >
> >Wireless is relatively new to the current "end user" of the service.
>
> In the USA, anyway. Just a matter of the
> marketing folks recycling an old term.
>
> The results are often confounding, however,
> as some end users don;t realize
> they are using radios when they use a
> cellphone or cordless phone.

And then they want complete privacy too...
so have congress make it illegal to listen :-) :-)

> >We have
> >actually flipped the use of RF vs hard wiring (fibre). In the past,
> >wireless (radio) was depended on for long distance and everything
> >local was wired.
> >
> >Today, wireless is a huge growth area with the "wireless" involving
> >the connection from user (i.e. cellphone) to a base unit and
> >the rest of the connectivity is then all "hard wired" via fibre.
>
> Good point! The result is that most of the distance is covered by
> fiber and the "last mile" by RF.

Exactly. Many people have now found they get all the
service they need with greater flexibility using only
a cellphone. One of the baby bells actually
incurred a negative growth of their hard wired
(i.e. traditional POTS) access lines during 2001.
(FYI - POTS, for those unfamiliar with the acronym
stands for Plain Old Telephone Service).

> But even that is changing. How long
> before we see each home or business wired
> ("fibred"?) with its own direct optical
> connection to the infrastructure, with
> the end user providing whatever
> terminal equipment is needed for voice
> telephone, data, entertainment, etc.?
> One fibre will do all that and much more.

I agree. The hold-up is and has been the cost of deploying
separate fibers then to each individual home, especially
in residential and rural areas.

> >> Doing techno-prediction is a risky game,
> >> but if current trends continue, RF's
> >> communications role will change

> >> drastically in the years to come. Cheap and
> >> universal fiber communication will replace
> >> RF in all but mobile/portable applications and specialties
> >> like the military, hams and the developing world.
> >>
> >> Just my opinion.
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Good overview. I injected a couple of things above for
> >clarity.
>
> They are greatly appreciated, Bill.

Sure beats reading about definitions :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2598. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:14:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aaerbouon1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41876

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020427004850.04302.00001028@mb-bh.aol.com...
> In article <20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
(Dennis
> >Ferguson) writes:
> >
> >>It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
> >>used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
> >>OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
> >>are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
> >>International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
> >>is 0 encoding.
> >>
> >Interesting.
> >
> >It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of commercial
> >fixed point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or other radiated-RF means
> >today. And the percentage is dropping.
>
> ...and your source for this?
>
> >The real communications revolution of the past 20 years has been fiber
optics.
> >Both the internet and lowcost long distance telephones are largely made
> >possible by the fiber revolution. Fiber optics offer enormous bandwidth,
low
> >time delay, high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune to
> >RFI, EMI and EMP. Fibers can be installed anywhere copper cables can go -
on
> >poles, underground, and under the sea. Terrestrial microwave and
satellites
> simply
> >cannot compete except in special situations.
>
> Some points not considered -
>
> While the fiber itself is immune to known radiation threats, the
> terminus of the fiber is NOT immune. There terminals of the
> fiber circuit link are electronic and therefore require RFI, EMI,
> EMP shielding (as needed). While military electronics is

> designed to withstand EMP, very little of commercial terminal
> electronics is so designed.

True, but those terminal boxes aren't located just anywhere.
They are usually in telephone company "central offices"
where RFI, etc. can be controlled better. They are
in cabinets for NEBS compliance, etc.

> Optical fiber cables are as susceptible to physical damage in
> their cable lay as copper-conductor cables.

True. But neither Jim nor I have said they weren't.

> "Optical pumping" of certain optical fiber material eliminates the
> need for amplifiers to bring the normally-quite-lossy (by comparison
> to copper) signal levels up above the noise. That is a distinct
> advantage over copper-conductor circuits.

Agreed.

> You CANNOT take advantage of long optical fiber circuits without
> being able to digitize the signal to be sent. That means digital
> electronics, high-speed A/D and D/A multiplexers, something
> totally foreign to the analog-only OOK CW ham.

Agreed. I think the original "anaology" was the simple
applicaption of OOK CW (not the character encoding).
Be it light or othersise, the digital bits (1s and 0s) are
simply on and off light pulses.

> The typical throughput on the UK-through-Med-around-India-
> around-SE Asia to Japan undersea optical fiber cable is 4 GBPS
> in two circuits. That bit rate alone is twice as high as highest-
> band ready-built off-the-shelf ham equipment.

Agreed. And I know of many other "rings" that far
exceed 4 Gig.

> >From a historical point of view, we have come full circle.
>
> From already-known history of communications, you are going
> around in circles. Some points -
>
> >The first telecom revolution was the widespread acceptance of the
electric
> >telegraph about 150 years ago. Before then, almost all information
travelled
> >only as fast as transportation could carry a messenger or a letter.
>
> No. OPTICAL semaphore systems were already in use in
> Europe and the UK for about two centuries before. That was
> on land. Various forms of flag and torch (night) were in use
> ship-to-ship.

Good point. And the American Indians used smoke signals.

> >Communications facilities available to President Andrew Jackson had more
in
> >common with those available to Julius Casear than they did with those
> >available to President Abraham Lincoln.
>
> Neither Julius Caesar nor Orange Julius was president of the
> USA. Please try to confine your analogues to some common
> geography.

Picky picky.

> >The telegraph conquered most of the land area in Western developed
countries,
> >then proceeded to cross the oceans. Radio was hampered in its early
> >development because it was at first considered merely a telegraph system
> >without wires.
>
> Early radio WAS nothing more than "a telegraph system without
> wires."
>
> Early radio could ONLY communicate by on-off coding schemes.
> Radio needed the vacuum tube to communicate an analog signal
> that was not on-off.
>
> The very early Fessenden "AM" experiment was with a rotary
> VLF generator using a water-cooled microphone.
>
> AM and even SSB were actually pioneered ON wire circuits.
>
> >It took years to get the term "radio" accepted universally instead of
> "wireless
> >telegraphy" or simply "wireless".
>
> Don't quibble over certain words which are geographic and
> ethnocentric.
>
> The first accepted radio communication occurred in 1896. The
> first US radio regulatory agency was created in 1912. That's a
> span of only 16 years for "acceptance." From essentially nothing
> to having a government agency regulating it is a quite rapid
> "acceptance."
>
> >Yet everything old is new again. Fiber optics has more in common with the
> >telegraph than with radio.
>
> Ignorant nonsense. At 4 GBPS bit rate, MANY THOUSANDS
> of separate communication circuits can coexist without
> interference. That includes ANY mode desired...simple POTS
> to already-time-multiplexed whatevers to video channels.
> Whatever mix is desired. No problem. The "telegraph" couldn't

> possibly come close to such throughput.
>
> >Many fibers follow railroad rights-of-way, just as the telegraph did.
>
> Sorry, wrong again. The optical fiber cable runs have the same
> physical characteristics as copper-conductor cable runs. MOST
> cable runs are underground or under water. Both types, optical
> or copper. In addition, both types can be elevated on poles or
> use terminal equipment to transfer signals to RF/microwave links
> for economically-infeasible geographic obstacles.
>
> The old telegraph lines couldn't possibly be installed with as much
> physical versatility as optical fiber cable circuits.
>
> >As Dennis points out, the signaling method used on the
> >fibers is on-off keying.
>
> That was a slightly-sarcastic commentary on OOK.
>
> Let's look at the circuit throughput at 4 GBPS on a single
> optical fiber run. Assume, for worst-case conditions, 20 bits
> for an analogue of any signal being sampled (that includes
> framing and synchronization). That allows a Nyquist-sample
> maximum of 200 MHz for the full bandwidth. That full bandwidth
> can be time-multiplexing of up to 30 video channels or 50
> thousand POTS (Plain Old Telephone System) circuits.
>
> The throughput of a modern optical fiber cable circuit is so
> much faster than plain old (very old) telegraphy that it shouldn't
> even be done by any thinking communicator-engineer.
>
> >And the companies selling us new radio technology call it "wireless" as
if
> >it's a new term.
>
> It is, but you are just quibbling on old-fashioned word use. The
> present-day electronic industry use of WIRELESS is an outgrowth
> of applying short-range radio links to LANs (Local Area Networks).
> That resulted in the WLAN or Wireless Local Area Network. That
> also required some regulated EM spectrum allocation which, in
> turn, allowed such things as digital cordless telephones, and a
> great many different control and measuring appliances. The
> "bluetooth" short-range radio control/measure/linkage system is a
> good example of modern electronics that is in the broad industry
> category of "wireless." There are three other "wireless" linkage
> standards vying for acceptance.
>
> >Doing techno-prediction is a risky game, but if current trends continue,
RF's
> >communications role will change drastically in the years to come.

>
> Why are you so behind the times?!?
>
> ALREADY, at the end of last year, one in four US citizens was a
> subscriber to a cellular telephone. Hello? A cellphone is a little
> two-way radio that is tied into the telephone system. Is 80 MILLION
> cellphone subscriptions enough to indicate any revolution in
> personal communications?!? There are OVER 300 million cellphone
> subscribers in the world NOW.
>
> The only "limitation" on geosynchronous communications satellites
> is the "space parking lot" is already, repeat ALREADY, full. In
> North America, there are no less than 56 commsats in geo-sync
> orbits visible to the 48 contiguous states, 58 commsats counting
> Alaska and Hawaii. Have you checked out the circuit capability of
> those birds? That was as of last summer (and the press run of
> the neat little Blonder-Tongue CATV reference book).
>
> Have you felt any pulse of the microwave radio industry? I doubt
> it. It is going full-bore on NON-cellular-phone applications. If you
> do some cross-country driving you can SEE the dishes. You can
> also see all the antennas which are NOT amateur, not cellphone,
> used for all sorts of communications.
>
> > Cheap and
> >universal fiber communication will replace RF in all but mobile/portable
> >applications and specialties like the military, hams and the developing
> >world.
> >
> >Just my opinion.
>
> Yes, we know. We also know that you aren't any Thomas White
> as historian of radio. We KNOW that you champion OOK CW on
> HF...and probably oil those old Greenlee chassis punches every
> year in hopes of reinventing radio with tubes and things.
>
> Start reading some periodicals besides ham magazines. There's a
> whole world of RADIO out there that has developed, still developing,
> and no end in sight for either fiber or radio communications.
> Look and learn. Some of the techniques may be applicable to
> amateur radio.

2599. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:16:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAEAFE.15AFF3C7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41867

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Larry, it is abundantly apparent that the basic problem was equating Morse code
> > skill with knowledge of electronics.
>
> Clear to you code haters. Not to anyone else. The qualifications were and are
> separate parts of the whole.

Nope, the qualifications were *inseparable* parts of the whole. The Morse code exam and the theory exam were given equal pass/fail weights. That's why you concluded that Morse code was as important as everything else in ham radio combined and based your self esteem on it. Tain't so. CW is just one of many modes, is my favorite mode, and I certainly don't hate it. What I hate is to see you worshiping Morse code as if it were a religion that admits hams into seventh heaven after cleansing them white as snow.

> You may get far more negative response than you wished.

So did Galileo, but he was right. Time to face up to the fact that you have lost your King of the Mountain status but continue to beat that dead horse.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2600. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:19:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAEBC4.4C3542A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41869

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > I was cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC
> > SEND AND RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!
>
> This must be some kind of proof that you have more time in the chow hall.
> Besides, the M28s were junked a quarter of a century ago. Even hams don't
> want them anymore.

I saw one at a hamfest a few years ago. It had a sign on it, "FREE!", and
nobody wanted it. Do you think Dick would have flown to AZ to get it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2601. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:20:27 UTC
From: K0HB <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <LZBy8.9157$8p3.776365@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41868

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Present-day use of different optical wavelength is fairly well
> limited to only two main spectral lines.
>

That statement is out of date by at least a decade. Using tunable lasers and WDM technology, multiple spectral lines can be used, simultaneously in a single fiber. Some representative products from our company can be found at the URL's below.

http://www6.adc.com/ecom/hier?NODE=OND55452
http://www6.adc.com/ecom/hier?NODE=OND55404
http://www6.adc.com/ecom/MyFile/OND67478/WidelyTunableEdgeEmitters.pdf

73, de Hans, K0HB

2602. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:22:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAEC50.C8726CE4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41871

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Larry's problem is not his ability to send good Morse, but his attitude
> towards those "knuckle-draggers" (his term, not mine) who don't exhibit
> his propensity towards the mode.

Well, he's probably right. Someone who drags his knuckles for very long
wouldn't have a very pretty fist. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2603. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:24:49 UTC
From: ---===Thomas Wang===--- <Thomas.Wang@IamTRASHerzol.net>
Message-ID: <fdplcuskd8s9c2epq1974s2vi02a67om2a@4ax.com>
Source record: 41870
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

On 26 Apr 2002 23:46:57 GMT, Mysterian2001@alt.net (Mysterian) was
delightful enough to say:

>In http://www.cnn.com/2002/LAW/04/26/death.penalty.order/index.html, a
>federal judge has finally seen the barbaric wrongness of the US death
>penalty and said that he may outlaw it.
>
>Jesus moves in mysterious ways. I will pray that this Christian judge
>prevails.

Anything that kills lots and lots of americans can't be all bad.

2604. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:26:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAED55.9978708A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41872

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Even an "Extra light" like me knows better.

You know, Carl, I kinda like the title, "Extra Lite", as opposed to
those earlier, "Extra Heavy", type (fat) hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2605. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:28:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAEDC9.585B57DE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41873

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> And again, the idea that Bill would be "afraid" that I might call him
> a "Luddite" is perhaps the funniest thing I've heard in years.

With all that power at your command, you must have to be extra careful.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2606. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:31:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAEE7A.93BF717E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41874

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Sorry, Dick ... you are incurably clueless.

Dick probably thinks that "advancing the radio art" is painting
a picture of a 75A-4. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2607. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:35:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAEF73.7CEF1747@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41875
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

K0HB wrote:
> A long and wicked life followed by five minutes of perfect grace gets you
> into Heaven. An equally long life of decent living and good works followed
> by one outburst of taking the name of the lord in vain-- then have a heart
> attack at that moment and be damned for eternity. Is that the system?

Southern Baptists can't fall from grace. For us it's "Once Saved, Always
Saved!" So I got saved when I was eight years old and have been having
a ball ever since.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2608. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 18:41:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCAF0F6.679E0999@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41877

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I don't need a clue, I have the solution.

Too bad the FCC disagrees with you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2609. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154119.01569.00000550@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41878

In article <dWwy8.756$qn5.32573775@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> We all know you are one of the best 1930s radio amateurs to
>> exist in the year 2002...except you seem to be a total technical
>> moron on how anything but on-off keying works.
>>
>> Now go hock another loogie in your splatoo duties while
>> specializing your paratransit.
>
>Len, len, len. Now he'll be spitting on his patrons and claim you made him
>do it. You gotta cut this stuff out.

I know. I so bad. :-)

I confess to an errant mental picture of a soma come loud ex-USAF non-commissioned OFFICER leading his Splatoon into the paper battle, waving his little Lionel Train J-38 and yelling "Follow me, this is 1935, do ya wanna live forever?!?"

It's just sooooo hard to resist. :-)

2610. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154121.01569.00000551@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41883

In article <20020427120721.09489.00000900@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <aad6b1$4dt$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com...
>>> In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
>>(Dennis
>>> Ferguson) writes:
>>>
>>> >It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
>>> >used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
>>> >OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
>>> >are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
>>> >International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
>>> >is 0 encoding.
>>> >
>>> Interesting.
>>>
>>> It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of commercial
>>fixed
>>> point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or other radiated-RF means
>>> today. And the percentage is dropping.
>>
>>I'd be surprised if it was even 10% at all.
>
>Your info is probably more current than mine, Bill. Note that by specifying
>"fixed point-to-point", we exclude such uses as cellphones.
>>
>>> The real communications revolution of the past 20 years has been fiber
>>optics.
>>> Both the internet and lowcost long distance telephones are largely made
>>> possible by the fiber revolution. Fiber optics offer enormous bandwidth,
>>
>>1.6T (i.e. 1.6 Terrabits/sec capacity for a single fibre is available today)
>
>And if you need another 1.6T, just pull another fibre through the duct.

You are mixing the optical CARRIER frequency with the information
transfer rate in bits per second. The existing high rate in information
transfer maximum in use is about 4 Gigabits per second

The optical "carrier" is in the below-IR to red in the visible
spectrum with wavelengths roughly in the 1000 to 700 nanometer
range. That varies depending on the optical fiber characteristics.

>>
>>> low time delay,
>>
>>The time delay for fibre (i.e. speed of light in the fibre)
>>isn't any better (actually its worse) than RF in space or cable.
>>The advantage of less delay is only in comparison to
>>satellite connections which include 50,000 miles of space propogation vs
>>perhaps only 10,000 miles of terrestial connectivity.
>
>You are correct, sir! I should have specified the comparison between
>geosynchronous satellite link vs. fibre optic more clearly

You should have, but didn't. Bad engineering practices! Tsk.

The geosync orbit is about 22 kilomiles up from the equator.
Some simple trigonometry will handle the average slant range.
Depending on the commsat in use, you might have a two-way
path as long as 100 kilomiles.

>And all comms through a geosynchronous satellite is subject to the 50,000
>mile delay, regardless of terrestrial distance covered.

No. It varies depending on which commsat is used and your
geographic position on the surface.

Don't worry, the commercial folks already anticipated that and
were developing echo-cancelling techniques over two decades
ago. Those handle the wide range of delays.

>>Wireless is relatively new to the current "end user" of the service.
>
>In the USA, anyway. Just a matter of the marketing folks recycling an old
>term.

Only if they are Anglophiles. In common English-speaking use,
the term "wireless" had been out of date for about three decades.
It came back only to differentiate between wired digital systems
and RF-linked digital systems.

>The results are often confounding, however, as some end users don;t realize
>they are using radios when they use a cellphone or cordless phone.

That's only part of the situation. MOST users don't care one way
or the other for nomenclature and don't bother with it. To them
(one out of four citizens in US is a cell subscriber) it is just "the
phone" or the "cellphone."

Few long-time HF ditty boppers have grasped the concept of over
100 million L-band MICROWAVE TRANSCEIVERS in use daily
by "unqualified" citizens who don't, won't, or can't do morse.
Think of it...L-band, 1 to 2 GHz...Microwaves. There's no way in

this planet where vacuum tube technology can provide a cell phone
or a cordless phone in today's common-use form factor. There's
no way you can provide the security or the time-division
multiplexing without using digital techniques.

You are also forgetting about keyless-entry systems, short-range
VHF-to-UHF emitters coming into common use on automobiles,
wireless simple networking of computers in home and small office
environments, the Bluetooth RF links for everything from cordless
earphone-mike adapters for cellphones to short-range wireless
CATV and other security devices.

>>We have
>>actually flipped the use of RF vs hard wiring (fibre). In the past,
>>wireless (radio) was depended on for long distance and everything local was
>>wired. Today, wireless is a huge growth area with the "wireless" involving
>>the connection from user (i.e. cellphone) to a base unit and
>>the rest of the connectivity is then all "hard wired" via fibre.
>
>Good point! The result is that most of the distance is covered by fiber and
>the "last mile" by RF.

Then both of you are exhibiting some optical myopia on cell sites.
Next time start counting the microwave antennas which may be
the only link from a cell site to a central office. Neither are all
microwave "dishes" used for cellphone site linkage...there are
many other services for communications not involving connection
to the telephone system. Those include everything from private
multichannel microwave systems to studio-transmitter links for
broadcasting and pipeline telemetry along pipeline rights of way
(one of the first uses of multi-channel microwave systems 50
years ago).

>But even that is changing. How long before we see each home or business wired
>("fibred"?) with its own direct optical connection to the infrastructure,
>with the end user providing whatever terminal equipment is needed for voice
>telephone, data, entertainment, etc.? One fibre will do all that and much
>more.

That sounds like cribbing from an AT&T Broadband ad flyer.

If you can't understand Bluetooth, consider "HomePlug" which
does NOT use new wires or new optical connections. It does
its thing through the AC mains wiring that already exists...at
relatively high data rates...and poses a threat to HF-only hams
everywhere.

HomePlug seems to be a "comer" in the commercial market-
place. If it catches on the only escape for the HF-afficionado
is true country living with no neighbors. [such a move will get
away from evil PRB and solve that problem...]

>>Good overview. I injected a couple of things above for clarity.
>
>They are greatly appreciated, Bill.

Miccolis isn't responding to my comments, either in public or in private. No matter. "The truth is out there" even if the "historian" wants to overlook most of the big issues yet still sound like an "authority" on communications.

<close with X-Files theme music>

2611. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154123.01569.00000553@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41880

In article <J1xy8.762$7t5.32872723@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020427004851.04302.00001029@mb-bh.aol.com...
>> In article <7sny8.329$S12.55694698@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
>Burke"
>> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
>> No problem. The NTSB would stay on the surface. Da Vinci's
>> "helicopter" had a vertical-axis screw. Wouldn't have created any
>> lift. Likewise Da Vinci's "ornithopter." :-)
>
>Who investigates airplane crashes?

Ace flyer Richard Chamberpot.

2612. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154123.01569.00000552@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41881

In article <20020427120719.09489.00000899@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3cca1d28_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
>writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20020424220651.26511.00000482@mb-fy.aol.com...
>>>
>>> I'm beginning to think the power limit thing should just be dropped. Allow
full
>>> power on all the subbands after reallocation to the experimental farm.
>>
>>Jim, NO, PLEASE ... anything worth developing won't require 1500 W pep.
>
>Then those who are developing the new modes won't use 1500 W.
>
>>Give the "brute force" boys an inch and they'll use both of them ... we want
>>and need to concentrate on "elegant" not "brute force."
>
>Sure. But the way to do that is not to force it on people.
>
>Dennis Ferguson's excellent posts have convinced me that there is no need for
>an APC rule in the "experimental farm" idea. Your experiences on 14.204
>confirmed that conviction.
>
>The proof is in the doing. The developers of PSK31 did not need high power to
>develop that mode. They did not need APC rules or a low power subband, either.
>All they DID need was some flexibility and encouragement. That's what the
>"experimental farm" is all about.

G3PLX, Peter Martinez, developed PSK31. It was designed to work
in the existing narrowband ITU-R HF amateur allocations.

The only "experimental farm" of the time of that development was
the UK's trial at their new LF band...which had no relationship to
PSK31 development.

Please post the technical reasons cited by G3PLX or the on-air
experimenters in Europe needed all that RF power. There's plenty
of information on the development of PSK31 *not* posted by the
ARRL (as if the ARRL had anything to do with it). Remember
that you are the "historian emeritus" of amateur radio and the
development is part of recent history.

>If you want APC rules, put that part in your comments to the FCC. I'm not
>going to. I think it's unnecessary.

Fine. We'll put you down as being in the HF Horsepower race.
You think it's okay to run a full gallon plus to talk across town
and everyone will think you are just a rogue CBer who loves CW.

2613. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154124.01569.00000555@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41879

In article <zdny8.299$4b1.18264316@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>Lets just bring it all under the microscope and try to make some meaning of it.
>
>> >> "If is for children, spinning daydreams". Did you petition the FCC to do that
>> >> way back then? If not, your just griping.
>> >
>> >And I thought you just said "If is for children..."
>>
>> Thee is correct. :-)
>
>I don't think Jim likes me.

You have a good summation there. :-)

2614. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154124.01569.00000554@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41886

In article <20020427082133.00489.00006221@mb-mj.aol.com>, Armflapper@aol.com (Richard Chamberpot) writes:

>>However, I'm still trying to decode "astronomics."
>
> Oooops...I made a mistake...meant "astronautics".
>
> See, Lennie...It isn't so hard to admit you made a mistake.

Poor baby. Life must be tough when you constantly make mistakes and typographical errors.

> Now, which radio service was created for "strictly recreational"
>purposes?

The creation of Part 95 has already been explained to you. Please listen closely and quit falling asleep in class.

2615. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154125.01569.00000556@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41885

In article <3CCACC9B.D2D011FE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> You deny that NCI is a conspiracy?
>
>"conspiracy - an evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan
>formulated in secret by two or more persons."
>
>What secret thing is NCI doing?

It must be that NCI has already punctured the imaginary
balloon of the virtual radio world in Dickie's head. It was
probably written up on his ASR28 hardcopy...except he
forgot to load up another paper roll. :-)

2616. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154126.01569.00000558@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41884

In article <3CCAC98D.63516C17@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> You dumbshit, you're so full of it your eyes have turned brown! I was
>> cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC SEND AND
>> RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!
>
>Time to get rid of that ASR, Dick. Computers are much better.

Now, now, Cecil, cut the guy some slack. Never mind that Model
19s (a Model 15 with a p-tape punch and reader) were used for
that same purpose before the 28s and the Model 40s did it after.
A Model 28 must have been very impressive in two-tone beige
and it ran at the fantastic rate of 100 WPM! Wowee!

I was "cutting message tapes" on Model 19s at a real live HF
station before the ASR28 expert was even picked on the draft.
Never got any 28s until later in civilian life and only briefly
tickled the keys on a big black 40 before going to video terminals.

>> You and Cecil are so damn stupid you are SURE that because I believe
>> hams should know how to use radiotelegraphy that's all I ever do or
>> ever did.
>
>Well, I was doing CW when you were still in diapers. (Too bad you
>were nine years old at the time.)

Potty training can be very traumatic to some youngsters. :-)

2617. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154126.01569.00000557@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41887

In article <3CCACB0D.1A419189@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> Show us where you can get 56k data rates within any reasonable
>> bandwidth on HF, much less within any rule the FCC might even
>> feasibly write. You can't do it. You're full of hot air and SSB.
>
>Uhhhhhhhh Dick, 56k data rates fit into the same bandwidth as SSB.
>Do you think the HF problems will never be solved?

Easy does it, Cecil. Dickie just recently learned that SSB uses
only half the bandwidth of AM. :-)

Meanwhile the ALE standards for HF communications were set
down about 8 years ago for handling HF comm amongst the
government and commercial users on HF and they've been
running all kinds of stuff on SSB with fine throughput.

Meanwhile a dozen assigned experimenters are busy investigating
the 60m band to see if it is "suitable" for radio amateurs. Hams
are busy working out the solutions already. They are making good
progress according to the Booth, Freret, and Imlay comment on
RM-10209. It looks promising for real, actual communications!
Just think...CW into the Carribbean area in 2001! Progress!

2618. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:41:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427154128.01569.00000559@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 41882

In article <3ccaaa4f_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3CCA0F06.9479820@worldnet.att.net...
>>
>>
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> >
>> > And, using the digital systems proposed in strawman form independently
>> ^^^^^^^^
>> > by Gary Coffman and myself more than 2 years ago, hundreds of digital
>> > signals at 20 wpm Morse equivalent transfer rates could coexist there
>...
>>
>> And we are all still looking at the patent office for the
>> Coffman system or the Stevenson System. How's the hardware
>> development going? ;-)
>>
>> 73,
>> Clay N4AOX
>
>Clay,
>
>Nothing jumps out at me from my recollection of Gary's proposal,
>or mine, that would likely be patentable ... there's the "obvious to
>anyone skilled in the art" aspect to patentability. That's part of
>the problem ... how they would work and the value of what
>Gary and I each proposed SHOULD have been obvious to many
>hams ... that that was NOT the case indicates that too many are
>NOT "skilled in the art." However, just because something may not
>be patentable, doesn't mean it's not "good stuff" with potentially high
>utility.

Carl, you have to understand some of the "qualifying judges."
They want something new published in QST with Reviews and
all the fine words, plus ready-built equipment on the HRO
store shelves before they "believe" it has merit. Sort of like an
FDA meat stamp proclaiming it is "grade A (for amateurs)."

They can memorize sales ads (in QST of course) verbatim,
quote them at length, argue about the sales phrases endlessly,
but can't delve into theory because they haven't learned much
beyond turning a carrier on or off with a Lionel Train key.

Terms that have subscripts on them (like ee-bee and en-oh)
seem to be dirty words unless some Name has written them
up in QST, the theory pre-digested for popular consumption.

Those "judges" are all terribly technically qualified through
fantastic ability at high-rate morsemanship.

>Frankly, I haven't done any development on that proposal ... first,
>I moved into a newly-constructed house and am still in the process
>of organizing the office, workshop, electronics lab, and ham shack.
>Second, the "We don't want no stinking, reliable digital systems, we
>LIKE to have to work hard to dig the weak ones out of the noise
>because we insist on using less capable methods." response here
>was, frankly so nauseatingly backward that it pushed that idea down
>the priority list a ways.

Some folks need to keep their hands busy turning analog knobs
and pulling imaginary on-offs through the noise...they can't be
bothered with evil digital techniques that they cannot comprehend.
They are already superbly qualified courtesy of that old-style
morsemanship skill with a federal merit badge to prove it.

>Other things at higher speeds and higher
>frequencies have been more on my mind lately, but I still have an
>interest in more capable HF digital systems.

While the gubmint and money-grubbing commercial radio services
are making strange noises on HF with ALE SSB circuits, the
technically-qualified long-timers are pushing the state of the HF
amateur art from 1935 all the way to 1937. That's progress! :-)

2619. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:52:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccb018c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41888

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEEAA0A.A5E7012C@townsqr.com...
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward"
> > > nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere,
> > > just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a
> > > joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet
> > > radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended
> > > widespread interest in the mode.
> > >
> >
> > In other words, we could have used a better packet system?
>
> We would have *had* a better system if all the store-and-forward idiots
> hadn't chased off all the sensible users.

Dick,

Please explain how the lack of message forwarding between
mailboxes would have "magically" converted the "sow's ear"
of Bell 202 AFSK modem tones through the mike/speaker
jack of 2m FM radios into the "purse" of a decent packet
radio system???

There's nothing inherently wrong with forwarding messages.
How do you think you see my postings here? Or get your
e-mail, for that matter?

The problem is that the SYSTEM (and I use the term VERY
loosely) did not have enough capacity to handle the traffic offered
and it choked and died as a result. Had better (faster) technology
been embraced and adopted on a large scale, packet radio would
still be interesting and useful ... in fact, moreso than in the very
early days ...

> Some of you seem to blithely assume that technology will solve all
> problems and salve all wounds. But it can't place gray matter in the
> empty space between the ears of the vacant eyed, nor can it undo the
> damage caused by those same induhviduals.

Technology could have solved the ills of packet radio, but too many
people like you were unwilling to even consider the need for something

better than 1200 baud AFSK (and too cheap to upgrade), so it essentially died because it became essentially unusable and boring compared to a dial-up internet connection.

You are right however, in one respect ... technology "can't place gray matter in the empty space between the ears of the vacant eyed, nor can it undo the damage caused by those same induhviduals."

It's really too bad that technology can't help you, but at least you don't have false hope.

Carl - wk3c

2620. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 19:56:46 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccb0284_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41889

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEEAD5C.5655861A@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3BEE063D.D650A13D@townsqr.com...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > >
> > > I wouldn't. He's a FCC employee, but he's also an active ham.
Wouldn't
> > surprise me
> > > if he wants to keep up on things in many different ways.
> >
> > TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, Mr. Cross does NOT read r.r.a.p.
>
> Which means you don't know.

Which means he's never commented on some of your lame
ideas during a lunchtime conversation or in any meetings
we've both attended at the FCC ...

I believe that he indicated once that he has better things to
do than observe the battles here, but I can't be 100% certain,
so I said "the the best of my knowledge."

Carl - wk3c

2621. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 20:09:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccb09b4_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41891

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEEB439.CB036D19@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3BEE063D.D650A13D@townsqr.com...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I would be very surprised if Mr. Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > >
> > > I wouldn't. He's a FCC employee, but he's also an active ham.
Wouldn't
> > surprise me
> > > if he wants to keep up on things in many different ways.
> >
> > TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, Bill does NOT read r.r.a.p.
> >
> > First, usenet has a (bad) reputation. *We* argue points here for the
sake
> > of discussion (and perhaps to win converts to our point of view from the
> > nearly constant flow of newcomers)
> >
>
> So he is never apprised of anything that goes on here. Sure. Ignoring all
> this just makes it go away.

I certainly don't brief him on the banter here ... besides, why WOULDN'T
he ignore it? The banter and fighting here have NOTHING to do with the
formal process prescribed for the FCC to establish and/or modify its rules.
r.r.a.p. is IRRELEVANT to the FCC process.

> > Second, Bill is tasked with occasionally making determinations of what
> > best serves the public interest and the Commission's public policy goals
> > and legitimate regulatory interests. If it's not in the public record
> > (comments, etc. filed with the FCC), it simply doesn't count for
anything.
>
> Wrong. If it doesn't reside between his ears it doesn't count for
anything. As
> has been noted many times already, there is no obligation for FCC to
> "consider" anything, or if it is considered, to give it any weight.

Actually, the Commission is obligated to *consider* all input from the
public comment/reply comment process that establishes "the record"

in a proceeding. What they are *not* required to do is to "buy into"
any particular argument ... in other words, they have the discretion to
consider, then reject, lame ideas like the ones you put forth here all
the time :-)

> That
> decision is his to make, subject only to overrule should he make some
really
> blatant faux paux.

That's not so ... Bill is not so autonomous as you seem to think ... he may
draft rules on some subject in response to a petition or whatever, but his
work must be reviewed and approved by quite a few layers of management
and then, ultimately, by the Commissioners before it becomes "law."

Your insinuations of less than dedicated public service by Bill and your
outright attacks on him are still TOTALLY unfounded and morally
reprehensible.

Carl - wk3c

2622. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 20:12:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCB0626.4305231A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41890

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Hello, all!
>
> But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
> told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
> not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
> FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
> DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.

"Amateur" here means "no pecuniary interest",
vs. "professional" meaning "making money at it"

There are no "professional" DXers and such....

2623. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 20:21:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccb09b6_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41892

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEEC18D.23EF9E46@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> >
> > Once again, Dick, you have no way of knowing what I do (or don't do)
> > on ham radio, nor what I may be working on "in the lab."
> >
> You seem to do a fair job of describing your "activities". And of
avoiding any
> questions about them that wouldn't show you in the light your desire. Nuff
said.

I don't give a daily diary of my activities, nor is it any of your business.
Only
someone like you would be so foolish as to assume that the occasional thing
I mention here constitutes the entirety of my activities ...

> Again, give us a good description of the circumstances surrounding the
need for
> hams to have instantly available a 56k instant graphics circuit on ham
radio. To
> show disaster damage? You'd better get your butt on the scene FAST, the
SKY-3
> News chopper will have you scooped post haste. So I suppose we should all
have
> broadcast quality video cameras and helicopters to fly them around with.
Hey,
> gotta keep up with the "commercials", you know! Sounds to me like more
sky pie.
>
> Oh, it isn't a bad idea, just another of those "great" things that will
come to
> very little, like Slow Scan TV. Sure, there's a few hams using it. It's
never
> been much more than a novelty, of course. How many photos can one pass
around
> before the novelty wears off?

Dick your lack of vision is astounding.

> > While I'm not a nostalgia/history buff like Jim, I'm not totally
ignorant of
> > the
> > history of amateur radio, either (and I am a member of QCWA) ... but the

> > point is STILL that YOUare asserting that "in the early days we needed
> > technical improvement, but today is a different situation entirely."
> >
>
> Read it again, this time for meaning, not to develop your prejudices. If
you
> don't comprehend the vast differences between early radio and the
equipment of
> today you're due some REAL education. The rig I first put on the air in
the
> early spring of '57, crude as it was, was a few orders of magnitude
better than
> the average beginners rig of the early years. The invention of the triode
vacuum
> tube followed shortly by the development of the sensitive regenerative
detector
> finally cured "coherer" receivers of their previous characteristic
deafness. And
> what I have sitting on the desk now is just about that far ahead of the
'57 rig.
> And it really doesn't need any help at all. So yes, indeed, the early days
> desperately needed all the improvement they could get, and today we really
do
> not. Hey, if it chaps your cheeks, learn to live with it, that's reality.

YOUR "reality" Dick, seems to be "Things aren't as crappy as they
were in the early days. Thus, since things are 'good enough' (for you,
at least), we don't need any more improvements."

That's the recipe for stagnation ... unfortunately, you and your ilk
have held that view for decades now, with the result that we are
generally decades behing the technology/knowledge curve on
average.

> > EXCUSE ME, but we STILL need technical improvement ... it's one of
> > our reasons for being ... and being satisfied with things that were
novel
> > 50 years (or much more) ago is NOT the way one "advances the radio art"
> > or "maintains a pool of (competent, useful) trained technicians and
> > electronics experts."
>
> I never have said that improvement isn't a good thing, nor that newer,
better
> modes won't be beneficial in the long run, all that is obvious. But this
> incessant demand that we DO something high tech, all the while handing out
Extra
> class tickets on the strength of an "Extra in a Day" school just doesn't
> compute. If you can't find a serious conflict of purpose here you should
take
> off the blinders.

If you can't see that you're tying unrelated things together in a completely nonsensical way "to make your point" (and failing miserably), YOU need help.
>
> > Sorry, Dick ... you are incurably clueless.
>
> I don't need a clue, I have the solution.

Yes, you do need a clue ... the only "solution" you seem to have is the bile that runs out of your mouth whenever someone points out that you are part of the PROBLEM, not part of the solution.

You ARE incurably clueless ...

Carl - wk3c

2624. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 20:43:28 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccb0d76_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41893

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020427120719.09489.00000898@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3cca2230_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >You mean us guys who passed the same written test as Generals
> >but didn't get privs because we only copied 5 wpm and not 13?
>
> Yep. I was one of them in 1968.
> >
> >There was no "freebie" in granting Generals to "old techs" once
> >the code requirement dropped to 5 wpm ...
>
> Noboy said "freebie". Allow me to clarify.

OK ...

> All pre-March-21-1987 Tech Pluses, and those with unexpired CSCEs for old
> Element 3B, have passed the necessary tests for a post-restructuring
General.
> It should have been a nobrainer for the FCC to do one or more of the
following:
>
> - allow those Tech Pluses to have General privileges if they have old
license
> documents to show they qualify
> - allow those Tech Pluses to renew as Generals when the time comes or as
part
> of a vanity call application
> - allow those Tech Pluses to upgrade by mail or online by sending in the
> appropriate forms and documents
> - have the FCC computer issue new Generals to all existing Tech Pluses who
> qualified
>
> All of these were suggested to the FCC. Yet the FCC insisted that all
> qualifying Tech Pluses show up at VE sessions and pay a VE fee to get a
license
> they'd earned years before. Why?

Because the system wasn't set up to handle that input directly from
the public ... the FCC doesn't receive/review old documents ... that
task has been relegated to the VE teams and VECs to manage.

> >NCI and the NCVECs both told the FCC "No freebies",
>
> Allowing the Tech Pluses listed above to get Generals without the VE
session
> hassle isn't a freebie.

Neither was it a burden ... I had NO issue with going to a VE session
to upgrade ... I had intended to take the extra test, but the VE team
on Friday night made a mistake and didn't have the test forms ...
so I gave them my paperwork and got back the paperwork that
said I was a General. When I got home, I got on the internet
and found another session, from another VE team Saturday morning
and drove down there with all of my paperwork, took and passed
the Extra test, and came home an Extra ... did I mind? Not really.
It would have been nice to have taken care of it all Friday evening,
but people make mistakes, so I finished up on Saturday morning.
Yes, I paid 2 VE session fees ... BFD ... those folks don't make
any money on the deal, and I'm happy to pay the very modest fee
for the service.

> >it was the ARRL who wanted to give freebies (presumably
> >to make some folks feel grateful in hopes they'd sent in their
> >subscription, er membership, $$$)
>
> You mean the upgrading of existing Novices and Tech Pluses to General.

Yes ...

> Your comments show an anti-ARRL bias that has no basis in fact.

I don't think it shows a bias ... it's just my personal view, based on the
facts in evidence ...

> What would you
> say to someone who claimed that the NCVEC and NCI stance was driven by a
desire
> to make existing hams "jump through a hazing hoop" of written exams, and
gather
> more $$$ at VE sessions, while protecting their status as having passed
the old
> writtens? ;-)

I'd say, "No freebie upgrades which bypass the written tests required by
the rules."

> >I could live without subbands by license class ... that is the norm
> >in most of the world and doesn't seem to really cause any demonstrable
> >problems.
>
> The norm in most of the world is far fewer hams per capita, and per square
> mile, too.

So?

> >While most of the world seems to do just fine without subband by mode
> >restrictions, I'm not so sure that we Americans are ready for that. Just
> >listening to the behavior that I hear from so many on the phone bands
> >(and I mean people who passed fast code tests, not some new thing
> >that's happened since the test was dropped to 5 wpm), I don't really
> >want to see that "Ugly American" phenomenon spread to the entirety
> >of the bands at the expense of all of the other modes and the digital
> >techniques that are our future.
>
> You've just proved my point.

I don't think so ... density of hams (per capita or per square mile)
doesnt' seem to me to have any more correlation to behavior than
does a Morse test.

> Note that ALL of the folks you hear on the HF 'phone bands have passed
multiple
> WRITTEN tests. But even before the restructuring, there were medical
waivers.
> One cannot assume that any HF ham has passed more than a 5 wpm code test
> without more information.

Many, if not most, of the worst offenders are long-timers who got
their "higher class" license (but not the manners to go with it) before
code waivers existed ...

Carl - wk3c

2625. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 21:15:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCB14D7.CC1C807F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41894
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Stagger Lee wrote:
> The only exceptions are Texans: It is said that if a man could choose
> between Texas and Hell, he'd choose Hell every time.

Reminds me of a story: A Texan died and walked up to the gates. He said,
"Hey, St. Peter, Heaven looks just like Texas." The gatekeeper answered,
"That ain't Heaven, and I ain't St. Peter."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2626. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 21:23:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427172304.27329.00000938@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 41896

In article <aaerbouon1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020427004850.04302.00001028@mb-bh.aol.com...
>> In article <20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
>(Dennis
>> >Ferguson) writes:
>> >
>> >>It probably isn't worth pointing out that the mode currently
>> >>used for digital communications over optical fiber is also
>> >>OOK CW. The only difference is that the carrier frequencies
>> >>are in the license-free 200 THz band, and rather than the complex
>> >>International Morse encoding they use the simpler "on" is 1 and "off"
>> >>is 0 encoding.
>> >>
>> >Interesting.
>> >
>> >It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of commercial
>> >fixed point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or other radiated-RF means
>> >today. And the percentage is dropping.
>>
>> ...and your source for this?
>>
>> >The real communications revolution of the past 20 years has been fiber
>optics.
>> >Both the internet and lowcost long distance telephones are largely made
>> >possible by the fiber revolution. Fiber optics offer enormous bandwidth,
>low
>> >time delay, high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune to
>> >RFI, EMI and EMP. Fibers can be installed anywhere copper cables can go -
>on
>> >poles, underground, and under the sea. Terrestrial microwave and
>satellites
>> simply
>> >cannot compete except in special situations.
>>
>> Some points not considered -
>>
>> While the fiber itself is immune to known radiation threats, the

>> terminus of the fiber is NOT immune. There terminals of the
>> fiber circuit link are electronic and therefore require RFI, EMI,
>> EMP shielding (as needed). While military electronics is
>> designed to withstand EMP, very little of commercial terminal
>> electronics is so designed.
>
>True, but those terminal boxes aren't located just anywhere.
>They are usually in telephone company "central offices"
>where RFI, etc. can be controlled better. They are
>in cabinets for NEBS compliance, etc.
>
>> Optical fiber cables are as susceptible to physical damage in
>> their cable lay as copper-conductor cables.
>
>True. But neither Jim nor I have said they weren't.

Picky, picky. :-)

I was just expanding on some points that weren't brought up.

>> "Optical pumping" of certain optical fiber material eliminates the
>> need for amplifiers to bring the normally-quite-lossy (by comparison
>> to copper) signal levels up above the noise. That is a distinct
>> advantage over copper-conductor circuits.
>
>Agreed.
>
>> You CANNOT take advantage of long optical fiber circuits without
>> being able to digitize the signal to be sent. That means digital
>> electronics, high-speed A/D and D/A multiplexers, something
>> totally foreign to the analog-only OOK CW ham.
>
>Agreed. I think the original "anaology" was the simple
>applicaption of OOK CW (not the character encoding).
>Be it light or othersise, the digital bits (1s and 0s) are
>simply on and off light pulses.

My read on Dennis' message was as a tongue-in-cheek
comment on OOK modulation. :-)

Heh. "...simply on and off light pulses." Okay, now make
the comparision between about 4 telegraph key closures per
second and 4,000,000,000 optical on-off transitions per
second. Are those possibly "similar" or have you just
ventured into reducto ad absurdum territory?

>> The typical throughput on the UK-through-Med-around-India-
>> around-SE Asia to Japan undersea optical fiber cable is 4 GBPS
>> in two circuits. That bit rate alone is twice as high as highest-
>> band ready-built off-the-shelf ham equipment.
>
>Agreed. And I know of many other "rings" that far

>exceed 4 Gig.

Yes, I've seen mention of them. However, I'm more impressed
by about 12 kilomiles of a terrestrial line, most of it under water
and not using any cable-enclosed electronic repeaters.

I don't know about your experience, but I find that on-off
switching of very long lines at 100 MBPS to be an "upper
limit." Thinking of bit rates 40 times that "limit" makes me
appreciate such "low-speed" (?) bit rates of 4 GBPS as being
electronically sophisticated. Your mileage may vary.

There's very little ready-built ham equipment that works with
carrier frequencies above the 2 GHz ham band. That mention
just to point out the truly rapid rate of 4 GBPS.

>> >From a historical point of view, we have come full circle.
>>
>> From already-known history of communications, you are going
>> around in circles. Some points -
>>
>> >The first telecom revolution was the widespread acceptance of the
>electric
>> >telegraph about 150 years ago. Before then, almost all information
>travelled
>> >only as fast as transportation could carry a messenger or a letter.
>>
>> No. OPTICAL semaphore systems were already in use in
>> Europe and the UK for about two centuries before. That was
>> on land. Various forms of flag and torch (night) were in use
>> ship-to-ship.
>
>Good point. And the American Indians used smoke signals.

Let me quote from NAVSHIPS 0967-255-0010, "Principles of
Telegraphy," June 1967, Department of the Navy, Electronic
Systems Command, Part A (historical background) -

" For centuries men of all nations and many positions in life
have recognized the need for rapid communication, and have
devoted their attention to devising the ultimate communications
medium. Through these efforts, many curious devices have
evolved and are cited in the annals of all nations. Fire, smoke,
bells, trumpets, drums, and guns have all played a part; many
primitive devices are still to be found in use in some parts of the
world. [such as J-38s and converted tuna fish cans - LHA]
For example, the use of flags and various forms of semaphore
signaling date from the thirteenth century. [four centuries before
the Morse-Vail system, not just two - LHA] Another type was
the heliograph, a system employed for visual signaling in sunlight,
which reflected the sun's rays from one point to another. However,
this method was limited, for in dull weather and at night lamp

signaling had to be used."

Both the French and British semaphore networks have been
well-described in books and considerable information is available
on the web for those. Those date back to the 1600s. Their
throughput was far faster than the best horse-carried message
system.

>> >Communications facilities available to President Andrew Jackson had more in
>> >common with those available to Julius Casear than they did with those
>> >available to President Abraham Lincoln.
>>
>> Neither Julius Caesar nor Orange Julius was president of the
>> USA. Please try to confine your analogues to some common
>> geography.
>
>Picky picky.

I'm not sure why President Jackson was picked for that quasi-analogue
(it couldn't be "stonewalling" could it?). Polk or Taylor were elected
(1840, 1844 respectively) at about the first trial of the Morse-Vail
telegraph system, Jackson was first elected in 1828, before Morse
began his tinkering. That made Pierce and Buchanan (before Lincoln)
as Presidents with telegram capability.

Engineers are supposed to strive for accuracy. That was impressed
on me by one James Miccolis. Accuracy was not shown. :-)

2627. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 21:23:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020427172305.27329.00000939@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 41895

In article <LZBy8.9157$8p3.776365@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Present-day use of different optical wavelength is fairly well
>> limited to only two main spectral lines.
>
>That statement is out of date by at least a decade.

I'm sure it is, mister chief. I haven't played on a stable table (optical bench) for about 12 years. Wanna see my speckle? :-)

I know you've pulled up a Bragg Cell and wanna tout, but I was referring to INSTALLED SYSTEMS AT WORK. NOW.

ON-OFF OPTICAL SWITCHING SYSTEMS. WORKING NOW.

Do you understand the flow of discussion or do you need tutoring?

>Using tunable lasers
>and WDM technology, multiple spectral lines can be used, simultaneously in a
>single fiber.

Marvy-do, golly wow, and other suitable-for-victorian-adults explitives.

So you have multiple wavelength capability. Just HOW do you put information to be communicated on the fiber...and HOW FAST can it go? Do you have an analogue of an "optical VFO" and use FSK, PSK, or what?

It doesn't really matter for amateur radio, does it? The longest optical wavelength for fiber comm is well above the 300 GHz ITU-R allocation limit. Don't get all bent out of shape on the discussion. You are looking through a half-silvered mirror or you've backed up into a corner cube, dunno which.

>Some representative products from our company can be found at
>the URL's below.

Yessiree, I can just see all the eager radio amateurs descending on those URLs, wanting to install optical VFO capability on their laser-emitting transceivers.

Optical wavelengths are license free. Not only that, they are totally unregulated! Maybe you ought to make another RM proposal to have the FCC just regulate the heck out of them

optical wavelength ranges! No more of this free stuff! Make all
Take The Test!!!

May the Angstrom be with you...

2628. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 21:35:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zQEy8.1050$Rp1.46344245@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41899

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020427120721.09489.00000901@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <aad6b1$4dt$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Even if Mr. Cross did read RRAP, as an FCC staffer, do you
> >think he (Mr. Cross) would be "intimidated" by anyone because
> >of what that "anyone" may have written in RRAP?
>
> Nope. At most, he might be dismayed at some of the behavior displayed
here.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I'd have to agree.

73, Brian

2629. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 21:39:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4UEy8.1051$lq1.46373076@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41900

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CCAEBC4.4C3542A5@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > > I was cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC
> > > SEND AND RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!
> >
> > This must be some kind of proof that you have more time in the chow
hall.
> > Besides, the M28s were junked a quarter of a century ago. Even hams
don't
> > want them anymore.
>
> I saw one at a hamfest a few years ago. It had a sign on it, "FREE!", and
> nobody wanted it. Do you think Dick would have flown to AZ to get it?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Many are left it the flea market areas of hamfests. The county calls it
"illegal dumping."

2630. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 21:42:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccb1b57$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41897

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CCB0626.4305231A@ix.netcom.com...
>
> "Amateur" here means "no pecuniary interest",
> vs. "professional" meaning "making money at it"
>
> There are no "professional" DXers and such....
>

Tell that to the guys who won't QSL unless you send a
(couple of) "green stamps" ... :-)

Carl - wk3c

2631. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 21:45:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NZEy8.1052$_t1.46561397@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41898

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEEAA0A.A5E7012C@townsqr.com...
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward"
> > > nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere,
> > > just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a
> > > joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet
> > > radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended
> > > widespread interest in the mode.
> > >
> >
> > In other words, we could have used a better packet system?
>
> We would have *had* a better system if all the store-and-forward idiots
> hadn't chased off all the sensible users.

Idiots? I love my e-mail. I don't have to be at home to answer the phone,
yet I still bet my messages. You want only keyboard to keyboard?

> Some of you seem to blithely assume that technology will solve all
> problems and salve all wounds.

You got wounded? Were all the "forward and store idiots" like the Chinese
overrunning your position?

But it can't place gray matter in the
> empty space between the ears of the vacant eyed, nor can it undo the
> damage caused by those same induhviduals.

So the people on the forward edge of amateur technology have no "gray matter
in the empty space between the ears of the vacant eyed?"

Brian

2632. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 22:23:21 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <aaf903$9b6$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 41901
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Wife beater "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> whined loudly in message
news:we.will.make.an.exception.for.woger@houston-hunks.com...
>
> [newsg\ /

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit "Stagger Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically
admits he has no credibility by his own definition in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :
"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

Quit whining, fuckhead.
And quit beating your wife and mutilating your neighbor's cattle. Did you
spend all day Saturday cheating outher hams out of money at the hamfest?

> On Sat, 27 Apr 2002 10:06:34 -0400, AB8MQ@ovis.net wrote:
> : Wife beater "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> whined in message
> : news:lloyd.is.mysterian@houston-hunks.com...
> : >
> : > On 26 Apr 2002 23:46:57 GMT, Mysterian <Mysterian2001@alt.net> wrote:
> : >
> : > : Jesus moves in mysterious ways. I will pray that this Christian
judge
> : > : prevails.
> : >
> : > Isn't that \ /
> :
> : Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit "Stagger Lee"
> : <SLee@houston-hunks.com> revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically
> : admits he has no credibility by his own definition in message
> : <3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :
> :
> : "Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
> : status makes the story even less credible."
> :
> : Looks like this proves I wasn't mysterian after all, huh, fuckhead?
> :
> : Utter fucking imbecile.
>
> It just\ /

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit "Stagger Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically

admits he has no credibility by his own definition in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :
"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

It just proves I wasn't the Mysterian poster, you utter fucking imbecile.

2633. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 22:24:09 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <aaf905$9b6$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 41902
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Wife beater "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:hell.runneth.over@houston-hunks.com...
>
> On Sat, 27 Apr 2002 13:35:31 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> : K0HB wrote:
> : > A long and wicked life followed by five minutes of perfect grace gets
you
> : > into Heaven. An equally long life of decent living and good works
followed
> : > by one outburst of taking the name of the lord in vain-- then have a
heart
> : > attack at that moment and be damned for eternity. Is that the system?
> :
> : Southern Baptists can't fall from grace. For us it's "Once Saved, Always
> : Saved!" So I got saved when I was eight years old and have been having
> : a ball ever since.
>
> Catholi\ /

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit "Stagger Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically
admits he has no credibility by his own definition in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :
"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

2634. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-27 22:38:02 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1fbap9f.1cqlm9v1ascl3mN%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 41903

Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:

> mike coslo wrote:
>
> >Interesting. Amateur *has* been transmuted by marketing
> >forces into something other than what it actually means. To
> >be an "amateur" is quite a compliment actually. It's kind of
> >like mediocre, which means average, but has been trans-
> >muted into poor. thank heavens for marketing forces, which
> >make Amateur radio, astronomy, etc into a bad thing, while
> >at the same time giving us "professional" toilet bowl cleaners!
>
> The negative connotation with "amateur" is a problem, no doubt,
> and there may not be any real answer for it, at the higher levels.

The word "amateur" is NOT a problem except for you. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the term. NOTHING. Who do you think the "pros" go to when disaster strikes? AMATEURS. In astronomy most comets, asteroids, nova, supernovae are discovered by AMATEURS. Most planet data is collected by AMATEURS. Most solar data is collected by AMATEURS.

> Both "amateur astronomy" and "amateur radio" started early in
> this century on the East Coast, at a time when there was very
> little in the way of commercial product and everybody made
> everything themselves, more or less. No one was worried
> about what was going to happen down the road because, well,
> they were too busy doing other things. Now, with "progress,"
> we have commercial product, organization, turf to defend . . all
> the wonderful accoutrements of modernity. And, with the end
> of the Baby Boomers in sight, we have to worry about the
> future and the numbers. Troubles never end!

There is no trouble. See above comments.

> >Now that being said, it is fairly shallow to avoid something
> >due to the name.
>
> I don't view it that way. It's an objection to be overcome and if
> you don't take it seriously and instead denigrate the "customer,"
> for having the objection, well, guess what.

Being an amateur is not degrading at all. It's something to be PROUD of. I'm a amateur radio operator and an amateur astronomer. I'm damn proud of it too. I even got an award from the AAVSO for my solar contributions (over 1,000 observations). The word amateur is not hurting ham radio.

(snip)

> Val Germann
> KC0MUB

--
If love is blind, why is lingerie so popular?
- George Carlin

2635. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 00:20:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aaffeb$vm3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41904

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CCACC9B.D2D011FE@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You deny that NCI is a conspiracy?
>
> "conspiracy - an evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan
> formulated in secret by two or more persons."
>
> What secret thing is NCI doing?

Thanks Cecil, it saved me the trouble
of looking up the definition which I expected
to be something akin to what you found.

Now it's up to Dick to tell us what the
"evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan" is...
and which two or more people formulated that
plan in secret.

ROTFLMAO!!!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2636. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 00:28:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aafg33$5t$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41905

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEEAD2D.84D6BDBB@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3BEE7A70.83D29CCC@townsqr.com...
> > >
> > > I hope you know that on 20 meters the skip zone normally starts
within a
> > few
> > > miles. (If you had done much mobile work you'd know it) It's very much
a
> > > possibility that they were far enough away from each other that they
did
> > need
> > > higher power to make the desired communication. And if you happened be
> > > positioned where you were off the side of their yagis which very
easily
> > could
> > > have all been pointed east and west, you were in a deep null, and it's
> > very
> > > much a possibility or even a likelihood that they never heard any hint
of
> > your
> > > low powered signal. In the Orlando area there are almost certainly
small
> > lots
> > > and antenna size limitations, so it is entirely possibile they didn't
> > have
> > > antennas for bands lower in frequency than 20 meters.
> > >
> > > Yet you automatically brand them as "LIDS" with no knowledge, only
your
> > > preconceived notions of their situations and what they were doing. You
> > just
> > > heard them talk about amps and yagis and "ASS-UMED".
> > >
> > > This is why the FCC virtually never attempts to enforce the rule on
> > minimum
> > > power needed to complete the desired communication. Most of the time
it is
> > > virtually impossible for anyone to determine with accuracy that the
rule
> > is

> > > actually being violated. But you try.
> >
> > Dick,
> >
> > Using high power on 20m to talk across town (expecially when you can
> > actually SEE the antenna of at least one of the other stations), is
simply
> > BAD PRACTICE ... such communications can and should be conducted
> > on something like 2m simplex, rather than blasting an HF band with
> > world-wide propagation with little regard for your effects on others.
> >
> > You can try to excuse the behavior all you want because you dislike
> > the complaintant (me), but that doesn't change the fact that the
behavior
> > is bad practice. Even an "Extra light" like me knows better.
>
> *IF* that's all there is to the situation,
> I certainly agree. My point is that
> you are doing exactly what you always
> do- make false assumptions with too little
> knowledge and information. If two of them
> could see each others antennas, the
> third could have been at the edge of the
> skip zone requiring all three to run
> higher power to complete the desired
> communication and the yagi scenario could
> easily apply.
> And demanding they do it on some other band
> is lame. Remember, there is NO
> requirement for hams to own any particular
> station equipment whatever. Maybe one
> of them doesn't have a two meter station.

Should I drag out the QSO with a ham in Ohio
who was just oh so proud he was running a KW when
I told him he was booming into NJ. He made no effort
to lower power...BUT then too, others in this newsgroup
then suggested it may have been "too difficult" to
lower power...which, in my not so humble opinion...
is just plain bad operating practice.

> Such situations occur all the time on HF.
> No doubt many or even most are
> preventable, but which ones? FCC knows
> there's no practical way to determine.

So much for the vaulted attitudes of those that
abuse power on the air when they are fully
aware they don't need even 1/4 of what they are running.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2637. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 00:32:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aafgab$e35$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41906

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE063D.D650A13D@townsqr.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > I would be very surprised if Mr.
> > Cross read rec.radio.amateur.policy
>
> I wouldn't. He's a FCC employee, but he's also
> an active ham. Wouldn't surprise me
> if he wants to keep up on things in many different ways.

So Dick, you never answered...
Even if Mr. Cross did read RRAP, as an FCC staffer, do you
think he (Mr. Cross) would be "intimidated" by anyone because
of what that "anyone" may have written in RRAP?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2638. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 00:52:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aafhfo$p35$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41907

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEE15E4.D1FE094C@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3AE84AC0.C3F10C09@townsqr.com...
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > > >
> > > > >Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > > > >typists?
> > > >
> > > > A picture is worth a thousand words...
> > >
> > > Since when do you need a 56k circuit for a picture? You
> > > don't, unless for some strange reason you demand Internet
> > > download speeds.
> >
> > Most people do ... why SHOULD we sit around waiting
> > for a picture to Slowwwwwly appear when technology is
> > available to make it snap onto the screen NOW?
>
> Hey Dingaling, we're talking HF HAM RADIO,
> not the internet. Wake up!

Classic Dick... "Hey dingaling?"

As to Ham radio not the internet...just where in
Part 97 does the FCC create the impression on you
that hams couldn't, shouldn't wouldn't find transmission
of files (video, data, or whatever) beneficial.
The apparent fact that you (Dick) see no benefit
in such an accomplishment is telling in and of itself.

> > But I guess that your viewpoint shouldn't surprise me,
> > since you seem to prefer doing things the slowest, hardest
> > way possible ... my preference is to work smart, not hard,
>
> Your preference is to be a total ignoramus, again, and again and
> again. Sky pie all the way!
> There's no way you'll ever get internet quality access on HF ham
> radio. Live with it! It's fact.
```

56K isn't internet quality. If you satrt talking 1.544 Megabits/sec,
now you're starting to equate to internet common practice.

> > you seem to prefer the opposite way ... one could possibly
> > infer from that that you're strong, but dumb??? :-)
>
> If practical meant anything to you it never shows even a hint.
> You're actually dumb enough to think that hams would ever want
> internet level data rates at HF. And you do nothing on HF but yak
> on SSB! Fantastic!

The propoganda angle again. Tell the phony story
often enough and maybe someone will believe it.

> > > Seems to me like dedication of resources
> > > far beyond any rational need, at least in this era.
> > > If the goal is to duplicate the Internet that becomes a
> > > different matter. As well as a huge limitation on usage of
> > > those resources. I can't imagine a ham radio that would
> > > allow all users of our spectrum to have the communications
> > > capability of the Internet on ham radio. I don't think
> > > that's technically feasable.
> >
> > See ... you can't even begin to conceive of what's possible.
>
> Show us where you can get 56k data rates within any reasonable
> bandwidth on HF, much less within any rule the FCC might even
> feasibly write. You can't do it. You're full of hot air and SSB.

Try thinking out of the box. FCC rules as to reasonable
bandwidth can be set aside for emergencies if needed.

> > That's your fundamental problem, Dick ... you can't conceive
> > of what's possible with today's technology (your inability to
> > grasp the value of a 56k circuit ...)
>
> I'll say it again- a 56K circuit on any ham band is of very
> limited value under any conceivable circumstance. We can do all we
> will ever need to do with much less involvement.

That's it, you're forever stuck inside the box.
Put a lid on it and toss it out in the trash.

> You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward"
> nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere,
> just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a
> joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet
> radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended
> widespread interest in the mode.
>
> You don't show common sense enough to know that even on the
> internet the 56k circuits aren't al lthat fast, and it isn't the
> fault of the 56k hardware either. So you'll make that fly on HF

> radio? Not a chance. You're a wildeyed dreamer.

Ditto my last.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2639. Netherlands votes to support suppression of S25.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 01:31:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aafjqo$f8u$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41908

Netherlands votes to support suppression of S25.5

At the VERON Council's meeting today (04/26/02)
a proposal by the Amsterdam and Twente divisions
to support the IARU's new policy on Morse testing
was accepted by an overwhelming majority. This gives
the VERON BOD a clear mandate to press for abolition
of S25.5 morse code treaty requirement.
VERON is the national organization of
amateur radio operators in the Netherlands.

Additionally, the chairman of VERON told those
present that he wants to make a plea for
following the Radio Society of Great Britain's
example in implementing a Foundation Licence.

2640. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 02:32:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BaJy8.787$aD6.98402677@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41909

"Fred Garvin" <Garvin@Truss.net> wrote in message
news:1fbap9f.1cqlm9v1ascl3mN%Garvin@Truss.net...
> Being an amateur is not degrading at all. It's something to be PROUD
> of. I'm a amateur radio operator and an amateur astronomer. I'm damn
> proud of it too. I even got an award from the AAVSO for my solar
> contributions (over 1,000 observations). The word amateur is not hurting
> ham radio.

Fred, is there a web site I can go to to read up on amateur solar obs?
Thanks, Brian

2641. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 02:47:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <RoJy8.794$2M6.98900404@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41910

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020427154124.01569.00000555@mb-mg.aol.com...

> >I don't think Jim likes me.
>
> You have a good summation there. :-)

Its just that when its my turn to comment on the ARRL proposal I have to
list my vitae on the Novice subbands, but when Hans or Dick comments,
anything goes.

2642. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:20:59 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <aafpqr$17nb$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 41911

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>In article <LZBy8.9157$8p3.776365@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
><KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>> Present-day use of different optical wavelength is fairly well
>>> limited to only two main spectral lines.
>>
>>That statement is out of date by at least a decade.
[...]
>I know you've pulled up a Bragg Cell and wanna tout, but I was
>referring to INSTALLED SYSTEMS AT WORK. NOW.
>
>ON-OFF OPTICAL SWITCHING SYSTEMS. WORKING NOW.

Len,

WDM systems have been deployed for 5 or 6 years now. They run at
the 1550 nm wavelength (about 193 THz frequency) sweet spot in glass. I
think the original Erbium-doped fiber amplifiers gave optical gain
from 1530 nm to 1560 nm, or a bit wider, though I think newer equipment
has doubled that. I'm pretty sure the ITU standardized a 0.8 nm
(i.e. 100 GHz) channel spacing, so you can get 40 carrier wavelengths
into the EDFA bandwidth. The 100 GHz channel is wide enough for 10 Gbps
OOK switching with its sidebands. Most of the systems installed in the
last 3 or so years have hence supported 40x10 Gbps channels (i.e.
wavelengths). I've seen a lot of this stuff installed, though I can't
say for sure that I've ever seen one where I was sure all 40 channels
were turned on. That's a pile of bandwidth on a single fiber, in fact
about 40 times what was possible 3 or 4 years prior to that, so there's
a relative glut of both unprovisioned fiber and unprovisioned bandwidth
these days.

The SONET multiplexing hierarchy likes bit rates which are a power-of-four
multiple of 155.520 Mbps, so the next stop after 10 Gbps is 40 Gbps.
I note that Bill Sohl mentioned a Bell Labs press release indicating
that they'd managed to do a long-haul 40x40 Gbps test, which hinted that
their system had replaced OOK modulation with some form of PSK. The
latter was probably necessary to keep inside the ITU-standard 100 GHz
channels. It's a lot like radio, just with bigger numbers.

Note that the above describes land-based fiber systems. I know
undersea fiber installed in the last few years also supports
2.5 Gbps or 10 Gbps WDM, but I doubt they run 40 channels since

the undersea stuff is usually done more conservatively.

>>Using tunable lasers
>>and WDM technology, multiple spectral lines can be used, simultaneously in a
>>single fiber.
[...]
>So you have multiple wavelength capability. Just HOW do you put
>information to be communicated on the fiber...and HOW FAST can
>it go? Do you have an analogue of an "optical VFO" and use FSK,
>PSK, or what?

Each laser powers a channel at a different frequency, so channels
are FDM. Tunable lasers are essentially transmitters with a
VFO. If the signal is digital (cable companies might use analog
modulation on fiber, though I'm not sure) they're used as CW
transmitters and the carrier on each channel is OOK modulated ("on"
is 1, "off" is 0) if the bit rate is 10 Gbps or less. Most long-haul
systems run at 10 Gbps, though local stuff might be lower in bit rate.
Telephone company stuff is almost always at 1550 nm, though cable company
use of fiber is a whole other thing and they may use 1310 nm.

I guess the original point might still be that we'd certainly call
OOK CW a digital modulation when used in these systems, and it isn't
clear to me that the nature of the modulation changes as you lower
the bit rate to human speeds, so I think calling OOK CW in amateur
radio "digital" is probably not incorrect.

Dennis Ferguson

2643. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:55:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020427235553.04364.00002299@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41912

In article <3CCA200A.2F6A6FE8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry, it is abundantly apparent that the basic problem was equating Morse
>code
>skill with knowledge of electronics. It is abundantly apparent that they are
>not
>equal and attempting to equate them was a gross perversion from which the ARS
>may
>never recover.

Cecil:

I don't know who was "equating" Morse with technical knowledge, but
Shirley, it wasn't me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2644. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:55:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020427235554.04364.00002300@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41913

In article <Acxy8.767$cx5.33086697@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Your opinion and you're entitled to it. You are not entitled to label
>everone who
>> disagrees with it as you wish without challenge. You may get far more
>negative
>> response than you wished.
>
>I agree with Cecil. I disagree with you.

Brian:

You will agree with anyone who supports the "dumbing down" of
the ARS, because it's the easiest path to follow. It ensures that
you will always be accepted as a full-fledged member of the Lowest
Common Denominator.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2645. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:55:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020427235554.04364.00002301@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41914

In article <3CCAEAFE.15AFF3C7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Nope, the qualifications were *inseparable* parts of the whole. The Morse
>code
>exam and the theory exam were given equal pass/fail weights. That's why you
>concluded that Morse code was as important as everything else in ham radio
>combined and based your self esteem on it. Tain't so. CW is just one of many
>modes, is my favorite mode, and I certainly don't hate it. What I hate is to
>see you worshiping Morse code as if it were a religion that admits hams into
>seventh heaven after cleansing them white as snow.

Cecil:

This type of hyperbole is the thing that cancels you out in the
code/no-code debate, because none of us PCTA's are thinking or
saying anything of the sort.

>> You may get far more negative response than you wished.
>
>So did Galileo, but he was right. Time to face up to the fact that you
>have lost your King of the Mountain status but continue to beat that
>dead horse.

The "King of the Mountain" whine is strictly a false construct of
the NCTA. All we're doing is supporting the requirement for radio
amateurs to learn a useful, basic communications mode. This
KOTM crapola is just whining -- something for which the NCTA
has made itself famous.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2646. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:55:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020427235555.04364.00002302@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41915

In article <Stoy8.359$EX2.59243654@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Ed, is it possible for Larry to produce -perfectly- formed Morse characters
>with a WWII vintage Lionel J-38 straight key?
>
>Please put his signal on a recording scope and examine it.
>
>> I love to "send" to my TNC and watch the characters form perfectly
>> on my computer screen! I just wish more of my fellow CW operators
>> used keyers on-the-air.
>
>Why? If you can produce perfect Morse with a clunky J-38, they should be
>able to do so as well.

Allow me to throw in a disclaimer: I obviously meant "as perfect as
possible" -- but "perfect" enough for my TNC to decode correctly.
I have received many compliments for my "fist" during CW QSO's.
But, practice makes perfect, and I have always strived to reach that
goal of perfection. I may never get there, but I'll come as close as
I can!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2647. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:55:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020427235556.04364.00002304@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41916

In article <bIwy8.753$Vj5.32391265@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Human written code is full of personality, but the 1's are one, and the 0's
>are zero, not 1 +/- .001 and 0 +/- .001 respectively.
>
>So Larry sends perfect code?

I don't send "perfect" anything. I'm only human.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2648. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:55:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020427235556.04364.00002303@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41917

In article <3CCA1E02.FF4F8E85@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I basically learned how to send CW by using
>> an Iambic keyer. I practiced off-the-air with it extensively, and as a
>> result, have trained my ear to produce perfectly formed CW characters
>> even when using my trusty old WWII-vintage Lionel J-38 straight key.
>
>You really expect us to believe that you send "perfect" CW, Larry?
>Your dashes are *exactly* three dots long?

I'd never claim that my CW is perfect, Cecil, but it's good enough
for my TNC to read it in the CW mode.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2649. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:55:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020427235557.04364.00002306@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41919

In article <20020427004847.04302.00001027@mb-bh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>Yes, Larrie, you tellum Macro Boy.
>
>We all know you hate voice with a passion.

Lenner:

I don't "hate" voice modes at all. What I dislike is what is being done with them, for the most part, by so-called radio amateurs who can't be bothered to learn a second mode of electronic communication.

>We all know you are one of the best 1930s radio amateurs to
>exist in the year 2002...except you seem to be a total technical
>moron on how anything but on-off keying works.

Well, compared to a professional electronics weenie like yourself, I *would* be a "technical moron" -- or at least, in the interest of the health of our electronics industry, I would hope I would be! I have never made dime number one with my electronics knowledge, and you have made your living at it! There had damn well BETTER be a world of difference between MY technical expertise and YOURS. However, I am a licensed AMATEUR radio operator. This newsgroup is about AMATEUR radio. Do YOU have an amateur radio license? No, you don't! With all your amazing technical knowledge, why the heck not? Just going to a VE session and getting your No-Clue Tech ticket would almost remove this stigma from your persona on this newsgroup, and it would get Steve off you back as well!

>Now go hock another loogie in your splatoo duties while
>specializing your paratransit.

No loogie spitting on MY bus -- they go into the empty Diet Pepsi Twist can!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2650. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:55:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020427235557.04364.00002305@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41920

In article <3ccaa3e0_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>
>Larry's problem is not his ability to send good Morse, but his attitude
>towards those "knuckle-draggers" (his term, not mine) who don't exhibit
>his propensity towards the mode.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

Axeually, I have a Cecil-like "live and let live" attitude toward hams who
are willing to limit themselves to life as a No-code Tech, and pursue
"public service" communications, repeater technology, V/UHF weak
signal modes, etc. It's the ones who just kerchunk all day, yakk for
hours with the bowel and bladder reports, and WHINE constantly about
the code testing requirements (even at the present 5 WPM) that I am
prone to accuse of allowing their knuckles to generate friction with the
floor. If said whining had never occurred, and if these no-code whiners
hadn't accused me of everything from single-handedly causing ethnic
cleansing and global warming, I probably wouldn't be here. Cause and
effect.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2651. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 03:55:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020427235558.04364.00002307@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41918

In article <dWwy8.756$qn5.32573775@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> We all know you hate voice with a passion.
>>
>> We all know you are one of the best 1930s radio amateurs to
>> exist in the year 2002...except you seem to be a total technical
>> moron on how anything but on-off keying works.
>>
>> Now go hock another loogie in your splatoo duties while
>> specializing your paratransit.
>
>Len, len, len. Now he'll be spitting on his patrons and claim you made him
>do it. You gotta cut this stuff out.

Brian:

Not to worry; I would never "hock a loogie" on one of my passengers,
but I can nail a Telefon Pole with a wad of chewing gum at fiftah mile
an aour! (said with strong Sussex County, Delaware accent)

73 de Larry, K3LT

2652. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 04:24:03 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ucmt8g2d5u3gb1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41921

Fred Garvin wrote:

>The word "amateur" is NOT a problem except for
>you. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the term.
>NOTHING.

It's not a matter of "right" or "wrong" (at least for
me) but about what works, recruiting wise.

>Who do you think the "pros" go to when disaster strikes?

Usually, other professionals, I think, though amateurs
have auxilliary roles.

>In astronomy most comets, asteroids, nova, supernovae
>are discovered by AMATEURS.

Not true with comets anymore, in spite of some recent
successes. And while amateurs make contributions in
those other areas I rather doubt that they outstrip the pros
anywhere today. The new NEO search programs are
turning stuff up by the bucket load, asteroids and comets
alike, and it was almost amazing that Ikeya-Zhang got
through to be discovered by human beings!

>Most planet data is collected by AMATEURS.

What in heaven's name are you talking about here?
The textbooks and web sites are FULL of material
generated by pros, not amateurs, which is not to say
that amateurs are not doing a lot of good work. Just
how much space-based planetary information, the
bulk of the real stuff today, is generated by amateurs?

>Most solar data is collected by AMATEURS.

You're kidding, right? MOST most solar?
I don't THINK so. The folks at Big Bear and
Kitt Peak might be a little surprised to hear that.

> Being an amateur is not degrading at all. It's
>something to be PROUD of. I'm a amateur radio
>operator and an amateur astronomer. I'm damn
>proud of it too. I even got an award from the AAVSO
>for my solar contributions (over 1,000 observations).
>The word amateur is not hurting ham radio.

Hey, I am proud too, to be an amateur astronomer and an amateur radio operator. However, that does not allow me to put my head in the sand vis-a-vis what I plainly see as an image/marketing problem for Ham Radio today. Times change.

Val Germann
KC0MUB

2653. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 04:53:37 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.com>
Message-ID: <3CCB7135.198DECB2@mailcity.com>
Source record: 41922
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

2test AB8MQ wrote:

>
> Quit whining, fuckhead.
> And quit beating your wife and mutilating your neighbor's cattle. Did you
> spend all day Saturday cheating outher hams out of money at the hamfest?

What is "outher"? Learn to spell 2test.

2654. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 05:10:55 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <aag08v$1c3t$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 41923

Carl R. Stevenson <wk3c@fast.net> wrote:
>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:3BEEAA0A.A5E7012C@townsqr.com...
>> K0HB wrote:
>>
>> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>> >
>> > > >
>> > > You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward"
>> > > nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere,
>> > > just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a
>> > > joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet
>> > > radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended
>> > > widespread interest in the mode.
>> > >
>> >
>> > In other words, we could have used a better packet system?
>>
>> We would have *had* a better system if all the store-and-forward idiots
>> hadn't chased off all the sensible users.
[...]
>The problem is that the SYSTEM (and I use the term VERY
>loosely) did not have enough capacity to handle the traffic offered
>and it choked and died as a result. Had better (faster) technology
>been embraced and adopted on a large scale, packet radio would
>still be interesting and useful ... in fact, moreso than in the very
>early days ...
>
>> Some of you seem to blithely assume that technology will solve all
>> problems and salve all wounds. But it can't place gray matter in the
>> empty space between the ears of the vacant eyed, nor can it undo the
>> damage caused by those same induhviduals.
>
>Technology could have solved the ills of packet radio, but too many
>people like you were unwilling to even consider the need for something
>better than 1200 baud AFSK (and too cheap to upgrade), so it essentially
>died because it became essentially unusable and boring compared to a
>dial-up internet connection.

You might take a look at this:

"Round Trip Time Estimation," P. Karn & C. Partridge, ACM
SIGCOMM-87, August 1987.

The first author is KA9Q. The paper deals with a fundamental insight gained in good measure by attempting to run TCP/IP over amateur packet radio links.

To make a long story short, the Transmission Control Protocol (the first part of TCP/IP, the pair of protocols upon which the Internet is based), which was a decade or so old when the paper was written, didn't work. TCP/IP networks collapsed under load. There were two or three very important papers written in the later 80's that provided a fundamental understanding of why that was and what to do about it. The above was one of those papers, and the TCP in your computer almost certainly implements the "Karn Algorithm" as part of this repair.

I wouldn't underestimate the importance of that paper. TCP/IP wasn't the only suite of networking protocols that existed at the time, and TCP/IP was considered by a lot of people in phone companies and governments and standards bodies and places like that as an academic toy which couldn't possibly be made to work. If you are reading this you should be grateful that view turned out to be wrong, because even if you think the Internet sucks I guarantee you that you would like the phone company/government version of a computer network much, much less. Amateur radio, and the experience of trying to run those protocols in a really crappy ad hoc environment, contributed to the eventual outcome in an important way.

If amateur experimentation with packet radio was a "failure" then I'd suggest that if experimental failures like this would happen in amateur radio every few years or so the service would be much better off in terms of justifying its existance. In an experimental service even things that don't work out can teach things of great value. The only real "failure" is the failure to attempt anything new at all.

Dennis Ferguson

2655. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 07:09:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428030920.00442.00006137@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 41924

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 04/27/02 15:41 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020427154124.01569.00000554@mb-mg.aol.com>

>The creation of Part 95 has already been explained to you. Please
>listen closely and quit falling asleep in class.

No, Lennie, you have expounded upon your rationalization for NOT telling us
which radio service was created for "strictly recreational" applications.

No such radio service exists. Never has.

Nothing you have said is even remotely borne out in FCC documentation.
Part 95 was created for PERSONAL USE, and "FAQ's" of the era SPECIFICALLY
stated that C.B. radio was NOT for "hobby-type, chit-chat" communications.

Now..>>.PLEASE<<...WHCIH radio service was created to be "strictly
recreational"...?!?!

Steve

2656. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 11:42:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <JeRy8.1561$_N.65875184@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41925

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020427235554.04364.00002300@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <Acxy8.767$cx5.33086697@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Your opinion and you're entitled to it. You are not entitled to label
> >everone who
> >> disagrees with it as you wish without challenge. You may get far more
> >negative
> >> response than you wished.
> >
> >I agree with Cecil. I disagree with you.
>
> Brian:
>
> You will agree with anyone who supports the "dumbing down" of
> the ARS, because it's the easiest path to follow. It ensures that
> you will always be accepted as a full-fledged member of the Lowest
> Common Denominator.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Wrong-O Big Boy. I'll support mode endorsements based upon mode exams. I
don't support a single mode exams that excludes people from operating other
modes. None-the-less, Morse Code has nothing to do with electronics, radio
theory, rules, safety, etc. It's merely an encoding scheme.

Brian

2657. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 12:32:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccbebe7_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41926

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:aaffeb$vm3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CCACC9B.D2D011FE@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You deny that NCI is a conspiracy?
> >
> > "conspiracy - an evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan
> > formulated in secret by two or more persons."
> >
> > What secret thing is NCI doing?
>
> Thanks Cecil, it saved me the trouble
> of looking up the definition which I expected
> to be something akin to what you found.
>
> Now it's up to Dick to tell us what the
> "evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan" is...
> and which two or more people formulated that
> plan in secret.
>
> ROTFLMAO!!!
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Right ... I'm waiting for Dick to blow the whistle on "the NCI
Conspiracy" ... after all, as Executive Director of NCI, I should
be amongst the first to learn about such things :-) :-) :-)

(Also ROTFLMAO!)
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
<mailto:wk3c@fast.net> (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
<mailto:wk3c-shack@fast.net> (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wk3c>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL

Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

2658. Europeen repeaters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 12:33:43 UTC
From: F6GKD <f6gkd@wanadoo.fr>
Message-ID: <aagq7pgkp1@wanadoo.fr>
Source record: 41927

Hello here the europeen list of repeaters.

And also super softward radio-mobils V3.7.4 special APRS

http://www.ref-union.org/cnrr/

73 F6GKD

--
f6gkd (CNRR)

2659. Larry's attitude STILL sucks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 12:52:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccbf098_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41928

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020427235557.04364.00002305@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3ccaa3e0_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry's problem is not his ability to send good Morse, but his attitude
> >towards those "knuckle-draggers" (his term, not mine) who don't exhibit
> >his propensity towards the mode.
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> Axeually, I have a Cecil-like "live and let live" attitude toward hams who
> are willing to limit themselves to life as a No-code Tech, and pursue
> "public service" communications, repeater technology, V/UHF weak
> signal modes, etc.

Larry,

How *benevolent* of you, oh exhaulted one! (NOT! on both counts!)

"... willing to limit themselves to life as a No-code Tech ..." were your
words.

Translation: As long as those who don't share your propensity for Morse
code "stay in their place," like the colonial slave-master relationship, or
the "back of the bus" thing, "you'll be benevolent enough" to "allow them
the privilege" (which they've earned with no help from you) of VHF/UHF
only operation (the back of the bus, in effect).

However, if they should feel that Morse is irrelevant, and should not
be an artificial barrier holding them back from HF privileges, then THAT
flies in the face of your "exhalted" status and is "stepping over the
boundary"
(that you view as existing between "exhalted beings" such as yourself and
"lower life forms" who haven't passed a high speed code test ...)

I don't see that as a "live and let live" attitude at all ... it's clear
from your words
and actions here that your attitude is TRULY that you and others who have
passed a high speed code test are, indeed, "exhaulted" in some perverse way
and because of that (delusion), you feel that it's OK to dump at will on
those

who you view as being "inferior" ...

Your attitude STILL sucks, Larry.

Carl - wk3c

2660. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 12:58:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCBF20E.DE1EB537@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41929

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The "King of the Mountain" whine is strictly a false construct of
> the NCTA.

The "King of the Mountain" structure was invented by the PCTA folk.
If some Extras had not paraded around acting like they knew everything
just because they knew 20wpm Morse code and had met the minimum technical
requirements for an Extra license, this whole sad pecking order situation
would never have existed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2661. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:00:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCBF279.34140331@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41930

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <bIwy8.753$Vj5.32391265@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Human written code is full of personality, but the 1's are one, and the 0's
> >are zero, not 1 +/- .001 and 0 +/- .001 respectively.
> >
> >So Larry sends perfect code?
>
> I don't send "perfect" anything. I'm only human.

But, but, but Larry, you said before that you could send perfect code
with a J-38.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2662. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:04:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccbf355_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41931

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:aag08v$1c3t$1@heap.juniper.net...
>
> You might take a look at this:
>
> "Round Trip Time Estimation," P. Karn & C. Partridge, ACM
> SIGCOMM-87, August 1987.
>
> The first author is KA9Q. The paper deals with a fundamental insight
> gained in good measure by attempting to run TCP/IP over amateur packet
> radio links.

Been there, done that, know Phil ... all of his papers are good stuff.

We could use more hams like him and less like Dick, that's for sure.

> To make a long story short, the Transmission Control Protocol (the
> first part of TCP/IP, the pair of protocols upon which the Internet
> is based), which was a decade or so old when the paper was written,
> didn't work. TCP/IP networks collapsed under load. There were two
> or three very important papers written in the later 80's that provided
> a fundamental understanding of why that was and what to do about it.
> The above was one of those papers, and the TCP in your computer almost
> certainly implements the "Karn Algorithm" as part of this repair.
>
> I wouldn't underestimate the importance of that paper.

Dick will almost certainly, as he did with Shannon, deem it "irrelevant,
because this is AMATEUR radio."

> TCP/IP wasn't
> the only suite of networking protocols that existed at the time, and
> TCP/IP was considered by a lot of people in phone companies and
governments
> and standards bodies and places like that as an academic toy which
couldn't
> possibly be made to work. If you are reading this you should be grateful
> that view turned out to be wrong, because even if you think the Internet
> sucks I guarantee you that you would like the phone company/government
> version of a computer network much, much less.

How true!!!!

> Amateur radio, and the
> experience of trying to run those protocols in a really crappy ad hoc
> environment, contributed to the eventual outcome in an important way.

>
> If amateur experimentation with packet radio was a "failure" then I'd
> suggest that if experimental failures like this would happen in amateur
> radio every few years or so the service would be much better off in
> terms of justifying its existance. In an experimental service even
> things that don't work out can teach things of great value. The only
> real "failure" is the failure to attempt anything new at all.

I agree that the amateur experiment with packet radio was useful. My
only point was that Dick's assertion of why it has died off is not the true
reason, but that the true reason is that amateur packet radio (almost
100%) stagnated at 1200 baud, and at that rate could not provide
the capacity or response times necessary to keep it interesting and
useful, compared to even a dial-up internet connection, for the vast
majority of users.

Carl - wk3c

2663. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:05:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCBF394.85B81EEE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41932

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3CCA1E02.FF4F8E85@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> I basically learned how to send CW by using
> >> an Iambic keyer. I practiced off-the-air with it extensively, and as a
> >> result, have trained my ear to produce perfectly formed CW characters
> >> even when using my trusty old WWII-vintage Lionel J-38 straight key.
> > >
> > >You really expect us to believe that you send "perfect" CW, Larry?
> > >Your dashes are *exactly* three dots long?
>
> I'd never claim that my CW is perfect, Cecil, but it's good enough
> for my TNC to read it in the CW mode.

How soon you forget. Just above, you said you can "produce perfectly formed
CW characters even when using my ... J-38 straight key." Are those "perfectly
formed CW characters" within a nanosecond of being perfect? within a microsecond?
Within a millisecond would certainly not be perfect.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2664. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:10:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccbf4d2$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41933

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020427235554.04364.00002301@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3CCAEAFE.15AFF3C7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Nope, the qualifications were *inseparable* parts of the whole. The Morse
> >code
> >exam and the theory exam were given equal pass/fail weights. That's why
you
> >concluded that Morse code was as important as everything else in ham
radio
> >combined and based your self esteem on it. Tain't so. CW is just one of
many
> >modes, is my favorite mode, and I certainly don't hate it. What I hate is
to
> >see you worshiping Morse code as if it were a religion that admits hams
into
> >seventh heaven after cleansing them white as snow.
>
> Cecil:
>
> This type of hyperbole is the thing that cancels you out in the
> code/no-code debate, because none of us PCTA's are thinking or
> saying anything of the sort.

Larry ... your other posts (and those of Dick and other PCTAs)
disprove your claim ...

Carl - wk3c

2665. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:13:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccbf597_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41934

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020427235557.04364.00002306@mb-fi.aol.com...
>
> No loogie spitting on MY bus -- they go into the empty Diet Pepsi
> Twist can!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Now THERE's an image I could have lived without ... but it does
go to show that Larry is truly a "class act" (NOT!) :-)

Carl - wk3c

2666. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:13:55 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <aagtp7$7vt$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 41939
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Jizzswallowing Jeorge" <radiobuff@mailcity.com> whined loudly in message
news:3CCB7135.198DECB2@mailcity.com...
>
> 2test

What's "2test?" learn to spell, you sub-literate retard.

> > AB8MQ wrote:
> >
> >
> > Quit whining, fuckhead.
> > And quit beating your wife and mutilating your neighbor's cattle. Did
you
> > spend all day Saturday cheating other hams out of money at the hamfest?
>
> What is[typo lame]

Learn to spell, "2test" isn't a word, drug-addicted dropout. You been
making up lies about the O'Briens, Jizzswallowing Jeorge?

2667. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:16:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccbf626_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 41935

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020427235558.04364.00002307@mb-fi.aol.com...
>
> Brian:
>
> Not to worry; I would never "hock a loogie" on one of my passengers,
> but I can nail a Telefon Pole with a wad of chewing gum at fiftah mile
> an aour! (said with strong Sussex County, Delaware accent)
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

More supporting evidence for my last post ...

Please give us a break and stop being so revoltingly graphic, Larry ...

And, if I am ever unfortunate enough to have to visit Sussex County,
DE, you can clean the gum off of my shoes at the county line as I
leave ...

Carl - wk3c

2668. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:17:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCBF668.65861BB9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41936

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You deny that NCI is a conspiracy?
> > >
> > > "conspiracy - an evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan
> > > formulated in secret by two or more persons."
> > >
> > > What secret thing is NCI doing?
> >
> > Thanks Cecil, it saved me the trouble
> > of looking up the definition which I expected
> > to be something akin to what you found.
> >
> > Now it's up to Dick to tell us what the
> > "evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan" is...
> > and which two or more people formulated that
> > plan in secret.

Have you noticed that everyone who disagrees with Dick is
involved in a conspiracy? The Lakers are involved in a
conspiracy to defeat Dick's favorite basketball team.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2669. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:28:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428092843.16841.00005677@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 41937

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> yakk for
>hours with the bowel and bladder reports, and WHINE constantly about
>the code testing requirements

Okay, I give up. If, as you say, they whine "constantly," in what way is their discussion about their health part of that whine?

You could admit that you see everything about amateur radio through a code-test filter and save us a lot of time.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2670. Re: Larry's attitude STILL sucks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:31:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCBF9C2.9B80C9FE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41938

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> I don't see that as a "live and let live" attitude at all ... it's clear
> from your words
> and actions here that your attitude is TRULY that you and others who have
> passed a high speed code test are, indeed, "exhaulted" in some perverse way
> and because of that (delusion), you feel that it's OK to dump at will on
> those who you view as being "inferior" ...
>
> Your attitude STILL sucks, Larry.

Oh, would God the gift to give us to see ourselves as others see us.
Larry doesn't seem to realize that his blatant pecking order modism
is still showing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2671. Re: Larry's attitude STILL sucks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 13:44:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428094458.04378.00009353@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 41940

```
>Your attitude STILL sucks, Larry.
>
>Carl - wk3c
>

Carl just SUCKS
```

2672. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 14:03:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gjTy8.1677$KH1.68429159@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41941

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CCBF279.34140331@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <bIwy8.753$Vj5.32391265@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> > <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Human written code is full of personality, but the 1's are one, and the
0's
> > >are zero, not 1 +/- .001 and 0 +/- .001 respectively.
> > >
> > >So Larry sends perfect code?
> >
> > I don't send "perfect" anything. I'm only human.
>
> But, but, but Larry, you said before that you could send perfect code
> with a J-38.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

A legend in his own mind.
```

2673. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 14:06:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5mTy8.1678$BB1.68121750@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41942

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CCBF394.85B81EEE@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <3CCA1E02.FF4F8E85@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
> >
> > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >> I basically learned how to send CW by using
> > >> an Iambic keyer. I practiced off-the-air with it extensively, and as
a
> > >> result, have trained my ear to produce perfectly formed CW characters
> > >> even when using my trusty old WWII-vintage Lionel J-38 straight key.
> > >
> > >You really expect us to believe that you send "perfect" CW, Larry?
> > >Your dashes are *exactly* three dots long?
> >
> > I'd never claim that my CW is perfect, Cecil, but it's good enough
> > for my TNC to read it in the CW mode.
>
> How soon you forget. Just above, you said you can "produce perfectly
formed
> CW characters even when using my ... J-38 straight key." Are those
"perfectly
> formed CW characters" within a nanosecond of being perfect? within a
microsecond?
> Within a millisecond would certainly not be perfect.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

On the other hand, Dick prides hisself on code sent so sloppily that no
computer could ever copy it.

2674. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 14:11:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ZpTy8.1680$r01.66442524@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41943

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3ccbf4d2$1_1@news7.fast.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020427235554.04364.00002301@mb-fi.aol.com...
> > In article <3CCAEAFE.15AFF3C7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
> >
> > >Nope, the qualifications were *inseparable* parts of the whole. The
Morse
> > >code
> > >exam and the theory exam were given equal pass/fail weights. That's why
> you
> > >concluded that Morse code was as important as everything else in ham
> radio
> > >combined and based your self esteem on it. Tain't so. CW is just one of
> many
> > >modes, is my favorite mode, and I certainly don't hate it. What I hate
is
> to
> > >see you worshiping Morse code as if it were a religion that admits hams
> into
> > >seventh heaven after cleansing them white as snow.
> >
> > Cecil:
> >
> > This type of hyperbole is the thing that cancels you out in the
> > code/no-code debate, because none of us PCTA's are thinking or
> > saying anything of the sort.
>
> Larry ... your other posts (and those of Dick and other PCTAs)
> disprove your claim ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

Until Larry posts his Novice vitae, he is not credible.

2675. HAMFEST - BAYVILLE, NJ August 11, 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 15:27:52 UTC
From: w2ce@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428112752.01817.00008637@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 41944

The Jersey Shore Amateur Radio Society is pleased to announce its 4th Annual Shorefest to be held August 11, 2002
at the Bayville (NJ) Fire House, Route 9, Bayville, NJ.

Table reservations are now being accepted. The hamfest is all indoors in 4,000 square feet of airconditioned pleasure.

If you plan to sell your gear in the the New Jersey shore area this is your only hamfest left in the area. Look at the current hamfest lists. Absecon, Brookdale, Shore Points, Garden State, they are all gone. The JSARS Shorefest is the only hamfest remaining along the shore from Sandy Hook to Cape May. With fog and early morning rain last year that's why we drew over 1,000 hams to our hamfest.

Come see all the area vendors in amateur radio and computers.

Visit http://www.jsars.org to see pictures of our past hamfests and to download a PDF hamfest flyer.

For advanced table reservations or tickets - Contact W2CE at (732) 657-9339 or w2ce@arrl.net

Robert Reed, W2CE
1991 Route 37 West - Lot 109
Toms River, New Jersey 08757

2676. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 16:19:02 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1fbcluj.12sfa7dnbtvnN%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 41945

Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

> "Fred Garvin" <Garvin@Truss.net> wrote in message
> news:1fbap9f.1cqlm9v1ascl3mN%Garvin@Truss.net...
> > Being an amateur is not degrading at all. It's something to be PROUD
> > of. I'm a amateur radio operator and an amateur astronomer. I'm damn
> > proud of it too. I even got an award from the AAVSO for my solar
> > contributions (over 1,000 observations). The word amateur is not hurting
> > ham radio.
>
> Fred, is there a web site I can go to to read up on amateur solar obs?
> Thanks, Brian

www.idsi.net/~trandall/welcome.html

http://www.aavso.org/

--
If love is blind, why is lingerie so popular?
- George Carlin

2677. ARNewsline 1289 - April 26 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 17:18:01 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428131801.19436.00005477@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 41946

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1289 - April 26 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1289 with a release date of
Friday, April 26th, 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Amateur radio aids in the aftermath of two rail accidents. This story is first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1289 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAM RADIO ASSISTS AT CALIFORNIA TRAIN COLLISION SITE

Amateur radio played a pivotal role following two major rail accidents occurring within a few days of one another. On Tuesday April 23rd, a Southern California Metrolink commuter train headed to San Juan Capistrano collided with a mile long freight train that may have missed a stop signal and wandered onto the same track. 2 people on the commuter train were injured and over 260 injured. Local hospitals were swamped with casualties. Joe Moell, K0OV, has more:

--
About four times a year, the hospitals and emergency responders in Orange County, California, hold large-scale drills to test the patient triage and transportation procedures that must be followed in the event of a mass casualty incident. The Hospital Disaster Support Communication System -- an ARES group with agreements to support all 35 hospitals in the county -- is always asked to participate. So it was on Tuesday, April 23 as two dozen HDSCS members awaited their assignments for a mock hazardous material incident, to be staged on a shopping street in Brea, California at 9 AM.

But it was not to be. At 8:10 AM, just 5-1/2 miles away in the city of Placentia, a 6000-ton mile-long freight train collided with a Metrolink double-decker commuter train. HDSCS hams were immediately assigned to the fourteen hospitals expected to receive patients. For the next 4-1/2 hours, a total of 28 hams provided vital links between these hospitals, the county's Central Point ambulance dispatch, and the county's Emergency Medical Service agency.

--
[sound bite 1]
--
Other traffic included verifying victim dispatch, locating victims, providing hospitals with information for inquiring victim families, and liaison with hams supporting the Red Cross. Within some hospitals, hams provided direct

communications between triage areas, Emergency Departments, and Command Posts. Dennis Kidder WA6NIA tells how important this was at one facility:

--
[sound bite 2]
--
This was the 75th actual hospital communications emergency in the 21-year history of HDSCS. From Orange County California, this is Joe Moell K-zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

More on this in a future Amateur Radio Newsline report. (ARNewsline™)

(Note: For more information about this organization and about effective ham radio support for hospitals, go to www.hdscs.org.)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAM RADIO ASSISTS AT FLORIDA DERAILMENT

Ham radio also helped provided coordination of emergency services following a train wreck near Crescent City Florida on Thursday April 18th. The accident happened at about 5:15 P-M Eastern time. Billy Williams, N4UF reports from Jacksonville:

--

The accident killed four passengers and injured 159 other passengers. It happened after the engineer of an ill-fated Amtrak train saw damaged track and hit the emergency brakes.

Rescue workers say 21 of the train's 40 cars including 14 of the 16 passenger cars derailed. Seven flipped on their sides, lying along the mangled track in a zig-zag pattern. Some passengers escaped through windows, while dozens of were trapped inside for hours.

Soon after the accident Bill Krueger, KF4EJD, was on the scene and at the wreck site relaying information to hams associated with ARES. Other hams soon had portable stations operational at the Putnam County Emergency Operations Center and the Crescent City High School shelter. A secondary shelter at Middleton-Burney Elementary School was established to assist in moving the passengers.

At the peak of activity, about 400 people were sheltered at Crescent City High School where a triage center had been set up. Also, a group from the Northeast Florida Chapter American Red Cross headquartered in Jacksonville was sent to the scene. This included several Jacksonville ham radio operators and a Red Cross Emergency Response vehicle.

Two hospitals in Jacksonville were staffed by Duval ARES operators to provide status reports to medical volunteers who were ready to head to the site if needed. Their help was not required and the hospital ham stations were secured at 10 PM Eastern time..

Meantime., the Florida Crown Emergency Net was in operation on the W4IZ Repeater System which was linked to the KF4PXZ system in Palatka. The net was in session from 5:30 to after 11PM.

There were many hams who volunteered in this emergency. Far to many to list here. And they once again proved that ham radio was willing and able to help when called on.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Billy Williams, N4UF, in Jacksonville Florida.

--

According to news reports, many of the train's 418 passengers were senior citizens traveling between northern homes and winter retreats. (N4UF, ARNewsline™)

**

REALLOCATION: FCC PUTS ARRL NOVICE BAND PROPOSAL TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments are due to the FCC by May 16 on An ARRL petition that would eliminate the 80, 40 and 15-meter Novice and Technician Plus CW subbands. The information is from an ARRL Bulletin. Amateur Radio Newsline's Paul Courson WA3VJB, reports from the nations capital:

--
Designated RM-10413, the notice is aimed at reusing the current Novice spectrum in part to expand the 80 and 40 meter phone subbands. The ARRL's petition was filed in March asks the FCC to eliminate the Novice and Technician Plus Morse only subbands and divvy them up alleviate what the ARRL sees as overcrowding elsewhere.

If the FCC goes along, the current Novice and Technician Plus would be permitted to operate on the 80, 40, 15 and 10-meter General-class CW allocations at up to 200 Watts output. For General and higher class operators, the ARRL plan would implement changes in the 80, 40 and 15-meter phone bands, expanding phone segments for many amateurs.

But the ARRL petition goes well beyond just refarming the Novice bands. The League also seeks FCC permission to use spread spectrum on 222 to 225 MHz. It also proposes to expand the pool of special event call signs beyond the 1 by 1 format to include identifiers for United States territories that do not provide for mailing addresses. The ARRL also wants to incorporate into the rules a 1990 FCC waiver authorizing amateurs in specific areas of Colorado and Wyoming to operate on certain segments of the 33-cm band. Lastly, the petition asks that the government clarify rules to indicate that modulated CW is permitted for repeater station identification.

May 16th is the designated commentary cutoff date on RM-10413, and the FCC is expecting a lot of response on this one.

Paul Courson, WA3VJB, Washington.

--

And we at Amateur Radio Newsline want to know your position on the reallocation of the current Novice subbands? Do you like the ARRL proposal? Do you have what you consider a better one? Should the subbands even be re-farmed? We would like to hear from you. Please send us a short e-mail with your opinion and we will put some of them on the air in future newscasts. The electronic address is news;ine@arnewsline.org. (ARRL, ARNewsline™)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the K6LY repeater serving Monterey California.

(5 sec pause here)

**
RADIO RULES: HAM PETITIONS FOR MANDATORY FIELD REPAIRABLE RIGS

How would you like to be able to take the cover off your radio and replace a plug-in highly complex integrated circuit, put the cover back on and have the radio work again. Kind of the way it was when tubes rather than solid state ruled ham radio. Well, that is what Nickolaus Leggett, N3NL, says hams should be able to do and he is asking the FCC to provide the rules to make it so. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has the details:

--
Nikolaus Leggett filed his request to the FCC in February. After reviewing it, the Commission has assigned it as RM-10412 and has set May 16th as a commentary cutoff date.

What Leggett suggests is not really new. He believes that Amateur Radio operators should have a fighting chance to keep their own gear operational. He acknowledges that today’s high tech equipment may not be component level serviceable, but he as asking the FCC to make mandatory certain key aspects of design so that a ham with a general knowledge of troubleshooting techniques might get a broken radio back in operation. Especially in time of a declared emergency.

--
Leggett: “What I proposed is that the Commission establish some sort of standards that would essentially establish that equipment be field repairable in some manner. Either it should have replaceable modules or replaceable circuit boards or parts on a circuit board should be spaced at a certain distance so that you can access them. There should be LED indicators on digital busses. There should be test points to take voltage and current measurements. In other words the equipment should be accessible for the Amateur to repair or modify it.”
--

Leggett acknowledges that should the FCC adopt his recommendations it will probably lead some makers of ham gear to drop out of the United States Amateur Radio marketplace:

--
Legget: “My response on that is to look at the QRP field. There is a very nice Single Sideband QRP transceiver kit, which costs about $700. It is fully field repairable. It is advertised allot in QST Magazine, and this indicates that there certainly are vendors in the marketplace who can come out with a nice piece of equipment; highly regarded; very well reviewed; and at a reasonable price that is field repairable.”
--

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW in Los Angeles.

--

You can hear lots more with Nickolaus Leggett on this weeks RAIN report. Take your web browser to www.rainreport.com or call area code 847-827-7246. Meantime, the manufacturers who supply ham gear are expected to file in opposition to the Leggett rule making request. (ARNewsline™, RAIN)

**

SPECTRUM USE: FCC ON AMTS AND DENIALS TO HAMS

The FCC has approved proposed rules allowing geographic based licensing of coast stations in the Automated Maritime Telecommunications Service, the primary user of the 219-220 MHz band. According to the ARRL Letter, the Commission also agreed to consider an ARRL petition for changes in the rules governing the secondary amateur allocation at 219-220 MHz.

Amateur use of the band within 80 kilometers of an the Automated Maritime Telecommunications Service or AMTS coast station is currently requires permission from the AMTS licensee. Industry practice has been to routinely deny such requests, regardless of channel separation.

Now, the FCC will consider whether AMTS licensees denying permission should be required to give a technical justification for the denial. This, in conjunction with the ongoing 3-G proceeding that's considering use of 216-220 MHz for new technologies. (ARRL)

**

SPECTRUM REALLOCATION: CONGRESS PROPOSES DELAY IN UHF CHANNEL AUCTION

Congressional lawmakers say that they plan to introduce legislation to delay indefinitely the Federal Communications Commission's June sale spectrum currently used by television broadcasters to wireless carriers. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Norm Seeley, KI7UP, Takes a closer look at what is about to transpire:

--
The proposed legislation is being sponsored by House Energy and Commerce Chairman Billy Tauzin and ranking Democrat Representative John Dingell. The current law requires the FCC to auction the spectrum used channels television channels 52 through 59 by September 30th of this year. But if Congress says O-K, the measure will eliminate the legal deadline in September for an auction be conducted. It will also tell the agency not to go forward with the sale

slated for June 19th.

The anticipated congressional action is intended to give more breathing room for broadcasters to move off their current analog television channels. It would also give mobile telephone carriers more certainty about a date when they would obtain this spectrum so that they make available a number of new services.

So far, no one has gone to court to force the FCC to hold the sale.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

More on this story in future amateur Radio Newsline reports. (Published news reports)

**

RADIO RULES: COURT SAYS OWNERSHIP CAPS ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS

Another blow to those who support a cap on the number of media outlets any one company can own. This, as a federal appeals court rules in favor of easing an FCC regulation that bars a broadcaster from owning two TV stations -- known as a duoploly -- in a single market. That is, unless there are eight other broadcast TV stations in that same market.

The court held that the Federal Communications Commission was arbitrary and capricious in excluding cable companies and other media outlets from the eight outlet standard. The ruling also admonished the FCC for failing to back up its argument that diversity and localism are protected by broadcast stations alone.

The court stopped short of declaring the duopoly rule unconstitutional and throwing it out altogether. Rather it directed the FCC to rethink that part of the rule dictating what constitutes a broadcast voice in any given market. (Published news reports)

**

RADIO LAW FOLLOW-UP: TOWERS VS. BIRDS

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service believes that communications towers are estimated to kill 4 to 5 million birds each year. And the service says that these kills violate the spirit and the intent of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Now, a new organization called the National Antenna Consortium has been formed. Its purpose is to help communications companies deal with bird kills and other vexing issues associated with tower construction.

The CGC Communicator reports the group held a meeting at the recent National Association of Broadcasters meeting in Las Vegas. Speakers included Andrew Skotdal of KRKO Radio and attorneys Barry Umansky and Fred Hopengarten, K1VR. More information is on the web at migratorybirds.fws.gov (CGC Communicator)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: KB0G SPEARHEADING LINUX

A alternative computer operating system now has a ham helping to develop it. Nate Dueher, WY0X, reports:

--
One of the worlds largest Linux organizations now has a ham radio operator as its leader. Bdale Garbee, KB0G, of Blackforrest Colorado, has been elected as the 2002 Project Leader for Debian Linux. Bdale, who is known by many hams for his excellent work on many Amateur Radio projects including the RUDAK system on board AO-40 has also been on the software development team for Debian Linux for many years.

Debian -- spelled D-E-B-I-A-N -- has excellent support for many popular ham radio modes including CW, RTTY, packet radio, APRS, PSK-31 and many others. It is a version of the Linux operating system known world wide as dedicated to free software, quality and even ham radio. Bdale’s leadership skills should prove to be a match made in technology.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Nate Nueher, NY0X, in Colorado.
--

More information on Debian Linux can be found in cyberspace at www.debian.org. (NY0X, ARNewsline™)

**

Break 2

This is ham radio news for todays radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

**

THE THANK YOU CORNER WITH ANY JAREMA, N6TCQ

Last week, Support Fund Administrator Andy Jarema, N6TCQ, presented the latest Newsline fiscal report. Andy is back with us this week to say thanks to those who supported Amateur Radio Newsline™ in the month of January. Here is N6TCQ:

--

In the month of January we heard from Benton Bonney, W4PE of Orlando Jodie Steggerda, N8ALJ of Champaign, IL. From California, we heard from GEARS, the Golden Empire Amateur Radio Society of Chico, as well as associate Joann Biegler, William Walters, WA2IBM of San Jose CARA, the Catalina Amateur Repeater Association Bruce Murray of Seal Beach and Jim Truran, KE6FNJ of Encino.

Thanks to everybody for their support. A reminder that Newsline is a 501c 3 and a California non-profit corporation; all contributions are tax-deductible. The address for the Newsline Support fund is PO Box 660937, Arcadia, CA

91066. I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Thanks Andy. (N6TCQ)

**

RADIO BUSINESS: AEROFLEX BUYS IFR

If you use R-F test equipment to keep your repeater operating, listen up. According to Chris Boone, WB5ITT, Wichita Kansas based Aeroflex Inc. is acquiring IFR Systems Inc. – maker of the famed IFR Spectrum Analyzer and other R-F test gear. According to an April 15th press release, Aeroflex is paying approximately $60 million in cash for IFR. (WB5ITT)

**

HAMVENTION 2002: ARRL DIGITAL VOICE FORUM

The ARRL Digital Voice Working Group will host a Digital Voice Forum at the 2002 Dayton Hamvention. The session will include presentations from experts in the fields of digital-audio hardware, software and other technical details. Applications from rag-chewing to emergency communications to digital audio broadcasting will be covered. The date is Sunday, May 19th at 10:15 at the Hara Arena Meeting Room 1 immediately following the ARRL Forum. (ARRL)

**

INTERNATIONAL – UK: SPECIAL EVENT STATION GB2PK

On the international scene, word that United Kingdom special event station GB2PK will be on the air intermittently from the 26th of April for a month from the Porthcurno Telegraph Museum in Cornwall. The operation will use both vintage 1950’s military and modern ham radio gear. QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL – SOUTH KOREA: SPECIAL EVENT STATION HL17FCW

Also involved in a celebration HL17FWC. This station is on the air from South Korea to commemorate the 17th FIFA Football World Cup. QSL via HLZ0HQ. (GB2RS)

**

CONTESTS - WRTC 2002: UNITED ARAB EMIRATES TEAM INVITED TO 2002 EVENT

From the world of contesting, word that the WRTC 2002 Organizing Committee has decided to invite the A61AJ team from the United Arab Emirates to be the representative of the contesting community in the Middle East. According to a WRTC press release, the teams operating from A61AJ have achieved superb results over the past few years. WRTC planners say that this invitation seeks to recognize this fact. Team UAE will be led by Ali Al-Futtaim, A61AJ. Al-Futtaim is well known as the driving force behind the development of what is one of

the premier contest superstations in the Middle East and Asia. (WRTC)

**

DX

In D-X, Cuban VHF DX'er Arnie Coro, CO2KK says over the VHF Reflector that six meters is, properly named the magic band. According to Coro, while testing a balcony mounted half wave dipole he heard VK2ZF calling CQ on CW several times near 50.106 MHz. Coro says that the signal was good copy with no signs of echoes. Arnie responded but with only two watts and a dipole, no Q-S-O was made. Coro says that if he had been running at last 5 watts and a beam, that contact would have been made. (VHF Reflector)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: AN EDITORIAL - WHERE HAVE ALL THE NOMINATIONS GONE?

And finally this week, an editorial word about the Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award. Here is our producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF:

--
Im going to start this commentary with one word: Help!

Why help? Well its now the end of April. The nominating period for the 2002 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award has been open since February 1st. We have announced it at the end of every newscast for almost three months. Sadly, to date, we have not received what we consider to be a single viable nomination. Not one!

Normally by now we have received at least a dozen or more nominations. As this is written, all we have are the usual letters asking that we enter a youngster in a contest that some think the award to be. To paraphrase one: "Our 5 year old just got her ham license so send a free radio."

But that is it! And for the record; the Young Ham of the Year Award is not a contest. Rather its a way to honor the accomplishments of youth in ham radio. It has been that -- and only that -- since 1986.

The nominating period for this years award closes on May 30th. Just about 4 weeks from now. As it stands, there may be no Young Ham of the Year Award presented in 2002 unless we begin to receive valid nominations. And that is where you come in.

Do you know of a young ham -- age 18 or younger? One who has accomplished something really special using Amateur Radio? Well, what are you waiting for? Now is the time to nominate that person.

Does your radio club have a youngster who has been an outstanding member. Maybe one who does far more for the club that most of the grown-up hams? Again, what are you waiting for? This very moment is the time nominate that boy or girl.

How about that quiet young ham who is always willing to volunteer in public service events? You know; the one who does everything from organizing the

communications to keeping the club repeater operating. Ill say it once again: What are you waiting for? Nominate that person.

I think you get the idea.

OK. How do you file a nomination? Simple. You go to www.arnewsline.org, scroll down to Young Ham of the Year Award. Click on the rules. Read them. Click on the nominating form. Download it. Fill it out and mail it in or e-mail it to us. Its that easy.

We at the Amateur Radio Newsline™ believe that the future of our hobby, our service and our nation is in the hands of the young. It will be the next generation of young hams who will be the technologists, public service leaders and political leaders of this new millennium. The Young Ham of the Year Award is one way to guarantee that there will be this “next generation” of ham radio leaders. By taking the time to nominate a youngster for this award, you take one step to help insure the future of Amateur Radio.

Thank you. Roy.

--

If the award is made this year, the youngster selected will receive a trip to the Huntsville Hamfest and a ham radio gift courtesy of Vertex Standard. He or she will also be treated to a week at Spacecamp Huntsville thanks to the folks at C-Q magazine. (ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline™ Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. Our mailing address is PO Box 660937, Arcadia California 91066. More information about this newscast and the Young Ham of the Year Award is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Roy Neal, K6DUE saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline™ is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

2678. Re: ARNewsline 1289 - April 26 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 17:55:06 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <_HWy8.10789$iU4.966023@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41947

"Radionews" <radionews@aol.com> wrote

>
> And we at Amateur Radio Newsline want to know your position on the
reallocation
> of the current Novice subbands? Do you like the ARRL proposal? Do you
have
> what you consider a better one? Should the subbands even be re-farmed?
We
> would like to hear from you. Please send us a short e-mail with your
opinion
> and we will put some of them on the air in future newscasts. The
electronic
> address is news;ine@arnewsline.org. (ARRL, ARNewslineT)
>

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10413
Amateur Service Rules Governing)
Operating Privileges)
)

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments are in response to the ARRL proposal for "refarming"
the existing HF "Novice sub-bands".

I. Discussion:

The ARRL petition does not address the implementation of
new technologies as repeatedly requested by the Commission in
WT Docket 98-143. It simply proposes to eliminate the Novice
segments and reshuffle that spectrum among existing legacy
modes. Rather than gain consensus, the ARRL polling method
produced a popularity poll among several non-responsive (to
98-143) choices.

Rather than just "more of the same old stuff", I propose
that the Commission take this opportunity to provide the
Amateur Radio service with a new incentive to concentrate

on paragraph 97.1(b) of the Commission's Rules.

97.1(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art.

While I agree that the declining Novice license population no longer justifies several significant chunks of spectrum as a "reservation" for improving their Morse skills, and that these "reservations" have outlived their regulatory purpose, I propose that we retain these 50-year old "reservations" and convert them to a new purpose which will ensure the future Amateur Radio service continues our "proven ability to contribute to the advancement".

II Proposal:

A. To "de-populate" the current Novice segments, I propose that all Novice (and Technician with code credit) licensees be authorized to use Morse code in the same band segments now authorized for General class licensees.

B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be set aside as a new "Experimental Reservation" for non-traditional and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized image, and other "forward looking" communications methods.

Traditional modulation methods would be allowed in these segments only for brief coordination discussion during the testing of an experimental mode.

C. I propose that the normal power output level of 1500W be allowed for those segments, but transmitters which are adjusted and capable of more than 50W must include auto-adaptive circuitry to reduce power to the minimum level needed to maintain reliable communications.

D. I recommend that the Commission grant broad discretion to amateurs operating in this "experimental reservation" as to innovative modulation schemes and non-traditional technologies.

Respectfully submitted,

Hans Brakob, K0HB

2679. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 18:13:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428141304.20744.00001019@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 41951

In article <20020427235557.04364.00002306@mb-fi.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20020427004847.04302.00001027@mb-bh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>Yes, Larrie, you tellum Macro Boy.
>>
>>We all know you hate voice with a passion.

>I don't "hate" voice modes at all. What I dislike is what is being
>done with them, for the most part, by so-called radio amateurs who
>can't be bothered to learn a second mode of electronic communication.

What do you mean by "second mode?" :-)

You simply hate voice modes, relegate them to "second place."

They are FIRST modes on HF, VHF, UHF ham bands.

>>We all know you are one of the best 1930s radio amateurs to
>>exist in the year 2002...except you seem to be a total technical
>>moron on how anything but on-off keying works.
>
>Well, compared to a professional electronics weenie like yourself,
>I *would* be a "technical moron" -- or at least, in the interest of the
>health of our electronics industry, I would hope I would be!

You are NO judge of technical things, Roll. You cannot compare professional electronics to amateur things because you have only a cursory knowledge. If put behind the front panel of your ready-built radio equipment you would be totally LOST.

>I have
>never made dime number one with my electronics knowledge, and
>you have made your living at it!

That is the basic definition of "amateur" versus "professional."

What other obvious things are you going to state?

>There had damn well BETTER be
>a world of difference between MY technical expertise and YOURS.
>However, I am a licensed AMATEUR radio operator.

Yes, you have a federal merit badge that signifies you can transmit RF energy within certain specified frequency limits using certain specified modulation modes. You bought all

your radio equipment ready-made and (apparently) were able
to read enough of the instruction manuals to make the
equipment work.

A little old lady neighbor (who knows nothing about electronics
or computers) recently bought a whole personal computer
setup and got it to work by doing the same thing...but did not
need any license or morse code ability. She doesn't brag
about her accomplishments and doesn't hold herself up as the
very model of a modern computer maven. You hold yourself up
as the shining example of an extra special amateur radio
operator.

>This newsgroup is about AMATEUR radio.

It is just about amateur radio policy, Roll, and filled with some
individuals who hold themselves in very high personal esteem
(their steem pressure is near explosive point) as models of
what other radio amateurs should be.

>Do YOU have an amateur radio license? No, you don't!

I have a commercial radio operator's license. Since 1956.
First class radiotelephone. One examination session.
No problem.

>With all your amazing technical knowledge, why the heck not?

Why should I dumb myself down to your level?

>Just going to a VE session and getting your No-Clue
>Tech ticket would almost remove this stigma from your persona on
>this newsgroup, and it would get Steve off you back as well!

There is no such thing as a "No-Clue Tech ticket."

Who is "Steve?"

If you mean Richard Chamberpot, amateur radio's counterpart to
Efrem Saldovar, he has a psychological aberration that makes
him want to beat up old men just for jollies. He's not rational.

Try to convince me that one of your merit badges is worthwhile
rather than dumbing me down to your level. Remember that I
got on HF legally for the first time in Februry, 1953, running a
full kilowatt on a single-channel RTTY circuit across the Pacific.

I've been in the business of radio-electronics since 1951 and have
participated in theory-design-prototyping-testing-field trials on
more frequencies and more modulations than you can hope to
accomplish solely on "amateur bands." I have "worked DX" to a
range of a quarter million miles to a station ON the moon. I don't
care for spending countless hours working DX just for the sake
of working DX or mashing a telegraph key to pretend I'm a

"pioneer in radio" of the 1930s, recreating times that will never come about again. I see amateur radio as a hobby activity that is more than self-imagery and self-puffery and a constant recreation of old events using old procedures described by self-important boilerplate phrasing that is older than the average licensee.

Amateur radio might be a nice hobby to take up in retirement. Unfortunately, there are too many self-important self-styled "I'm in charge here" radio kops swaggering their sticks and waving their paper medals as if they were supermen Nobel laureates for what they did. Lawrence T. Roll comes across as one of those. That's not a role model for anyone.

2680. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 18:13:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428141305.20744.00001020@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 41950

In article <aafpqr$17nb$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>>In article <LZBy8.9157$8p3.776365@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
>><KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>>
>>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>>
>>>> Present-day use of different optical wavelength is fairly well
>>>> limited to only two main spectral lines.
>>>
>>>That statement is out of date by at least a decade.
>[...]
>>I know you've pulled up a Bragg Cell and wanna tout, but I was
>>referring to INSTALLED SYSTEMS AT WORK. NOW.
>>
>>ON-OFF OPTICAL SWITCHING SYSTEMS. WORKING NOW.
>
>Len,
>
>WDM systems have been deployed for 5 or 6 years now. They run at
>the 1550 nm wavelength (about 193 THz frequency) sweet spot in glass. I
>think the original Erbium-doped fiber amplifiers gave optical gain
>from 1530 nm to 1560 nm, or a bit wider, though I think newer equipment
>has doubled that. I'm pretty sure the ITU standardized a 0.8 nm
>(i.e. 100 GHz) channel spacing, so you can get 40 carrier wavelengths
>into the EDFA bandwidth. The 100 GHz channel is wide enough for 10 Gbps
>OOK switching with its sidebands. Most of the systems installed in the
>last 3 or so years have hence supported 40x10 Gbps channels (i.e.
>wavelengths). I've seen a lot of this stuff installed, though I can't
>say for sure that I've ever seen one where I was sure all 40 channels
>were turned on. That's a pile of bandwidth on a single fiber, in fact
>about 40 times what was possible 3 or 4 years prior to that, so there's
>a relative glut of both unprovisioned fiber and unprovisioned bandwidth
>these days.

Dennis, all that and what is snipped is good information on the state of the arts in fiberline communications. It wasn't my point to get into a large argument over what is or isn't the cutting edge of throughput at optical wavelengths. This is not the venue for that.

My hands-on experience with optical wavelengths is relatively limited to certain applications of optical interferometry, specifically phase measurement better than a nanometer. That includes

having to play on an optical bench alongside some physicists
(I dubbed optical benches as "stable tables" - heh).

If you wish to dub "slow" communications rates of 4 GBPS on-off
as "digital," I have no quarrel with that. To the average radio
amateur, such rates must appear in the fantasy region, the bit
rate being twice as fast as the highest carrier frequency ham
rig one can buy at HRO.

I was pointing out that on-off bit rates of 4,000,000,000 times per
second is what I consider "more digital" than 4 times per second
of a telegraph key closure used with an OOK CW transmitter.
A billion times faster, ten to the ninth power.

>I guess the original point might still be that we'd certainly call
>OOK CW a digital modulation when used in these systems, and it isn't
>clear to me that the nature of the modulation changes as you lower
>the bit rate to human speeds, so I think calling OOK CW in amateur
>radio "digital" is probably not incorrect.

Some folks called an old damped-wave arc-spark transmitter a
"radio" too. Very broadband thing, no problem to detect with a
galena crystal (with cat's whisker). Want to set one of those
alongside a modern Icom or Yaesu or Kenwood transceiver and
say both are "radios?" Both can do OOK CW. But they are
hardly similar, are they? :-)

The entire EM spectrum above 300 GHz is NOT REGULATED.

Nobody needs to get any license to operate above 300 GHz.

Optical frequencies are open for amateurs to really shine! :-)

2681. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 18:13:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428141306.20744.00001021@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 41948

In article <RoJy8.794$2M6.98900404@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020427154124.01569.00000555@mb-mg.aol.com...
>
>> >I don't think Jim likes me.
>>
>> You have a good summation there. :-)
>
>Its just that when its my turn to comment on the ARRL proposal I have to
>list my vitae on the Novice subbands, but when Hans or Dick comments,
>anything goes.

Both of them "know what is best for amateur radio."

Dickie didn't say those exact words but Hans most certainly
did around four years ago. In public. In here. :-)

2682. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 18:13:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428141307.20744.00001022@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 41949

In article <aag08v$1c3t$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>If amateur experimentation with packet radio was a "failure" then I'd
>suggest that if experimental failures like this would happen in amateur
>radio every few years or so the service would be much better off in
>terms of justifying its existance. In an experimental service even
>things that don't work out can teach things of great value. The only
>real "failure" is the failure to attempt anything new at all.

Good words. I suspect that the amateur radio community thinking won't allow that or "failure." Failure is taken as a "weakness" and no self-important radio amateur wants to be "weak" or wimpish. Everything new must be laid out for them, already developed, plus explanatory articles on the new stuff printed in QST to make it "official" for amateur radio use. What will immediately follow are ready-made, designed-by-others equipment which the amateurs can buy, install, and then brag about their operating on the cutting edge of technology...without knowing much about it except for some important buzzphrases used to impress others. :-)

2683. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 18:17:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCC3CA3.B934B11F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41952

Brian P Burke wrote:
> On the other hand, Dick prides hisself on code sent so sloppily that no
> computer could ever copy it.

In Dick's case, do you reckon it's called the "Turnip Truck Swing"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2684. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:33:14 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428153314.00688.00004235@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 41953

> This is a common situation among radio technical
>professionals who did not receive the start of their
>interest in the field via ham radio. They don't seem to
>realize the potential for furthering their knowledge and
>experience through the wide variety of experimenting
>possibilities that exist in ham radio.

As an Electrical Engineer, I would like to see more technical activities in "Ham" radio clubs. I have been to a few clubs and it seems that most Hams are not interested in the technology of radio, they just want to operate it.

It is fine if you just want to operate a radio, do morse code, or contests. But, the professional would want to do other activities that they find iteresting. There are many "Ham" radio amateur clubs, but right now there are no clubs for the Amateur radio enthusiasts that want to work with rf technology.

I would like to see more antenna setups, kit building, discussions of ciruits people have designed, radio direction finding, etc. The ARRL handbook is full of good technical information, but most Ham radio people do not want to do these things. This is why professional stay away from Ham radio.

Right now, it is a waste to go join clubs, except for field day. Most clubs meet once a month and discuss Ham business. There is little opportunity to get involved. The only benefit to getting an Amateur radio licence is use of the spectrum.
I like working with rf and with radios. Probably, if my initial exposure was though a Ham radio club, I would not have
got exited about radios and would have forgot about it.

2685. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:57:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEF0562.1EFA7C29@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41955

CAM wrote:

> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > > I was cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC
> > > SEND AND RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!
> >
> > This must be some kind of proof that you have more time in the chow hall.
> > Besides, the M28s were junked a quarter of a century ago. Even hams don't
> > want them anymore.
>
> I saw one at a hamfest a few years ago. It had a sign on it, "FREE!", and
> nobody wanted it. Do you think Dick would have flown to AZ to get it?

Even further proof that you two dupes don't bother to read, rather just spout off trash. Candid Carl was trying to assert that I knew nothing about AUTOMATIC transmission of messages. Of course he's as wrong as always.

2686. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:57:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEF5E6A.11C70D81@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41954

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3BEEAA0A.A5E7012C@townsqr.com...
> > K0HB wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > > You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward"
> > > > nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere,
> > > > just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a
> > > > joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet
> > > > radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended
> > > > widespread interest in the mode.
> > > >
> > >
> > > In other words, we could have used a better packet system?
> >
> > We would have *had* a better system if all the store-and-forward idiots
> > hadn't chased off all the sensible users.
>
> Dick,
>
> Please explain how the lack of message forwarding between
> mailboxes would have "magically" converted the "sow's ear"
> of Bell 202 AFSK modem tones through the mike/speaker
> jack of 2m FM radios into the "purse" of a decent packet
> radio system???
>
> There's nothing inherently wrong with forwarding messages.
> How do you think you see my postings here? Or get your
> e-mail, for that matter?
>

You can't even read what others post. You have no idea what I said. Dialog
with you is a lost cause.

>
> The problem is that the SYSTEM (and I use the term VERY
> loosely) did not have enough capacity to handle the traffic offered
> and it choked and died as a result.

Ah, No kidding??? Whatta revelation! Indeed, it was a simple string of a few
digipeaters stuck up by a few hams financed out of the pocket change. Sorry we

couldn't keep up with all the "Commercials".

> Had better (faster) technology
> been embraced and adopted on a large scale, packet radio would
> still be interesting and useful ... in fact, moreso than in the very
> early days ...
>

Yeah, let's see if the ARRL wants to finance some of that out of their stash.
I won't hold my breath, suggest you not either.

>
> > Some of you seem to blithely assume that technology will solve all
> > problems and salve all wounds. But it can't place gray matter in the
> > empty space between the ears of the vacant eyed, nor can it undo the
> > damage caused by those same induhviduals.
>
> Technology could have solved the ills of packet radio, but too many
> people like you were unwilling to even consider the need for something
> better than 1200 baud AFSK (and too cheap to upgrade), so it essentially
> died because it became essentially unusable and boring compared to a
> dial-up internet connection.
>

Carl this is really a revelation. You have absolutely no idea what ham radio
really is.You live off in some world of your own where you can bullshit some
MBA into thinking you actually know what you're doing. No wonder Lucent is in
the tank with hand on handle.

>
> You are right however, in one respect ... technology "can't place gray
> matter in the empty space between the ears of the vacant eyed, nor
> can it undo the damage caused by those same induhviduals."
>

It damn sure didn't in your case.

2687. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:57:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEF5EFE.D49588A9@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41958

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CCACC9B.D2D011FE@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You deny that NCI is a conspiracy?
> >
> > "conspiracy - an evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan
> > formulated in secret by two or more persons."
> >
> > What secret thing is NCI doing?
>
> Thanks Cecil, it saved me the trouble
> of looking up the definition which I expected
> to be something akin to what you found.
>
> Now it's up to Dick to tell us what the
> "evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan" is...
> and which two or more people formulated that
> plan in secret.
>

No, its just Cecil playing with his uh dictionary again.

2688. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:57:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEF5F77.A5E3755@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41959

Bill Sohl wrote:

> > Such situations occur all the time on HF.
> > No doubt many or even most are
> > preventable, but which ones? FCC knows
> > there's no practical way to determine.
>
> So much for the vaulted attitudes of those that
> abuse power on the air when they are fully
> aware they don't need even 1/4 of what they are running.

Of course YOU and Carl know, though. Of course. You've got a grip. Right.

2689. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:57:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEF61D3.F0FD57CA@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41960

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3CCAEAFE.15AFF3C7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Nope, the qualifications were *inseparable* parts of the whole. The Morse
> >code
> >exam and the theory exam were given equal pass/fail weights. That's why you
> >concluded that Morse code was as important as everything else in ham radio
> >combined and based your self esteem on it. Tain't so. CW is just one of many
> >modes, is my favorite mode, and I certainly don't hate it. What I hate is to
> >see you worshiping Morse code as if it were a religion that admits hams into
> >seventh heaven after cleansing them white as snow.
>
> Cecil:
>
> This type of hyperbole is the thing that cancels you out in the
> code/no-code debate, because none of us PCTA's are thinking or
> saying anything of the sort.
>
> >> You may get far more negative response than you wished.
> >
> >So did Galileo, but he was right. Time to face up to the fact that you
> >have lost your King of the Mountain status but continue to beat that
> >dead horse.
>
> The "King of the Mountain" whine is strictly a false construct of
> the NCTA. All we're doing is supporting the requirement for radio
> amateurs to learn a useful, basic communications mode. This
> KOTM crapola is just whining -- something for which the NCTA
> has made itself famous.

Poor ol' besotted Cecil has had himself so worked up for so long he's no longer
capable of being rational.

2690. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:57:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3BEF6362.BFA5DDE4@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41961

K0HB wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > Some of you seem to blithely assume that technology will solve all
> > problems and salve all wounds.
>
> I don't know who this "some of you" are. I make no such assumption, and
> haven't made any such claim here. I haven't asked anyone to change their
> preferred "ham radio lifestyle", and I won't.
>
> All I have suggested is that the ARRL "refarming" proposal is poorly
> conceived, and advanced the notion that perhaps those little reservations
> might make a good place for pioneers and experimenters. You seem to hold
> that notion in some disdain. That puzzles me.
>

It's Cluless Carl that I mainly refer to and and him and his agenda that I
hold in disdain.

2691. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:57:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCBFD0D.904CC667@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41956

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> Carl R. Stevenson <wk3c@fast.net> wrote:
> >"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:3BEEAA0A.A5E7012C@townsqr.com...
> >> K0HB wrote:
> >>
> >> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >> >
> >> > >
> >> > > You must have missed all the packet radio "store and forward"
> >> > > nonsense. Huge reams of data about nothing being sent nowhere,
> >> > > just to be able to say that "we could do it so we did it". What a
> >> > > joke. That crap clogged all the digipeaters and ruined the packet
> >> > > radio system as far as most of us were concerned, and ended
> >> > > widespread interest in the mode.
> >> > >
> >> >
> >> > In other words, we could have used a better packet system?
> >>
> >> We would have *had* a better system if all the store-and-forward idiots
> >> hadn't chased off all the sensible users.
> [...]
> >The problem is that the SYSTEM (and I use the term VERY
> >loosely) did not have enough capacity to handle the traffic offered
> >and it choked and died as a result. Had better (faster) technology
> >been embraced and adopted on a large scale, packet radio would
> >still be interesting and useful ... in fact, moreso than in the very
> >early days ...
> >
> >> Some of you seem to blithely assume that technology will solve all
> >> problems and salve all wounds. But it can't place gray matter in the
> >> empty space between the ears of the vacant eyed, nor can it undo the
> >> damage caused by those same induhviduals.
> >
> >Technology could have solved the ills of packet radio, but too many
> >people like you were unwilling to even consider the need for something
> >better than 1200 baud AFSK (and too cheap to upgrade), so it essentially
> >died because it became essentially unusable and boring compared to a
> >dial-up internet connection.
>
> You might take a look at this:
>
> "Round Trip Time Estimation," P. Karn & C. Partridge, ACM

> SIGCOMM-87, August 1987.
>
> The first author is KA9Q. The paper deals with a fundamental insight
> gained in good measure by attempting to run TCP/IP over amateur packet
> radio links.
>
> To make a long story short, the Transmission Control Protocol (the
> first part of TCP/IP, the pair of protocols upon which the Internet
> is based), which was a decade or so old when the paper was written,
> didn't work. TCP/IP networks collapsed under load. There were two
> or three very important papers written in the later 80's that provided
> a fundamental understanding of why that was and what to do about it.
> The above was one of those papers, and the TCP in your computer almost
> certainly implements the "Karn Algorithm" as part of this repair.
>
> I wouldn't underestimate the importance of that paper. TCP/IP wasn't
> the only suite of networking protocols that existed at the time, and
> TCP/IP was considered by a lot of people in phone companies and governments
> and standards bodies and places like that as an academic toy which couldn't
> possibly be made to work. If you are reading this you should be grateful
> that view turned out to be wrong, because even if you think the Internet
> sucks I guarantee you that you would like the phone company/government
> version of a computer network much, much less. Amateur radio, and the
> experience of trying to run those protocols in a really crappy ad hoc
> environment, contributed to the eventual outcome in an important way.
>
> If amateur experimentation with packet radio was a "failure" then I'd
> suggest that if experimental failures like this would happen in amateur
> radio every few years or so the service would be much better off in
> terms of justifying its existance. In an experimental service even
> things that don't work out can teach things of great value. The only
> real "failure" is the failure to attempt anything new at all.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

Dennis- thanks for the insight, you have explained some things that needed explaining.
The only failure I found in packet radio on VHF (not HF) was the narowmindedness of certain operators in that they abused the system to the point that it was useless to everyone else. Carl seems to think that the answer was for the handful of hams involved to fund some AT&T version of packet radio that would have worked at Internet speeds. Looks to me like he's far out of touch with the reality of ham radio in real life. Few hams could or would be interested in any such venture. His "solutions" seem to be a pretty far stretch for a bunch of hobbyists, while completely normal for those well versed and working in such fields.

I couldn't agree more that the only real failure is to fail to attempt anything new at all.
Carl can't get it through his head that my beef with him is NOT in his promoting experimentation, but his and others insisting that every ham has to

emulate him or put him on a pedestal as the savior of ham radio. Never will happen and he isn't astute enough to understand that.
Only a small percentage of hams virtually all of whom work in the technology trades are equipped to do advanced digital experimentation, and most others follow trends and use the products of that experimentation *when those products prove to be attractive and useful within the ARS*. That hasn't changed in nearly a hundred years, and all the ranting Carl can do won't make it change now.

It really IS novel that Carl, the dashing digital guru, works basically only SSB on ham radio while I, the old CW hound, have found myself attracted to working and experimenting with a variety of digital modes. Looks like more "do as I say, not as I do" from him.

Dick

2692. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:57:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCBFE99.66948CCF@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41957

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

My

> only point was that Dick's assertion of why it has died off is not the true
> reason, but that the true reason is that amateur packet radio (almost
> 100%) stagnated at 1200 baud, and at that rate could not provide
> the capacity or response times necessary to keep it interesting and
> useful, compared to even a dial-up internet connection, for the vast
> majority of users.

You really DON'T have a clue, do you? The VHF packet network was doing fine until the idiots decided to overwhelm it with continuous forwarding of junk mail. No rational ham radio system could survive that sort of assault. We finally just turned it off. But you would have upgraded it to a 56k circuit so as to give them even more capacity to forward junk mail. How so highly advanced of you!

2693. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 19:59:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCC5498.C2BF9247@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41962

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
>
> What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> fast can the fastest typist
> type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> typists? How many large
> databases can you generate and forward in any potential
> disaster?

Well, if you had multiple people with laptops creating files
of traffic "off line", and only one ham packet station, you
wouldn't have a typist directly driving the computer/TNC/
transmitter, but one of those laptops piping stored files
over the air..... Of course this would
have to be set up in practice sessions before hand, etc.

2694. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 20:03:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCC55A9.5503EF10@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41963

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> Show us where you can get 56k data rates within any reasonable
> bandwidth on HF, much less within any rule the FCC might even
> feasibly write. You can't do it. You're full of hot air and SSB.
>

It's done on a phone line that has around 3KHz bandwidth,
about that of SSB. Of course HF is not the same as a
phone line, but give the experts the FCC permissions and time to
develop it, it is likely to be possible.

2695. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 20:23:21 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCC5A39.6009710A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41964

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> I agree that the amateur experiment with packet radio was useful. My
> only point was that Dick's assertion of why it has died off is not the true
> reason, but that the true reason is that amateur packet radio (almost
> 100%) stagnated at 1200 baud, and at that rate could not provide
> the capacity or response times necessary to keep it interesting and
> useful, compared to even a dial-up internet connection, for the vast
> majority of users.

1200 baud if you're lucky.... Between retries, waiting for other users
and such, it becomes something like 150 baud. I used to post
to the packet BBS network small (up to 10K) files of short computer
programs and small highly compressed JPG image files. And that
was after cutting them up in pieces with "7plus" (IIRC). This was
back in '94 and my "home" BBS was W0RLI in the Portland area.
Even then, with some error correction in the packet protocol,
I still got a lot of error reports. If I knew the "map" of the packet
BBS distribution system, and analyzing the error reports (almost
always reporting the same error), I could probably identify the
broken BBS that was causing most all the errors. IIRC, I probably
could have used the headers of the error reports and figured it out
and then send a message to say "I suspect your BBS may have a
problem...". Didn't have time, etc....

People would complain about "recipe" packet posts. What's
wrong with those? It's non commercial and is "clean" speech,
nothing pornographic. AFAIK, the content is not restricted
to radio topics, or else people couldn't talk about the traffic or
their health issues either.

2696. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 20:36:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCC5D6A.76D1D64A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 41965

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020427235558.04364.00002307@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >
> > Brian:
> >
> > Not to worry; I would never "hock a loogie" on one of my passengers,
> > but I can nail a Telefon Pole with a wad of chewing gum at fiftah mile
> > an aour! (said with strong Sussex County, Delaware accent)
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
> And, if I am ever unfortunate enough to have to visit Sussex County,
> DE, you can clean the gum off of my shoes at the county line as I
> leave ...
>

I was in that area about 20 years ago. Some company in or near
Reholoth Beach had me come to town for a job interview. Not
much there, small towns and lots of empty land like
farms and such. Cost of living should be fairly low, though...

I wouldn't think any of those small towns would have a bus
system of their own. Larry must be on a county-wide
system.

2697. Re: Larry's attitude STILL sucks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 20:56:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%lZy8.51494$Rw2.4052484@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41966

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3ccbf098_2@news7.fast.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020427235557.04364.00002305@mb-fi.aol.com...
> > In article <3ccaa3e0_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3c@fast.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Larry's problem is not his ability to send good Morse, but his
attitude
> > >towards those "knuckle-draggers" (his term, not mine) who don't
exhibit
> > >his propensity towards the mode.
> > >
> > >Carl - wk3c
> >
> > Carl:
> >
> > Axeually, I have a Cecil-like "live and let live" attitude toward hams
who
> > are willing to limit themselves to life as a No-code Tech, and pursue
> > "public service" communications, repeater technology, V/UHF weak
> > signal modes, etc.
>
> Larry,
>
> How *benevolent* of you, oh exhaulted one! (NOT! on both counts!)
>
> "... willing to limit themselves to life as a No-code Tech ..." were
your
> words.
>
> Translation: As long as those who don't share your propensity for Morse
> code "stay in their place," like the colonial slave-master relationship,
or
> the "back of the bus" thing, "you'll be benevolent enough" to "allow
them
> the privilege" (which they've earned with no help from you) of VHF/UHF
> only operation (the back of the bus, in effect).
>
> However, if they should feel that Morse is irrelevant, and should not
> be an artificial barrier holding them back from HF privileges, then THAT
> flies in the face of your "exhalted" status and is "stepping over the

> boundary"
> (that you view as existing between "exhalted beings" such as yourself
and
> "lower life forms" who haven't passed a high speed code test ...)
>
> I don't see that as a "live and let live" attitude at all ... it's clear
> from your words
> and actions here that your attitude is TRULY that you and others who
have
> passed a high speed code test are, indeed, "exhaulted" in some perverse
way
> and because of that (delusion), you feel that it's OK to dump at will on
> those
> who you view as being "inferior" ...
>
> Your attitude STILL sucks, Larry.
>
> Carl - wk3c

Man, if there ever was a textbook illustration of attributing your worst fears and insecurities onto someone or something else, we now have one.

Carl, most give up the image of the 'good guy' as one whose head goes dependably up and down, never disagrees, and won't even tell you your fly is open somewhere around the age of 15.

2698. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 20:58:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428165846.04515.00000248@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 41968

In article <3CCBFD0D.904CC667@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> If amateur experimentation with packet radio was a "failure" then I'd
>> suggest that if experimental failures like this would happen in amateur
>> radio every few years or so the service would be much better off in
>> terms of justifying its existance. In an experimental service even
>> things that don't work out can teach things of great value. The only
>> real "failure" is the failure to attempt anything new at all.
>>
>> Dennis Ferguson
>
>Dennis- thanks for the insight, you have explained some things that needed
>explaining.
> The only failure I found in packet radio on VHF (not HF) was the
>narowmindedness of certain operators in that they abused the system to the
>point that it was useless to everyone else. Carl seems to think that the
>answer
>was for the handful of hams involved to fund some AT&T version of packet
>radio that would have worked at Internet speeds.

Carl didn't describe any "AT&T version of packet radio." He merely
described the possibility of doing digital communications at speeds
higher than they are now...without increasing bandwidth.

> Looks to me like he's far out of
>touch with the reality of ham radio in real life.

Not to me. Dickie will have to define "reality of ham radio,"
other than what it means to Dickie.

>Few hams could or would be
>interested in any such venture. His "solutions" seem to be a pretty far
stretch
>for a bunch of hobbyists, while completely normal for those well versed and
>working in such fields.

Oh? Are the ham radio hobbyists so dumbed down that they
cannot comprehend higher digital rates without increasing
bandwidth? You must think that radio amateurs are very
dumbed down then.

Isn't it "normal" in the "ham radio reality" to have radio amateurs
buying all their digital radio equipment ready-made to just plug it
together and have it play?

> I couldn't agree more that the only real failure is to fail to attempt
>anything new at all.

Then why do you fail so much?

Begin with Shannon's Law of 1947 and its applicability to radio,
including amateur radio. Then go on to your outboard DSP
radio peripheral that you described as giving you so many
problems because you didn't set it up correctly. :-)

> Carl can't get it through his head that my beef with him is NOT in his
>promoting experimentation, but his and others insisting that every ham has to
>emulate him or put him on a pedestal as the savior of ham radio.

You must have been looking into a mirror when writing that.

Carl did NOT describe himself as "every ham had to emulate him"
or that all should put him on a "pedestal." :-)

Carl merely described, many times, the possibility that higher-
rate digitial signals could be sent in the same bandwidth as
conventional SSB voice of today. An accurate technical
description was depicted. Several others agreed with him on
that possibility.

On the other hand, Richard Carroll has consistently maintained
that all hams should know morse code...because Carroll is an
"old morse hound."

>Only a small percentage of hams virtually all of whom work in the technology
>trades are equipped to do advanced digital experimentation, and most others
>follow trends and use the products of that experimentation *when those
>products prove to be attractive and useful within the ARS*.

Define "advanced digital experimentation."

DSP for "brick wall" types of filtering can be done with a simple
PIC microcontroller from Microchip, capable of being programmed
with the filter software and containing built-in A/D converters.
There are several textbooks on the subject, one available over the
Internet (all chapters).

Compared to all-analog radio technology, the workbench setups
and equipment are FAR SIMPLER for digital experimentation
for bit rates as fast as the high end of HF. The cost is much less,
too.

>That hasn't changed in
>nearly a hundred years, and all the ranting Carl can do won't make it change
>now.

For "nearly a hundred years," US radio amateurs have been buying
ready-built equipment designed by others, using it, and then
bragging about how they are experts in radio for just using it. :-)

> It really IS novel that Carl, the dashing digital guru, works basically only
>SSB on ham radio while I, the old CW hound, have found myself attracted to
>working and experimenting with a variety of digital modes. Looks like more
>"do as I say, not as I do" from him.

Please describe the general nature of those "digital mode varieties."

Did you do that from scratch? Build a kit? By a plug-and-play
box? Could you understand what you were doing?

2699. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 20:58:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428165847.04515.00000249@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 41967

In article <3BEF0562.1EFA7C29@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>CAM wrote:
>
>> Brian P Burke wrote:
>> >
>> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>> > > I was cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC
>> > > SEND AND RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!
>> >
>> > This must be some kind of proof that you have more time in the chow hall.
>> > Besides, the M28s were junked a quarter of a century ago. Even hams don't
>> > want them anymore.
>>
>> I saw one at a hamfest a few years ago. It had a sign on it, "FREE!", and
>> nobody wanted it. Do you think Dick would have flown to AZ to get it?
>
> Even further proof that you two dupes don't bother to read, rather just
spout
>off trash. Candid Carl was trying to assert that I knew nothing about
>AUTOMATIC transmission of messages. Of course he's as wrong as always.

Sorry, Carl is right. The "ASR" or "Automatic Send-Receive" built
into an ASR28 (Teletype Corporation model number) is selectable
for punching a paper tape, holding it for re-transmission until an
outgoing circuit is free for re-transmission. The "automatic" part is
primarily a convenience feature that can be duplicated manually
by anyone with a KSR28 with an outboard p-tape punch and
transmitting distributor. That's as "automatic" an operation as
handling mail envelopes beteen IN and OUT boxes. :-)

The Model 28s (and lower model numbers) from Teletype Corp.
were ALL electromagnetic, ready-built. If you wanted a store-
and-forward system you had to add electronics. The pre-28
models for chadless p-tape handling were the only TRUE
"automatics" with two tape readers, one taking over automatically
if the other finished reading a tape. I was around a couple
hundred such units for a few years in a REAL communications
station.

Please don't try any more snow jobs about teleprinter equipment
that is now obsolete.

Reference for those with a desperate need to know: Department
of the Navy, Electronic Systems Command, NAVSHIPS 0967-0010,

dated June 1967, sections F and G.

2700. K1B Baker Island / DXCC #308 for AB7SL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 21:29:56 UTC
From: CJ <andy@livewire.com>
Message-ID: <ucoqeqdmh8ald3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 41969
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Oh yeah!!! My W9INN dipole at 54ft served me well again today to snag
K1B - Baker Island on 15m phone on the very first call....oh brother!
That is the way to get an all-time new one!

DXCC #308 on DIPOLE!!!
http://www.ab7sl.com/index.html?row1col2=w9inn.html
http://www.ab7sl.com/index.html?row1col2=logbook.html

Here is the URL for the Baker Island DXpedition web site....
http://www.kragujevac.co.yu/KH1/index.htm

Online logs -after- they are QRT. If goes well they will be QRV till
9-May-2002
--

73 / DX
Charles - AB7SL
AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
www.ab7sl.com

2701. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 21:45:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <a4_y8.1589$Ou1.125122714@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41970

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020428141306.20744.00001021@mb-mm.aol.com...
> In article <RoJy8.794$2M6.98900404@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020427154124.01569.00000555@mb-mg.aol.com...
> >
> >> >I don't think Jim likes me.
> >>
> >> You have a good summation there. :-)
> >
> >Its just that when its my turn to comment on the ARRL proposal I have to
> >list my vitae on the Novice subbands, but when Hans or Dick comments,
> >anything goes.
>
> Both of them "know what is best for amateur radio."
>
> Dickie didn't say those exact words but Hans most certainly
> did around four years ago. In public. In here. :-)

Yes, a person couldn't go wrong listening to Dick or Hans. They've pretty
much got it all figured out. The rest of us have a lot to learn.

Brian

2702. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 21:49:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <q7_y8.1593$1y1.125302193@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41971

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:3BEF61D3.F0FD57CA@townsqr.com...

> Poor ol' besotted Cecil has had himself so worked up > for so long he's no longer capable of being rational.

Being rational is not a prerequisite here. If it were you would have been barred on your first post.

2703. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 21:52:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ea_y8.1596$hz1.125349230@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41972

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCBFE99.66948CCF@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> My
>
> > only point was that Dick's assertion of why it has died off is not the
true
> > reason, but that the true reason is that amateur packet radio (almost
> > 100%) stagnated at 1200 baud, and at that rate could not provide
> > the capacity or response times necessary to keep it interesting and
> > useful, compared to even a dial-up internet connection, for the vast
> > majority of users.
>
> You really DON'T have a clue, do you? The VHF packet network was doing
fine
> until the idiots decided to overwhelm it with continuous forwarding of
junk
> mail.

Not very robust, huh?

> No rational ham radio system could survive that sort of assault. We
> finally just turned it off. But you would have upgraded it to a 56k
circuit so
> as to give them even more capacity to forward junk mail. How so highly
advanced
> of you!

Kind of like here. read what you want. reply to what you want. ignore the
rest. Freedom is Great!

2704. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 22:12:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <2t_y8.11578$iU4.1005721@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41973

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Both of them "know what is best for amateur radio."
>
> Dickie didn't say those exact words but Hans most certainly
> did around four years ago. In public. In here. :-)
>

Sort of like you, Old Sir. Crank your organ faster. You'll feel better in
the morning.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2705. Re: K1B Baker Island / DXCC #308 for AB7SL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 22:16:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ix_y8.11589$iU4.1007064@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41974
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"CJ" <andy@livewire.com> wrote in message

> Oh yeah!!! My W9INN dipole at 54ft served me well again today

Your *bought* a DIPOLE???????

2706. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 22:37:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCC79A7.4A310109@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41975

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > > > I was cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC
> > > > SEND AND RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!
> > >
> > > This must be some kind of proof that you have more time in the chow hall.
> > > Besides, the M28s were junked a quarter of a century ago. Even hams don't
> > > want them anymore.
> >
> > I saw one at a hamfest a few years ago. It had a sign on it, "FREE!", and
> > nobody wanted it. Do you think Dick would have flown to AZ to get it?
>
> Even further proof that you two dupes don't bother to read, rather just spout
> off trash. Candid Carl was trying to assert that I knew nothing about AUTOMATIC
> transmission of messages. Of course he's as wrong as always.

Your knowledge of automatic transmission of messages seems to be limited to ASR28's.
Nowadays, there are much better ways.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2707. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 22:38:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCC79F5.DA095EB7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41976

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CCACC9B.D2D011FE@IEEE.org...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > You deny that NCI is a conspiracy?
> > >
> > > "conspiracy - an evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan
> > > formulated in secret by two or more persons."
> > >
> > > What secret thing is NCI doing?
> >
> > Thanks Cecil, it saved me the trouble
> > of looking up the definition which I expected
> > to be something akin to what you found.
> >
> > Now it's up to Dick to tell us what the
> > "evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan" is...
> > and which two or more people formulated that
> > plan in secret.
>
> No, its just Cecil playing with his uh dictionary again.

Nope, it's just Dick butchering the English language again.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

2708. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 22:40:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCC7A53.E49EE751@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41977

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > The "King of the Mountain" whine is strictly a false construct of
> > the NCTA. All we're doing is supporting the requirement for radio
> > amateurs to learn a useful, basic communications mode. This
> > KOTM crapola is just whining -- something for which the NCTA
> > has made itself famous.
>
> Poor ol' besotted Cecil has had himself so worked up for so long he's no longer
> capable of being rational.

Too late for such, Dick. You have already shown your true colors, over and over.
Can a leopard change its spots?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

2709. Re: K1B Baker Island / DXCC #308 for AB7SL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 22:55:25 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <qptocush06fah0ebv77rmga36ns8h474po@4ax.com>
Source record: 41978
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 28 Apr 2002 14:29:56 -0700, "CJ" <andy@livewire.com> wrote:

>Oh yeah!!! My W9INN dipole ...

[Spam snipped.]

How annoying! I had him kill-filed as 'Charles Johnston', but now
he's started spamming as 'CJ'.

Plonk!

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

2710. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 23:03:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428190309.15212.00006692@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 41979

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 04/28/02 18:12 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <2t_y8.11578$iU4.1005721@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Sort of like you, Old Sir.

Hans is far more polite than I...I still think you're just a Geezer.

2711. Re: K1B Baker Island / DXCC #308 for AB7SL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 23:20:56 UTC
From: peter@strg-alt-entf.org
Message-ID: <aai04o$aocdu$1@ID-31.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 41980
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In rec.radio.amateur.dx CJ <andy@livewire.com> wrote:

[SPAM]

I did it twice and I'll do it a third time. Stop your moronic crossposting
or you will lose your *third* commercial usenet account. Yes, I warned you.
Every time.

http://www.supernews.com/faq.html#15

F'up adjusted, sorry for the noise.

Peter Lemken
DF5JT
Berlin

--
Post quality. Encourage quality. Discourage crap. Be entertaining, be
creative, or shut the fuck up.

2712. PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-28 23:37:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCC87C2.E4150087@IEEE.org>
Source record: 41981

PACTOR III is here and runs on the existing SCS modems. It has a raw throughput
of 3600 baud which is high enough for digitized voice with a speech compression/
coding PC-based front end. PACTOR III is described at http://www.scs-ptc.com

Is a 2.2 kHz wide digital signal allowed on HF?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2713. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 00:13:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aai3brpmr1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 41982

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEF5F77.A5E3755@townsqr.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > > Such situations occur all the time on HF.
> > > No doubt many or even most are
> > > preventable, but which ones? FCC knows
> > > there's no practical way to determine.
> >
> > So much for the vaulted attitudes of those that
> > abuse power on the air when they are fully
> > aware they don't need even 1/4 of what
> > they are running.
>
> Of course YOU and Carl know, though.
> Of course. You've got a grip. Right.

Why Dick, this is America, we are entitled
to have individual gripes. Would you have
it any other way?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2714. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 01:15:46 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <aai6s2mcs1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 41986

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> Show us where you can get 56k data rates within any reasonable
>> bandwidth on HF, much less within any rule the FCC might even
>> feasibly write. You can't do it. You're full of hot air and SSB.
>
>It's done on a phone line that has around 3KHz bandwidth,
>about that of SSB. Of course HF is not the same as a
>phone line, but give the experts the FCC permissions and time to
>develop it, it is likely to be possible.

If I've done the math right you need a minimal SN ratio of almost
60 db to get 56 kbps into 3 kHz. For comparison the very best
SN ratio you'll get on an analog telephone line is about 48 db
(because of the 8 bit D/A converter), so you'd need to be getting
better-than-telephone-line quality signals on HF to do this.
That might be a stretch.

I think the 56 kbps modems you get achieve this by cheating. They
run the A/D converter at the modem at double-speed, which effectively
allows them to make productive use of about 8 kHz of bandwidth on the
line in the downstream direction towards your house. As they can't do
this in the upstream direction, the data rates you get on that side of
the circuit are probably more representative of what you get with a
less-than-4 kHz bandwidth limit and telephone quality. I think they
run no faster than 33.6 kbps in that direction.

Dennis Ferguson

2715. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 01:30:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428213011.19000.00001280@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 41985

In article <aaepmcuap1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20020427120721.09489.00000900@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <aad6b1$4dt$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020426224929.06141.00000162@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> >> In article <aaa6hs$24g1$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
>> >(Dennis
>> >> Ferguson) writes:

>> >> It's also probably not worth mentioning that only about 10% of
>> >> commercial fixed point-to-point telecom goes by satellite or
>> >> other radiated-RF means today. And the percentage is dropping.
>> >
>> >I'd be surprised if it was even 10% at all.
>>
>> Your info is probably more current than mine, Bill.
>> Note that by specifying
>> "fixed point-to-point", we exclude such uses as cellphones.
>
>Agreed.

Also note "radiated-RF means", which excludes things like cable TV.

>> And if you need another 1.6T, just pull another fibre through the duct.
>
>In reality the fiber is already there. Typically a multi-fiber
>cable is run with spare fibers then available for growth of
>capacity.

Yup. Also spare ducting is usually installed if new duct has to be put in. My
basic point is that it's not like the RF spectrum where reuse is an issue.

>> >> high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune to RFI,
>> >> EMI and EMP.

It is also somewhat more resistant to being tapped. During the Cold War, US
Navy submarines "tapped" Soviet undersea comm cables by means of pods placed
alongside the Soviet cables. The "taps" worked by induction. (See
"Blind Man's Bluff", now out in paperback, for lots more detail).

> Fibers can be installed anywhere copper cables can go - on
>> >> poles underground, and under the sea. Terrestrial microwave and

>satellites
>> >> satellites simply cannot compete except in special situations.
>> >>
>> >> From a historical point of view, we have come full circle.
>> >>
>> >> The first telecom revolution was the widespread acceptance of the
>electric
>> >> telegraph about 150 years ago. Before then, almost all information
>> >> travelled only as fast as transportation could carry a messenger or
>letter.

Note "most communication". There were some specialized systems even in Caesar's
day, but they were slow, limited, expensive and required "repeaters" every few
dozen miles.

>> >> Communications facilities available to President Andrew Jackson had
>more
>> >> in common with those available to Julius Casear than they did with
>those
>> >> available to President Abraham Lincoln.
>> >>
>> >> The telegraph conquered most of the land area in Western developed
>> >> countries then proceeded to cross the oceans.
>> >> Radio was hampered in its early development because it was
>> >> at first considered merely a telegraph system without wires. It
>> >> took years to get the term "radio" accepted universally instead of
>> >> "wireless telegraphy" or simply "wireless".
>> >>
>> >> Yet everything old is new again.
>> >> Fiber optics has more in common with the
>> >> telegraph than with radio.
>> >> Many fibers follow railroad rights-of-way, just as the
>> >> telegraph did. As Dennis points out, the signaling method used
>> >> on the fibers is on-off keying.
>> >>
>> >> And the companies selling us new radio technology call it "wireless"
>> >> as if it's a new term.
>> >
>> >Wireless is relatively new to the current "end user" of the service.
>>
>> In the USA, anyway. Just a matter of the
>> marketing folks recycling an old term.
>>
>> The results are often confounding, however,
>> as some end users don;t realize
>> they are using radios when they use a
>> cellphone or cordless phone.
>
>And then they want complete privacy too...
>so have congress make it illegal to listen :-) :-)

Only AFTER some embarrassing incidents, too!
>
>> >We have
>> >actually flipped the use of RF vs hard wiring (fibre). In the past,
>> >wireless (radio) was depended on for long distance and everything
>> >local was wired.
>> >
>> >Today, wireless is a huge growth area with the "wireless" involving
>> >the connection from user (i.e. cellphone) to a base unit and
>> >the rest of the connectivity is then all "hard wired" via fibre.
>>
>> Good point! The result is that most of the distance is covered by
>> fiber and the "last mile" by RF.
>
>Exactly. Many people have now found they get all the
>service they need with greater flexibility using only
>a cellphone. One of the baby bells actually
>incurred a negative growth of their hard wired
>(i.e. traditional POTS) access lines during 2001.

All depends what the customer wants and needs. A person who travels a lot
may actually save money by using a cell phone and a coast-to-coast one-rate
plan. In other cases, the cost of having more lines installed may exceed the
cost of a cellphone.

But most of the communications (in terms of circuit-miles) is fibre.

>> But even that is changing. How long
>> before we see each home or business wired
>> ("fibred"?) with its own direct optical
>> connection to the infrastructure, with
>> the end user providing whatever
>> terminal equipment is needed for voice
>> telephone, data, entertainment, etc.?
>> One fibre will do all that and much more.
>
>I agree. The hold-up is and has been the cost of deploying
>separate fibers then to each individual home, especially
>in residential and rural areas.

Of course - but those costs will drop over time. Glass is cheaper than copper.
There was a time when it was predicted by knowledgeable folks that cable TV
would flop in areas where good reception could be had with "rabbit ears".
Nobody thinks that way anymore!

New telecomm laws may make it more economic to run a single fibre rather than
multiple pairs for telephone service, coax for cable TV, etc.

>> >> Doing techno-prediction is a risky game,
>> >> but if current trends continue, RF's
>> >> communications role will change
>> >> drastically in the years to come. Cheap and
>> >> universal fiber communication will replace

>> >> RF in all but mobile/portable applications and specialties
>> >> like the military, hams and the developing world.
>> >>
>> >> Just my opinion.
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >Good overview. I injected a couple of things above for
>> >clarity.
>>
>> They are greatly appreciated, Bill.
>
>Sure beats reading about definitions :-) :-)

AMEN!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2716. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 01:30:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428213012.19000.00001281@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 41983

In article <B1py8.53013$QC1.3814391@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

(N2EY wrote):

>> Doing techno-prediction is a risky game, but if current trends continue,
>RF's
>> communications role will change drastically in the years to come. Cheap
>and
>> universal fiber communication will replace RF in all but mobile/portable
>> applications and specialties like the military, hams and the developing
>world.
>>
>> Just my opinion.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>And a good one it be.

TNX

> In fact fiber development parallels telegraphy
>development so closely as to be almost eerie; same basic engineering
>problems, power, repeaters, multiple channels.

You summed up my whole treatise in a sentence. Cool.

>You are, of course, aware
>that Sprint was Southern Pacific Railroad INTernal communications before
>bypassing the telco was legal.

oh yeah! The RRs were into COAM communications from the beginning. Most of them
now lease telecom circuits.

Much of the long-distance fibre infrastructure in the USA follows the
railroads, just as the telegraph did. The right of way was already there,
relatively easy to utilize, and companies like MCI could deal with a few RRs
instead of many municipalities and other utilities.

In some cases the RRs could offer the fibre folks facilities like spare ducts
in existing systems used for RR cables, or substantial aerial facilities. In
most cases, however, the new duct had to be buried, and the RRs produced a real
win-win solution in the form of the "on track plow".

The on track plow is a specially equipped work train capable of simultaneously
burying flexible duct, RR signal, power and comm cables, and warning tapes at
speeds up to about 200 feet per minute. Gondola cars that are part of the plow
train setup carry large reels of the cables and duct to be buried, simplifying

material supply issues. Production was usually measured in miles-per-day. The RRs could usually also lease or sell land for the repeater and terminal equipment houses as well as the ductwork right of way.

Off-track plow systems were also developed, based on bulldozers, for the places where the on-track plow system was impractical or not cost effective.

The fibre folks "win" was low cost construction and a complete right of way between many major cities. The RR's "win" was income from the leases. Many RRs also replaced pole lines with new cables as part of the plowing project, and often negotiated leaseback of fibre circuits for RR communications.

> St. Louis in my years there was the end of
>Sprint and the beginning of MCI which was originally STL to Chi so we were
>the only place to be able to call coast to coast without Ma Bell. How
>things have changed.

Yup. One can only wonder what would have evolved if the Bell system's effective monopoly had not been broken - or if it had been broken earlier.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2717. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 01:30:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020428213014.19000.00001282@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 41984

In article <3ccaae1c_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020427000658.27399.00000927@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <3cca0f50_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3c@fast.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020426000707.13101.00001028@mb-ct.aol.com...
>>
>> >> Another point of the "experimental farm" idea is that the widening of
>the
>> >> 'phone bands is not a good idea, IMO.
>> >
>> >Agreed ... the phone bands would be OK of folks acted more civily.
>>
>> One of the reasons I operate almost all CW.
>> >
>> >Last weekend I tried to work the SETI League QSO party, just
>> >for fun and to talk to other folks interested in SETI.
>>
>> Kewl.
>> >
>> >Started calling "CQ SETI" at the start of the 24 hour window
>> >on 14.204 (1% of the H line freq) ... and worked a few
>> >stations over the course of about a half an hour.
>>
>> Using USB, I presume...
>
>That was the designated mode for the QSO party, so don't
>draw and quarter me, OK? :-)

Just wanted to absolutely clear about what mode was used for the
following encounter.

>> >All of a sudden
>> >some inconsiderate LIDs in/around the Orlando, FL area came
>> >up 40 db over S9, 700 Hz above me at 14.204.7 ... and start
>> >shooting the breeze. No "Is the frequency in use?" or nothing.
>> >
>> >I politely said "The frequency is in use." and signed my call
>> >a couple of times and they simply ignored me ...
>

>> >Now I would give them the benefit of the doubt that
>> >they might not have been able to hear me, but they were
>> >all 30-40 dB over S9 and while I'm not running legal limt
>> >and a beam, my station is not THAT bad, either ... there
>> >is no doubt in my mind that they could hear me and simply
>> >didn't give a damn.
>>
>> Lessee, if you're running 100 W and a vertical and they have 1500 W and 20
>db
>> of effective antenna gain (!!) you might be 35-40 dB below them - max. So
>you
>> would be S9 there, worst-case.
>>
>> However, consider this:
>>
>> If they were 40 over to you, they might be 60 or more dB over to each
>other.
>> With slow AGC they might not hear an S9 signal.
>
>They were all in the Orlando area, using high power and high beams
>on 20m to talk across town ... the guy who was strongest here (by a
>barely perceptible margin) said he could see the antenna of one of
>the others ...

What a waste! Wrong band for the job, and way too much power as well.
Bad practice, pure and simple.

No wonder they couldn't hear you - they probably couldn't have heard
you if you'd had the legal limit and 10dB of antenna.

>The other problem was the "quick keying" without an opportunity for
>anyone else to break in ... so the AGC might have had an effect as you
>point out, but even with no AGC, they were so quick on the turn-around
>that someone would have had a hard time breaking in most times.

One more bad practice for the list.
>
>> But that doesn't excuse not listening first, nor doing the "frequency in
>use?"
>> thing. Nor the fact they could have dropped power 20 dB and been blowing
>each
>> other's rigs off the desk.

The above means that I do not, in any way, condone what they were doing.
>
>Again, at least 2 of the stations can see each other's antennas ...

oh mama...

>so why use
>high power on 20m to talk across town when 2m simplex with a 5W HT
>would probalby work just fine and not block an HF frequency over huge

>areas of the earth???

Why use 20 at all when any VHF/UHF amateur band could do the job??

>To me, this is just bad practice (and probably a
>violation of the minimum power rule) ...

I count several bad practices:

- Wrong band for the distance covered
- Way too much power
- Failure to listen first and during use of the frequency
- Failure to ask about occupancy before starting the QSO

>but what do I know, since I'm
>an "Extra light" :-)

I thought it was spelled "lite" ;-)

>> >To make them even bigger lids, they were talking more or less
>> >"local" on 20m and obviously using very high power (bragging
>> >about their amps and big towers/beams) ...

Actually, that turns out to be a "good" thing, in a way. They unwittingly
confirmed
your suspicions about the use of too much power and the use of the wrong band.

The mere fact that somebody is 40 over isn't proof of excessive power. Their
conversation gave you the proof.

>> That's the biggest lidism, right there - use of the wrong band for the
>purpose.
>> What time of day was this?
>
>0030Z

So the band wasn't dead at their location, either. Just keeps getting worse.
(There may be some rationale to the use of a band like 20 for crosstown chats
if the band is dead, but that doesn't apply at all in this case.)
>
>I heard one of them again today on 14.205 calling the group ...
>same 40 over S9 ... gave him a call and he came right back to
>me with a "good signal" report ... I discussed the incident of
>last weekend with him and he professed that they didn't hear
>me. Maybe their extreme signal strengths to each other,
>combined with AGC and quick-keying did cause them to not
>hear me ... but, yes, using high power on 20m to talk across
>town is bad practice.

Agreed - see above list of bad practices.

>I tried to diplomatically hint at that
>by asking why and the response was "Habit."
>

Bad habit. Very bad habit.

>However, they did apologize and indicated that in the future
>they would listen a bit more and would certainly be willing
>to QSY a bit from their "normal" frequency for other stations
>already working close by ...

I sincerely hope it's true.

Perhaps in the search for extra-terrestrial intelligence, you helped those folks to utilize a bit more of their own.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2718. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 02:40:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <No2z8.2711$Tw.89522226@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 41987

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020428213014.19000.00001282@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3ccaae1c_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3c@fast.net>
> writes:
> >They were all in the Orlando area, using high power and high beams
> >on 20m to talk across town ... the guy who was strongest here (by a
> >barely perceptible margin) said he could see the antenna of one of
> >the others ...
>
> What a waste! Wrong band for the job, and way too much power as well.
> Bad practice, pure and simple.

Dick disagrees.

2719. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 03:22:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCCB84A.3BDA003D@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41988

Robert Casey wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > fast can the fastest typist
> > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > typists? How many large
> > databases can you generate and forward in any potential
> > disaster?
>
> Well, if you had multiple people with laptops creating files
> of traffic "off line", and only one ham packet station, you
> wouldn't have a typist directly driving the computer/TNC/
> transmitter, but one of those laptops piping stored files
> over the air..... Of course this would
> have to be set up in practice sessions before hand, etc.

Only those of us who have lived through "unplanned" real emergencies seem to understand that planning is great and certainly a of significant benefit. But it can only take you so far.
It's like the old German or Soviet armies - when their leaders went down, the rank and file were essentially lost, having been drilled incessently to do and only do what their authorities ordered. They never learned to think and act for themselves.
You guys can be like that if you wish, but my training and experience allows me to think for myself when the going gets rough. It won't take a truckload of the latest technology to get me communicating.

2720. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 03:22:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCCBC02.B93B4B57@townsqr.com>
Source record: 41989

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > > > > I was cutting message tapes for a Model 28ASR (that means AUTOMATIC
> > > > > SEND AND RECIEVE) wireline teletype when you were still in diapers!
> > > > >
> > > > This must be some kind of proof that you have more time in the chow hall.
> > > > Besides, the M28s were junked a quarter of a century ago. Even hams don't
> > > > want them anymore.
> > > >
> > > I saw one at a hamfest a few years ago. It had a sign on it, "FREE!", and
> > > nobody wanted it. Do you think Dick would have flown to AZ to get it?
> > >
> > Even further proof that you two dupes don't bother to read, rather just spout
> > off trash. Candid Carl was trying to assert that I knew nothing about AUTOMATIC
> > transmission of messages. Of course he's as wrong as always.
>
> Your knowledge of automatic transmission of messages seems to be limited to ASR28's.
>

Any rational person could easily see that was shown as an early form of automatic transmission that I experienced. Sorry you couldn't. No, I'm actually not sorry at all. It's exactly what we have come to expect from the likes of you idiots.

> Nowadays, there are much better ways.

You don't say!

2721. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 04:03:11 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CCCC5DE.9AA0033@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41990

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
> news:aag08v$1c3t$1@heap.juniper.net...
> >
> > You might take a look at this:
> >
> > "Round Trip Time Estimation," P. Karn & C. Partridge, ACM
> > SIGCOMM-87, August 1987.
> >
> > The first author is KA9Q. The paper deals with a fundamental insight
> > gained in good measure by attempting to run TCP/IP over amateur packet
> > radio links.
>
> Been there, done that, know Phil ... all of his papers are good stuff.
>
> We could use more hams like him and less like Dick, that's for sure.

KA9Q stopped by here on his way to Part 15 after his rise to
fame developing TCP/IP. We should let his friend Carl tell
us what he said when he stopped by. I thought it was
interesting.

73,
Clay N4AOX

2722. Re: Federal judge may outlaw barbaric death penalty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 04:34:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.com>
Message-ID: <3CCCBE3D.92202670@mailcity.com>
Source record: 41991
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

2test AB8MQ blubbered:

>
> What's "2test?"

Asks the one whom the FCC called in and made him retake the
amateur exam because of his jamming activities on 20 meters.
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!

2723. Curious story - FCC monitoring techniques ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 04:38:45 UTC
From: Pineapples <gatew3farsi@juno.com>
Message-ID: <p74z8.13119$8p3.1046697@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 41992
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Each NOSS launch placed a cluster of one primary satellite
and three smaller sub-satellites (that trail along at distances
of several hundred kilometers) into low polar orbit. This satellite
array can determine the location of radio and radars
transmmitters, using triangulation, and the identity of naval
units, by analysis of the operating frequencies and transmission
patterns. NOSS used the ELINT (Electronic Intelligence) technique
called 'time difference of arrival,' TDOA, rather than true interferometry."

- Space Policy Agency: Military Space Programs about White Cloud NOSS

Check out this link for the full story:

http://www.earthfiles.com/earth338.htm

VERY VERY INTERESTING!

2724. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 05:38:20 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aajbtu11ohp@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42003

Wow... that didn't take long! And it was you that had come up with the first reponse! :)

Now, ya gotta change or it is gonna drive Larry and Dick and a few others nuts, since now there is a "dirty" equivalent of your callsign phonetics.

:)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3CC9679C.D806E3C5@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Unfortunately Cecil..... you're gonna have to change your callsign. I am
> > sure people here can come up with a ton of dirty connotations!!!! :) :) :)
>
> When I was in high school the standard phonetics were even dirty.
> "David Xray Peter". Of course, most hams came back with "David's
> Xrayed Peter".
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

2725. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 05:45:31 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aajbu021ohp@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42004

Alrighty.... I have to ask the question..... Allegedly the ARRL supposedly is defending ham radio.... I would like to know how they are supposedly spending the money of it's members.

Who is getting the money... are Congresspersons.... or Senators being bribed? Obviously there is a certain about of their revenues that go to the manufacture of the magazine and the services around that, as they do sell ads also so the magazine is not a total drain on the budget. And obviously there is from what I see, people recieving salaries too.... I guess I will have to pursue a salary from our local radio club, it is non-profit too. (I spend at least 20 hours per week doing various work related to the club.)

If I can get the clear answers, which I do not have a right to being a non-ARRL member, but some of you are, as to where the money is going, I will send a money order out the next day I get the answers, for the membership.

Ryan
KC8PMX

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3cca27fe_1@news7.fast.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020426204551.21592.00000879@mb-fa.aol.com...
>
> > For FY2000, the ARRL has 17 employees making over $50,000
> > per year (Jon Bloom reported as getting just a bit over $70,000).
> > Booth, Freret, Imlay billed the ARRL for $105,122 worth of legal
> > thingies and $60,060 was billed from Chwat & Co. for lobbying
> > the gubmint.
>
> With some of the lame things they're asking those guys to do
> (some, but not all ...), it's probably a good thing they didn't
> get $165k worth of results.
>
> > Executive VP Dave Sumner is shown as receiving
> > $124,875.20 in compensation plus $6,610.97 in employee
> > benefit contributions and an expense account of almost $7K.
> > [your membership dollars at work]
>
> Damn ... thanks for telling me that, Len ... I'm going to have
> to ask for a raise ... Dave's making almost as much as I do ...
> but then again, he doesn't get stock options :-)
>
> However, I find $7k unbelievable for Dave's expenses ...

> considering he spent time in Istanbul for WRC-2000
> (If I recall he came home for Dayton or something in
> the middle of the WRC, then went back ...)
>
> Thus, I can't believe $7k ... my last expense report (a few
> trips to Washington last month and business class
> airfare r/t to Sydney, Australia for the IEEE 802
> meeting) was over $10k and that's just one ... I file
> about one report a month so that AMEX gets paid often
> enough to keep them happy ...
>
> Now, to write myself a note about that raise ...
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
>

2726. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 06:52:06 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <18B0814BB86EFB6B.5529704C9CA48316.3E8DEBBBE8C0217C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 41993

On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 11:00:52 -0500, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> wrote:

>But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
>told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
>not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
>FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
>DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.

Tell him to go to QRZ and do name searches on the authors of all those college textbooks that they use to teach 'professionals' about antenna theory, tower engineering, etc.

Better yet, tell him to look up Whit Griffith, N5SU, next time he's in Dallas. I'm sure anyone who hasn't taken the amateur title would be able to teach a 70+ year amateur like Whit a thing or two. Maybe even convince him to rewrite the book; http://www.arrl.org/catalog/retf/

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2727. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 06:54:15 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <C42A59AA0CD8D627.A4E0DB45A9F57767.73E1A1D0DEC9ABFB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 41994

On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 16:46:02 -0400, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

> How do you want us to "upgrade" our image? is perhaps the most
>important question.

Use one of those blank spots in part 97 to prohibit the wearing of
bermuda shorts by hams over 60. Use another one to ban "If it ain't
CW, it's just CB" t-shirts.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2728. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 07:04:10 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <D93580843A3492C1.CCA927F6B03B7BD4.0310BFE66966FC40@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 41995

On Fri, 26 Apr 2002 13:59:04 -0400, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

> To me it is like Nike sneakers or more what some people may think if
>you *don't* wear them.

That you have enough taste to realize their awful color schemes don't
go with anything more classy than spandex? I'll stick with my
Timberlands, thanks.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2729. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 08:46:17 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <520A49981C43759F.A5371C7B0D9F3CDF.3D1396C70B7053E1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 41996

On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 22:18:32 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>"Society for Uncreative Radio Anachronism" There's just something about
>that that I don't like.

But does it still have the belly dancers, mead, and coed topless
wrestling?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2730. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 10:07:15 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <nX8z8.52361$Rw2.4140284@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 41997

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020428213012.19000.00001281@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <B1py8.53013$QC1.3814391@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> (N2EY wrote):
>
> >> Doing techno-prediction is a risky game, but if current trends
continue,
> >RF's
> >> communications role will change drastically in the years to come.
Cheap
> >and
> >> universal fiber communication will replace RF in all but
mobile/portable
> >> applications and specialties like the military, hams and the
developing
> >world.
> >>
> >> Just my opinion.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> >And a good one it be.
>
> TNX
>
> > In fact fiber development parallels telegraphy
> >development so closely as to be almost eerie; same basic engineering
> >problems, power, repeaters, multiple channels.
>
> You summed up my whole treatise in a sentence. Cool.
>
> >You are, of course, aware
> >that Sprint was Southern Pacific Railroad INTernal communications
before
> >bypassing the telco was legal.
>
> oh yeah! The RRs were into COAM communications from the beginning. Most
of them
> now lease telecom circuits.
>
> Much of the long-distance fibre infrastructure in the USA follows the
> railroads, just as the telegraph did. The right of way was already

there,
> relatively easy to utilize, and companies like MCI could deal with a
few RRs
> instead of many municipalities and other utilities.
>
> In some cases the RRs could offer the fibre folks facilities like spare
ducts
> in existing systems used for RR cables, or substantial aerial
facilities. In
> most cases, however, the new duct had to be buried, and the RRs produced
a real
> win-win solution in the form of the "on track plow".
>
> The on track plow is a specially equipped work train capable of
simultaneously
> burying flexible duct, RR signal, power and comm cables, and warning
tapes at
> speeds up to about 200 feet per minute. Gondola cars that are part of
the plow
> train setup carry large reels of the cables and duct to be buried,
simplifying
> material supply issues. Production was usually measured in
miles-per-day. The
> RRs could usually also lease or sell land for the repeater and terminal
> equipment houses as well as the ductwork right of way.
>
> Off-track plow systems were also developed, based on bulldozers, for the
places
> where the on-track plow system was impractical or not cost effective.
>
> The fibre folks "win" was low cost construction and a complete right of
way
> between many major cities. The RR's "win" was income from the leases.
Many RRs
> also replaced pole lines with new cables as part of the plowing project,
and
> often negotiated leaseback of fibre circuits for RR communications.
>
> > St. Louis in my years there was the end of
> >Sprint and the beginning of MCI which was originally STL to Chi so we
were
> >the only place to be able to call coast to coast without Ma Bell. How
> >things have changed.
>
> Yup. One can only wonder what would have evolved if the Bell system's
effective
> monopoly had not been broken - or if it had been broken earlier.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I keep thinking of Randolph Scott and Western Union laying telegraph lines across the great treeless praries where you had to bring in everything on wagons as the Onion Pacific had not yet been invented. The work trains are slick, the wagon-schtick is monumental.

2731. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 10:42:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429064226.26630.00000009@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 41999

In article <3ccb0d76_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020427120719.09489.00000898@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <3cca2230_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3c@fast.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >You mean us guys who passed the same written test as Generals
>> >but didn't get privs because we only copied 5 wpm and not 13?
>>
>> Yep. I was one of them in 1968.
>> >
>> >There was no "freebie" in granting Generals to "old techs" once
>> >the code requirement dropped to 5 wpm ...
>>
>> Noboy said "freebie". Allow me to clarify.
>
>OK ...
>
>> All pre-March-21-1987 Tech Pluses, and those with unexpired CSCEs for old
>> Element 3B, have passed the necessary tests for a post-restructuring
>General.
>> It should have been a nobrainer for the FCC to do one or more of the
>following:
>>
>> - allow those Tech Pluses to have General privileges if they have old
>license
>> documents to show they qualify
>> - allow those Tech Pluses to renew as Generals when the time comes or as
>part
>> of a vanity call application
>> - allow those Tech Pluses to upgrade by mail or online by sending in the
>> appropriate forms and documents
>> - have the FCC computer issue new Generals to all existing Tech Pluses who
>> qualified
>>
>> All of these were suggested to the FCC. Yet the FCC insisted that all
>> qualifying Tech Pluses show up at VE sessions and pay a VE fee to get a
>license
>> they'd earned years before. Why?
>
>Because the system wasn't set up to handle that input directly from

>the public ... the FCC doesn't receive/review old documents ... that
>task has been relegated to the VE teams and VECs to manage.

FCC is set up to do renewals by mail, even after a license has expired almost
two years. Also
vanity applications.

>> >NCI and the NCVECs both told the FCC "No freebies",
>>
>> Allowing the Tech Pluses listed above to get Generals without the VE
>session
>> hassle isn't a freebie.
>
>Neither was it a burden ...

Not for you, but for others it could be. That's my point.

>> >it was the ARRL who wanted to give freebies (presumably
>> >to make some folks feel grateful in hopes they'd sent in their
>> >subscription, er membership, $$$)
>>
>> You mean the upgrading of existing Novices and Tech Pluses to General.
>
>Yes ...
>
>> Your comments show an anti-ARRL bias that has no basis in fact.
>
>I don't think it shows a bias ... it's just my personal view, based on the
>facts in evidence ...

The part about "presumably to make some folks feel grateful in hopes they'd
sent in their
subscription, er membership, $$$" is pure speculation, not based on fact.

>> What would you
>> say to someone who claimed that the NCVEC and NCI stance was driven by a
>desire
>> to make existing hams "jump through a hazing hoop" of written exams, and
>gather
>> more $$$ at VE sessions, while protecting their status as having passed
>the old
>> writtens? ;-)
>
>I'd say, "No freebie upgrades which bypass the written tests required by
>the rules."

Other side of the same coin.

Fast forward a year or so. Let's say S25.5 is history in the wake of WRC-2003.
Should existing Techs get more HF/MF privileges
without taking more written tests? I think they should (something like half the
General privs, plus 200 W power limit). Many would say that's a freebie
upgrade.

>
>> >I could live without subbands by license class ... that is the norm
>> >in most of the world and doesn't seem to really cause any demonstrable
>> >problems.
>>
>> The norm in most of the world is far fewer hams per capita, and per square
>> mile, too.
>
>So?

So the conditions which cause a need for subbands by mode and license class
here in the USA don;t exist in most of the world.
>
>> >While most of the world seems to do just fine without subband by mode
>> >restrictions, I'm not so sure that we Americans are ready for that. Just
>> >listening to the behavior that I hear from so many on the phone bands
>> >(and I mean people who passed fast code tests, not some new thing
>> >that's happened since the test was dropped to 5 wpm), I don't really
>> >want to see that "Ugly American" phenomenon spread to the entirety
>> >of the bands at the expense of all of the other modes and the digital
>> >techniques that are our future.
>>
>> You've just proved my point.
>
>I don't think so ... density of hams (per capita or per square mile)
>doesnt' seem to me to have any more correlation to behavior than
>does a Morse test.

I think the density has an effect.
>
>> Note that ALL of the folks you hear on the HF 'phone bands have passed
>multiple
>> WRITTEN tests. But even before the restructuring, there were medical
>waivers.
>> One cannot assume that any HF ham has passed more than a 5 wpm code test
>> without more information.
>
>Many, if not most, of the worst offenders are long-timers who got
>their "higher class" license (but not the manners to go with it) before
>code waivers existed ...

Not from what I read in the FCC enforcement letters. Seems to be a pretty wide
distribution by license class and "time-in-grade". Of course the enforcement
letters are not necessarily an exact representation of all violations.

Still, the point is that the written tests, which directly address the rules of
how to act on the air, are not a perfect filter against violations. Does that
mean we don't need written tests? Of course not!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2732. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 10:42:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429064227.26630.00000010@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 41998

In article <OIAy8.53709$QC1.3895584@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>> but why would a refinery have a nuke plant?
>
>What I meant was to have the transmitter *at*
>an automated nuclear plant.

Ah - OK

> But then, why would
>you have a manually-keyed radiotelegraphy
>transmitter at a nuclear power plant - to stay
>in touch with the uranium mine in the wilds of
>the Belgian Congo?

That's one possibility. Or it could be that as things fell apart the few
stations left on the air were using whatever was available.

They left it in transmit mode, too.
>
>I guess there really does have to be a willing
>suspension of disbelief to make the multi-billion-
>dollar film industry work -

Much of it, anyway. Look at the hit movies for the past few years and see how
few of them are based on any sort of reality. Even when a film is based on
history, like "Titanic", it has to be jazzed up with a phony love story. Or, as
in the case of "A Beautiful Mind", the nasty rough edges of the real story are
glossed over to make the characters more likeable,

73 de Jim, N2EY

2733. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 10:51:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429065155.00704.00005056@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 42000

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>> >it was the ARRL who wanted to give freebies (presumably
>>> >to make some folks feel grateful in hopes they'd sent in their
>>> >subscription, er membership, $$$)

>The part about "presumably to make some folks feel grateful in hopes they'd
>sent in their
>subscription, er membership, $$$" is pure speculation, not based on fact.

And had the ARRL asked that Novice and Tech+ be required to upgrade or lose their licenses, there would have been talk that the Leauge only did to so that the ARRL VEC would take in the examination $$$.

And if the ARRL had proposed that the existing licenses be retained (as was the FCC final decision) it would have been accused of trying to preserve an overly complicated licensing structure.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2734. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 10:56:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429065607.00704.00005058@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 42001

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Any rational person could easily see that was shown as an early form of
>automatic
>transmission that I experienced. Sorry you couldn't. No, I'm actually not
>sorry at all.
>It's exactly what we have come to expect from the likes of you idiots.

My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2735. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 11:58:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204290358.399515a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42002

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CCC87C2.E4150087@IEEE.org>...

> Is a 2.2 kHz wide digital signal allowed on HF?

It is my understanding that such a signal would be allowed on the amateur HF voice subbands. It would not be allowed outside those subbands, even if used for data.

Under the proposal for the "experimental farm" reallocation of the Novice subbands, it could be used in those subbands for voice, data, etc., at any desired data rate as long as the entire signal was inside the subband.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2736. Re: Curious story - FCC monitoring techniques ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 12:14:34 UTC
From: Apples <Apples@FruitsRusHamRadio.com>
Message-ID: <aajddh$g8s$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 42005
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Pineapples" <gatew3farsi@juno.com> wrote in message
news:p74z8.13119$8p3.1046697@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Each NOSS launch placed a cluster of one primary satellite
> and three smaller sub-satellites (that trail along at distances
> of several hundred kilometers) into low polar orbit. This satellite
> array can determine the location of radio and radars
> transmmitters, using triangulation, and the identity of naval
> units, by analysis of the operating frequencies and transmission
> patterns. NOSS used the ELINT (Electronic Intelligence) technique
> called 'time difference of arrival,' TDOA, rather than true
interferometry."
>
> - Space Policy Agency: Military Space Programs about White Cloud NOSS
>
> Check out this link for the full story:
>
> http://www.earthfiles.com/earth338.htm
>
> VERY VERY INTERESTING!
>

If you are attempting to allude or imply that the FCC may
be using sophisticated techniques such as you describe here,
NO, not even close. The FCC does not even appear on the
screen, when national priorities are considered, especially when
you start talking about sophisticated intelligence systems. Perhaps
in the eyes of a few bureaucrats at the commission whose egos
have surpassed reality, but no, you're talking about an unimportant
agency whose biggest "project" operates out of two leaky trailers
in Laurel, MD, behind a 62 year old building in need of major
repairs.

Apples, Fruits, & assorted nuts.

2737. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 12:59:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCD4397.513D3E36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42006

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You guys can be like that if you wish, but my training and
> experience allows me to think for myself when the going gets
> rough.

Too bad you don't start thinking ahead of that time. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2738. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 13:04:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCD44C0.D7D73283@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42007

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Your knowledge of automatic transmission of messages seems to be limited to ASR28's.
>
> Any rational person could easily see that was shown as an early form of automatic
> transmission that I experienced.

But have you experienced anything more modern than that?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2739. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 13:31:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCCBF72.C878D3F2@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42008

N2EY wrote:

>Much of the long-distance fibre infrastructure in the USA follows the

> railroads, just as the telegraph did.

One wonders what the terrorists think of that convenience - they can take out
both railroads and communications infrastructure with the same destructive device.
Do it at multiple well planned locations and there goes Bill Sohl's "ring"
redundancy.
Of course such wouldn't be without precedent, either. It has been done before
during wartime, as earlier as the Civil war..

2740. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 13:32:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCD4B60.6E23FBC4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42009

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Any rational person could easily see that was shown as an early form of
> >automatic
> >transmission that I experienced. Sorry you couldn't. No, I'm actually not
> >sorry at all.
> >It's exactly what we have come to expect from the likes of you idiots.
>
> My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)

I was aware he was relating an earlier experience. All I was asking was:
Was that his latest experience?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2741. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 14:33:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204290633.32f37e2e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42010

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020429065155.00704.00005056@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >>> >it was the ARRL who wanted to give freebies (presumably
> >>> >to make some folks feel grateful in hopes they'd sent in their
> >>> >subscription, er membership, $$$)

Ed and group,

I did not write the above words. Carl did.
>
> >The part about "presumably to make some folks feel grateful in hopes they'd
> >sent in their
> >subscription, er membership, $$$" is pure speculation, not based on fact.
>
That part I did write.

> And had the ARRL asked that Novice and Tech+ be required to upgrade or lose
> their licenses, there would have been talk that the Leauge only did to so that
> the ARRL VEC would take in the examination $$$.

There would also be speculation that it was done to sell more study
guides, too. Of course ARRL has no monopoly on study guides or VE
sessions.
>
> And if the ARRL had proposed that the existing licenses be retained (as was the
> FCC final decision) it would have been accused of trying to preserve an overly
> complicated licensing structure.
>
Yep - complete with "pecking order", etc., yada, yada, yada.

One goal of the restructuring was the elimination of unnecessarily
complex regs, including license classes. The ARRL BoD plan did just
that. FCC didn't think keeping 3 of the 6 license classes unavailable
to newcomers was a problem.

Meanwhile, attrition, upgrading and reclassification of Tech Pluses
winnows the numbers of those classes down. If/when S25.5 disappears,
the difference between Tech and Tech Plus will disappear, too. (I
think perhaps FCC sees that as a given).

We're now over 100,000 Extras, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2742. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 14:47:40 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <g2dz8.13688$8p3.1106145@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42011

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Much of the long-distance fibre infrastructure in the USA follows the
> railroads, just as the telegraph did.
>

Do you mean to tell me that the railroads are dumbed down and don't use
telegraph anymore? ;-)

73, de Hans, K0HB

2743. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 15:11:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccd62c8_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 42012

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCBFD0D.904CC667@townsqr.com...
>
> Dennis- thanks for the insight, you have explained some things that needed
> explaining.
> The only failure I found in packet radio on VHF (not HF) was the
> narowmindedness of certain operators in that they abused the system to the
> point that it was useless to everyone else.

Pot calls kettle black ... Dick, you have some gall in calling ANYONE
"narrowminded."

How did these operators "abuse the system?" Your previous reference
was WRT message forwarding ... clearly a highly useful application.

> Carl seems to think that the answer
> was for the handful of hams involved to fund some AT&T version of packet
radio
> that would have worked at Internet speeds.

What I said was that the "system" stagnated at 1200 baud and didn't
have enough capacity to provide an acceptable level of service to
the large number of people who tried to use it ... that's just a fact and
is indisuptable, except perhaps in Dick's fantasy world.

> Looks to me like he's far out of
> touch with the reality of ham radio in real life. Few hams could or would
be
> interested in any such venture. His "solutions" seem to be a pretty far
stretch
> for a bunch of hobbyists, while completely normal for those well versed
and
> working in such fields.

The problem is that too many users of packet radio did not bother
to become sufficiently technically knowledgable to be able to comprehend
the nature of the problems, recognize that they could be simply and
relatively economically solved to a very large degree, and see the benefit
to all in doing so ... thus it didn't get done and packet pretty much died.

> I couldn't agree more that the only real failure is to fail to attempt
> anything new at all.

Your continued protestations here that things modern and useful
(or even basic fundamentals of communications, such as Shannon)
are "irrelevant" to amateur radio show that your statement is less
than totally honest.

[gratuitous personal attack snipped]

> Only a small percentage of hams virtually all of whom work in the
technology
> trades are equipped to do advanced digital experimentation, and most
others
> follow trends and use the products of that experimentation *when those
products
> prove to be attractive and useful within the ARS*. That hasn't changed in
> nearly a hundred years, and all the ranting Carl can do won't make it
change
> now.

That doesn't HAVE to be true, Dick ... first, it's easier (and cheaper) than
ever
to "do advanced digital experimentation," with the availability of very
inexpensive
DSP development kits and FPGA development kits (hardward and software).

The issue is NOT the availability of suitable hardware and software ... for
a couple of hundred bucks you can set up to do your own DSP development
and design and program custom ASICs using FPGAs ... in your ham shack lab
...

The ISSUE is that too many people (like you) haven't expended the effort
to stay anywhere NEAR current with such technology and therefore can't
even begin to envision what is possible and easily within reach ... if only
one
has the knowledge ...

Being so woefully lacking in relevant, useful knowledge (and it does NOT
require an EE degree) is the biggest impediment that people like you suffer
from, Dick ... unfortunately, there are lots of hams like you ... which
bodes
poorly for amateur radio.

Carl - wk3c

2744. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 15:15:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccd639c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 42013

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CCC5498.C2BF9247@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > fast can the fastest typist
> > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > typists? How many large
> > databases can you generate and forward in any potential
> > disaster?
>
> Well, if you had multiple people with laptops creating files
> of traffic "off line", and only one ham packet station, you
> wouldn't have a typist directly driving the computer/TNC/
> transmitter, but one of those laptops piping stored files
> over the air..... Of course this would
> have to be set up in practice sessions before hand, etc.

Bob,

Something like what you describe is clearly beyond Dick's
ability to comprehend ... he is stuck in the past in the "everything
must be one on one and done manually ...

Carl - wk3c

2745. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 15:21:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccd6505_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 42014

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:aai6s2mcs1@heap.juniper.net...
>
> If I've done the math right you need a minimal SN ratio of almost
> 60 db to get 56 kbps into 3 kHz. For comparison the very best
> SN ratio you'll get on an analog telephone line is about 48 db
> (because of the 8 bit D/A converter), so you'd need to be getting
> better-than-telephone-line quality signals on HF to do this.
> That might be a stretch.
>
> I think the 56 kbps modems you get achieve this by cheating. They
> run the A/D converter at the modem at double-speed, which effectively
> allows them to make productive use of about 8 kHz of bandwidth on the
> line in the downstream direction towards your house. As they can't do
> this in the upstream direction, the data rates you get on that side of
> the circuit are probably more representative of what you get with a
> less-than-4 kHz bandwidth limit and telephone quality. I think they
> run no faster than 33.6 kbps in that direction.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

Dennis,

While I'm not conceding that 33.6 is the limit on HF data rates,
even that would be a SIGNIFICANT improvement over 300
baud HF packet, right?

The issue is not "Can we do better at HF?" The answer to that
is/and will continue to be "Yes."

The issue is "Why can't people like Dick comprehend the value
in doing so?"

Carl - wk3c

2746. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 15:28:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccd66b9_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 42015

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3CCCC5DE.9AA0033@worldnet.att.net...
>
> KA9Q stopped by here on his way to Part 15 after his rise to
> fame developing TCP/IP. We should let his friend Carl tell
> us what he said when he stopped by. I thought it was
> interesting.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

Sorry, Clay, but I'm not a mind reader, nor can I devine
what may have been said on occasions when I wasn't
present.

If you want to take a shot ar Phil, you'll have to do it yourself,
'cause I don't know what the heck you're alluding to ... either
circumstance or content ...

Carl - wk3c

2747. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 15:37:54 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CCD68D3.E0838C6C@psu.edu>
Source record: 42016

I wear cheap ones myself. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> On Fri, 26 Apr 2002 13:59:04 -0400, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> > To me it is like Nike sneakers or more what some people may think if
> >you *don't* wear them.
>
> That you have enough taste to realize their awful color schemes don't
> go with anything more classy than spandex? I'll stick with my
> Timberlands, thanks.

2748. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 15:47:17 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CCD6B07.EA085D68@psu.edu>
Source record: 42017

Vshah101 wrote:

> As an Electrical Engineer, I would like to see more technical activities in
> "Ham" radio clubs. I have been to a few clubs and it seems that most Hams are
> not interested in the technology of radio, they just want to operate it.

A lot are. You have to keep hunting.

> It is fine if you just want to operate a radio, do morse code, or contests.
> But, the professional would want to do other activities that they find
> iteresting. There are many "Ham" radio amateur clubs, but right now there are
> no clubs for the Amateur radio enthusiasts that want to work with rf
> technology.

You might have to start something in one of your local clubs. Hopefully
they would be receptive!

> I would like to see more antenna setups, kit building, discussions of ciruits
> people have designed, radio direction finding, etc. The ARRL handbook is full
> of good technical information, but most Ham radio people do not want to do
> these things. This is why professional stay away from Ham radio.

A large percentage of my club's members are professional. We have RF
people, computer jockey's, generalists like myself, and others.

I think you are doing a generalization of all hams from a limited
dataset. Reading ARRL's publications and websurfing should convince
people that there is a lot of experimenting going on out there.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2749. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 15:49:42 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CCD6B98.2E9F2033@psu.edu>
Source record: 42018

Or "Don't try to get a fifth day out of that same pair of pants." 8^)

- mike KB3EIA -

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 16:46:02 -0400, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> > How do you want us to "upgrade" our image? is perhaps the most
> >important question.
>
> Use one of those blank spots in part 97 to prohibit the wearing of
> bermuda shorts by hams over 60. Use another one to ban "If it ain't
> CW, it's just CB" t-shirts.

2750. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 15:54:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCD6A25.7B4DFA76@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42019

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Any rational person could easily see that was shown as an early form of
> >automatic
> >transmission that I experienced. Sorry you couldn't. No, I'm actually not
> >sorry at all.
> >It's exactly what we have come to expect from the likes of you idiots.
>
> My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)

If you believe that "showed me up" you are eligible to join the ranks of the
idiots.

2751. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 17:27:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429132750.11987.00006854@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 42020

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>Alrighty.... I have to ask the question..... Allegedly the ARRL supposedly
>is defending ham radio.... I would like to know how they are supposedly
>spending the money of it's members.

The ARRL web site, http://www.arrl.org, offers a good overview of the work of ARRL.

Among its pages is the "Inside Your League" series of articles about the work of the ARRL HQ staff. See:

http://www.arrl.org/news/features/inside-your-league.html

>Who is getting the money... are Congresspersons.... or Senators being
>bribed?

Not at all. Some of the money is spent for ARRL to meet with Congressfolks.

>And obviously
>there is from what I see, people recieving salaries too.... I guess I will
>have to pursue a salary from our local radio club, it is non-profit too. (I
>spend at least 20 hours per week doing various work related to the club.)

The salaries of the HQ staff is ARRL's largest expense. The volunteer who will give 20 hours per week to anything is a rare bird indeed! 20 hours per month is still the exception. ARRL could not be staffed by volunteers; there is too much work to be done and on those sunny days in June, the building would be empty. :-)

>If I can get the clear answers, which I do not have a right to being a
>non-ARRL member, but some of you are, as to where the money is going, I will
>send a money order out the next day I get the answers, for the membership

I think you have a right to ask the question and receive a straight answer. Did you ask it of ARRL directly, or only post here?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2752. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 18:10:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCD8C7A.AD44A96E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42021

Valentine Germann wrote:

>
> But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
> told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
> not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
> FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
> DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.

I've seen a similar thing with people that may feel to
be not getting enough respect. The doctors at the
hospital may just see him as a "worker droid" or such.
And thus he has more of a need to assume the "Professional"
badge. And to avoid something that might take away
from that.

2753. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 18:11:50 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <aak2d6$91b$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 42024

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>For FY2000, the ARRL has 17 employees making over $50,000
>per year (Jon Bloom reported as getting just a bit over $70,000).

It may be I'm suffering from intercoastal culture shock, but I'm
a bit amazed by this. In these parts if you take a foreign student
fresh out of school that you want to hire to do whatever it is
you let engineers with no experience do, and you apply for an H1B
visa with the job offer listing a $66,000 salary, the INS will decline
to process the application based on the opinion that you are
underpaying the alien. Only Americans have the right to work that
cheap.

>[your membership dollars at work]

Whatever the ARRL's other sins might be, based on what I've observed
here I'd say that the ARRL is making pretty effective use of their
human resources dollars and it is pretty clear their employees are
motivated to work there by considerations other than maximizing their
earning potential.

Dennis Ferguson

2754. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 18:19:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204291019.71af8abd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42022

"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<g2dz8.13688$8p3.1106145@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> > Much of the long-distance fibre infrastructure in the USA follows the
> > railroads, just as the telegraph did.

> Do you mean to tell me that the railroads are dumbed down and don't use
> telegraph anymore? ;-)

US railroad use of wire telegraphs was phased out over several
decades. It was essentially gone by the 1960s. Cheaper to install
telephones than to pay higher wages. They used American Morse, btw.

Steam locomotives, cabooses (aka cabin cars), block operators and
interlocking towers with people in them 24/7 have all but vanished for
the same reason. In fact, improvements in RR signaling have eliminated
the need for most of the communications that operators used to do
(train orders, work permits, etc.)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2755. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 18:38:48 UTC
From: George McCouch <geomac@hopkinsville.net>
Message-ID: <geomac-623FA0.13384829042002@news.uswest.net>
Source record: 42023

In article <20020427012310.27628.00000813@mb-bj.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> In article <3cca27fe_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020426204551.21592.00000879@mb-fa.aol.com...
> >
> >> For FY2000, the ARRL has 17 employees making over $50,000
> >> per year (Jon Bloom reported as getting just a bit over $70,000).
> >> Booth, Freret, Imlay billed the ARRL for $105,122 worth of legal
> >> thingies and $60,060 was billed from Chwat & Co. for lobbying
> >> the gubmint.
> >
> >With some of the lame things they're asking those guys to do
> >(some, but not all ...), it's probably a good thing they didn't
> >get $165k worth of results.
> >
> >> Executive VP Dave Sumner is shown as receiving
> >> $124,875.20 in compensation plus $6,610.97 in employee
> >> benefit contributions and an expense account of almost $7K.
> >> [your membership dollars at work]
> >
> >Damn ... thanks for telling me that, Len ... I'm going to have
> >to ask for a raise ... Dave's making almost as much as I do ...
> >but then again, he doesn't get stock options :-)
> >
> >However, I find $7k unbelievable for Dave's expenses ...
> >considering he spent time in Istanbul for WRC-2000
> >(If I recall he came home for Dayton or something in
> >the middle of the WRC, then went back ...)
> >
> >Thus, I can't believe $7k ... my last expense report (a few
> >trips to Washington last month and business class
> >airfare r/t to Sydney, Australia for the IEEE 802
> >meeting) was over $10k and that's just one ... I file
> >about one report a month so that AMEX gets paid often
> >enough to keep them happy ...
> >
> >Now, to write myself a note about that raise ...
>
> Carl, I'll lay this one on you. On those tax returns for
> FY2000, the preparer was the ARTHUR ANDERSEN

> branch office in Hartford.
>
> Can anyone spell "creative accounting?" :-)
>
> Quod erat demonstrandum.
>
> ...and then sum.

Hello Len,

I just looked at one and found it interesting that Arthur Anderson did the work. Of course if I took the time to look at the financial statement published in QST I probably would have known it, but interesting just the same.

73
George
W3GEO

2756. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 19:05:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <bQgz8.155$9X3.19978@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42025

I am delighted to receive the following support for my comments.
The last sentence wasn't in my proposal, but I think I support it.

73, Hans, K0HB

To the FCC:

The members of the ADC Telecommunications Amateur Radio
Club (K0RT) urge the Commission to favorably consider the
comments of Hans Brakob, K0HB, John Rippey, W3ULS, and
others who have suggested that the vacated "Novice" bands
be set aside as a "national park for communications experimenters".

Our club is largely composed of engineers and technicians
daily involved in advancing the telecommunications art in
the US and around the world. We are concerned that amateur
radio seems to be declining as a source of new technicians
and engineers in the communications industry. We feel that
a "showcase for technology" within the Amateur Radio bands
might be a way for the Commission to encourage and focus
the excitement of discovery in technological matters among
young people, similar to the efforts of ARRL in their "Big
Project".

We propose that if such a "preserve" is established, that
Technician class licensees be allowed to participate at
power levels less than 10W.

Thank you.

ADC_Hams@earthlink.net

2757. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 19:10:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429151042.27628.00000902@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42028

In article <9f4bfe89.0204290358.399515a8@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:<3CCC87C2.E4150087@IEEE.org>...
>
>> Is a 2.2 kHz wide digital signal allowed on HF?
>
>It is my understanding that such a signal would be allowed on the
>amateur HF voice subbands. It would not be allowed outside those
>subbands, even if used for data.

It's my understanding that a proposal is just a proposal. There's no RM for it yet...yet the Radio Kops are making pronouncements.

Well, the 2.2 KHz kills any hope of modifying RM-9404...it was only 2.1 KHz wide for 136 KHz band. :-)

>Under the proposal for the "experimental farm" reallocation of the
>Novice subbands, it could be used in those subbands for voice, data,
>etc., at any desired data rate as long as the entire signal was inside
>the subband.

By all means, SEGREGATE those bands! Demand EM-ethnic purity! Make the experimenters ride way in the back of the bus! Keep "the bands" clear for the legacy modes!

You showem which side of the white bread is buttered, paleface.

beep, beep

2758. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 19:10:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429151043.27628.00000903@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42026

In article <aajbu021ohp@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Alrighty.... I have to ask the question..... Allegedly the ARRL supposedly
>is defending ham radio.... I would like to know how they are supposedly
>spending the money of it's members.
>
>Who is getting the money... are Congresspersons.... or Senators being
>bribed?

"Details upon request" is written down on several of the 26 pages of
the ARRL FY2000 tax return forms. Lobbying expenses are reported
as a bit over $90K.

The rationale possible from the ARRL is "that works out to only about
half a dollar per member, very cheap." :-)

[attention Ed, that's a freebie rationale for the League] :-)

2759. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 19:10:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429151044.27628.00000905@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42027

In article <520A49981C43759F.A5371C7B0D9F3CDF.3D1396C70B7053E1@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 22:18:32 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
><bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
>>"Society for Uncreative Radio Anachronism" There's just something about
>>that that I don't like.
>
>But does it still have the belly dancers, mead, and coed topless
>wrestling?

The belly dancers are over 60, the mead is only 3.2, and the coed
topless wrestlers are all male... :-)

2760. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 19:10:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429151044.27628.00000904@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42029

In article <20020429064227.26630.00000010@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>Much of it, anyway. Look at the hit movies for the past few years and see how
>few of them are based on any sort of reality.

You mean...(!)...morse code will not save the world from alien
invaders?!?!? [you are shattering illusions here, Jimmie]

>Even when a film is based on
>history, like "Titanic", it has to be jazzed up with a phony love story.

The sparkies on the Titanic weren't in love with morsemanship?!?

[illusions and delusions falling right and left!]

>Or, as
>in the case of "A Beautiful Mind", the nasty rough edges of the real story
>are glossed over to make the characters more likeable,

...and, in the memorable TV film version of "The French Atlantic
Affair" of over 15 years ago, the heroes were a girl and boy who
had 1x2 calls and were under twelve. "The French Atlantic
Affair" was written by a ham and had at least one ham actor.
[I think it got a review in QST or some ham publication way back
when...picture of smirking female interviewer with author]

Well, it goes to show ya that any time you have hijacked ocean
liners, hijacked airliners, iceberg-hitting ocean liners, firemen time
traveling, aliens invading the earth, and worldwide apocalyptic
catastrophy, good old morse cod will show its usefulness!
[something fishy there]

beep, beep

2761. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 19:10:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429151045.27628.00000906@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42030

In article <nX8z8.52361$Rw2.4140284@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>I keep thinking of Randolph Scott and Western Union laying telegraph lines
>across the great treeless praries where you had to bring in everything on
>wagons as the Onion Pacific had not yet been invented. The work trains
>are slick, the wagon-schtick is monumental.

You hang in there, old timer. Git yer eddycasion from da moom
pitchas.

Just think -
Drugs, sex, killing, swinging and CW in "The French Atlantic Affair."
[the book, not the movie]

Hopelessness, despair, and a dash of CW in "On The Beach."
[photographed in black and white...ham radio is primarily white]

Huge flying saucers, alien domination, and CW saving the
world in "Independence Day."
[I have to admit it had a black fresh prince as a jet jock but then
Data was hiding in Area 51 and the US president was also a
jet jock and Jeff Goldblum knows all about 'puters...]

Radio time travel and disturbed mentalities in "Frequency."
[Dennis Quaid's character must have been disturbed that his
"son" didn't look at all like him and that Benton Harbor products
are timeless...]

Flashing tail lights in morse save an about-to-be shot down
hijacked 747 in "Executive Decision."
[even Kurt Russell and Halle Berry have to work in potboilers
to make $$$]

Monumental special effects and monumental public relations
along with a sound-over byte of a morse sparky save James
Cameron in "Titanic."
[shows to go ya that morsemanship, however slight, can earn
an Oscar, kingdom of the world...and result in a divorce and
exile to syndicated TV series production]

All of that is so...so...AUTHENTIC! :-)

2762. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 19:30:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCD9F66.8242A2C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42031

Len Over 21 wrote:
> All of that is so...so...AUTHENTIC! :-)

Nope, it's not, Len. You know that our species will favor symbolism
over substance every time. It has been that way for at least ten
thousand years. Religion is a prime example. Who, in their right
minds, could possibly, in this enlightened day and age, believe
in the supernatural? "If that's all there is, my friend, then
let's keep dancing, break out the booze, and have a ball, if
that's all there is."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2763. APRS/ONSTAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 21:12:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <iHiz8.216$Uw4.23308@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42032
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.digital,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I have two new GM vehicles which came equipped with OnStar. Has anyone here figured out a way to intercept the OnStar latitude/longitude info for a feed to an APRS node?

73, de Hans, K0HB
k0hb at arrl dot net

2764. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 21:32:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCDBBBD.A6F65D44@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42033

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >Any rational person could easily see that was shown as an early form of
> > >automatic
> > >transmission that I experienced. Sorry you couldn't. No, I'm actually not
> > >sorry at all.
> > >It's exactly what we have come to expect from the likes of you idiots.
> >
> > My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)
>
> I was aware he was relating an earlier experience. All I was asking was:
> Was that his latest experience?

Cecil how you sure are you that I don't have a whole lot more experience than
you in many areas including that one?

2765. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:17:01 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3ccdc633.363659053@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 42034

On 29 Apr 2002 10:42:27 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Much of it, anyway. Look at the hit movies for the past few years and see how
>few of them are based on any sort of reality. Even when a film is based on
>history, like "Titanic", it has to be jazzed up with a phony love story. Or, as
>in the case of "A Beautiful Mind", the nasty rough edges of the real story are
>glossed over to make the characters more likeable,

Or more recently, Pearl Harbor.

2766. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:20:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <UGjz8.2266$Tg.165429459@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42035

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:520A49981C43759F.A5371C7B0D9F3CDF.3D1396C70B7053E1@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 22:18:32 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> >"Society for Uncreative Radio Anachronism" There's just something about
> >that that I don't like.
>
> But does it still have the belly dancers, mead, and coed topless
> wrestling?

No, none of that. But on the Harvest Moon, the YL's dance naked aroung a
bonfire. Mead is optional.

2767. Re: APRS/ONSTAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:22:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BIjz8.2268$%b.165220697@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42036
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.digital,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:iHiz8.216$Uw4.23308@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> I have two new GM vehicles which came equipped with OnStar. Has anyone
here
> figured out a way to intercept the OnStar latitude/longitude info for a
feed
> to an APRS node?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> k0hb at arrl dot net

I'd try TAPR or Buck Rogers first.

2768. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:28:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BOjz8.2272$NI.165671063@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42037

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3BEEAD2D.84D6BDBB@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> *IF* that's all there is to the situation, I certainly agree. My point is
that
> you are doing exactly what you always do- make false assumptions with too
little
> knowledge and information. If two of them could see each others antennas,
the
> third could have been at the edge of the skip zone requiring all three to
run
> higher power to complete the desired communication and the yagi scenario
could
> easily apply.
> And demanding they do it on some other band is lame. Remember, there is
NO
> requirement for hams to own any particular station equipment whatever.
Maybe one
> of them doesn't have a two meter station.

? *IF* ?

Dick, why is it that you can -imagine- the one (1) situation in a million
where only CW can save the day, and thusly condemn the amateur world to have
to learn it, but given a real world situation you simply cannot believe it?
73,
Brian/N0iMD

2769. Re: Goodbye to the Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:30:33 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3ccdc96e.364485977@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 42038

I'm not going to say goodbye to you, why? I know you'll be back
eventually.

AA7YA

2770. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:32:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1Sjz8.2274$mq.165888332@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42039

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020429065607.00704.00005058@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Any rational person could easily see that was shown as an early form of
> >automatic
> >transmission that I experienced. Sorry you couldn't. No, I'm actually not
> >sorry at all.
> >It's exactly what we have come to expect from the likes of you idiots.
>
> My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Knowing how rusty Dick is, I can only wonder how rusty that "FREE" m28 is
sitting in that hamfest parking lot.

2771. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:34:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <LTjz8.2276$um.165704978@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42040

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CCD4B60.6E23FBC4@IEEE.org...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >Any rational person could easily see that was shown as an early form of
> > >automatic
> > >transmission that I experienced. Sorry you couldn't. No, I'm actually
not
> > >sorry at all.
> > >It's exactly what we have come to expect from the likes of you idiots.
> >
> > My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)
>
> I was aware he was relating an earlier experience. All I was asking was:
> Was that his latest experience?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

A very good question.

Its important that one's experiences in old modes be very recent in order to
have credibility.

2772. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:38:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <UXjz8.2278$wv.166145212@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42041

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCDBBBD.A6F65D44@townsqr.com...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > >
> > > >Any rational person could easily see that was shown as an early form
of
> > > >automatic
> > > >transmission that I experienced. Sorry you couldn't. No, I'm actually
not
> > > >sorry at all.
> > > >It's exactly what we have come to expect from the likes of you
idiots.
> > >
> > > My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)
> >
> > I was aware he was relating an earlier experience. All I was asking was:
> > Was that his latest experience?
>
> Cecil how you sure are you that I don't have a whole lot more experience
than
> you in many areas including that one?

Cecil, I guess its time to break out the tuning fork and show this guy
whats what.

2773. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:47:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <j4kz8.2285$ZB.166436209@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42042

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCCB84A.3BDA003D@townsqr.com...
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > > fast can the fastest typist
> > > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > > typists? How many large
> > > databases can you generate and forward in any potential
> > > disaster?
> >
> > Well, if you had multiple people with laptops creating files
> > of traffic "off line", and only one ham packet station, you
> > wouldn't have a typist directly driving the computer/TNC/
> > transmitter, but one of those laptops piping stored files
> > over the air..... Of course this would
> > have to be set up in practice sessions before hand, etc.
>
> Only those of us who have lived through "unplanned" real
> emergencies seem to understand that planning is great and
> certainly a of significant benefit. But it can only take you so
> far.

Name your "real, unplanned" emergency. It you tell me it was the ChiComs
overrunning your position I'll know that you are GrayJL, aka Xray.

> It's like the old German or Soviet armies - when their leaders
> went down, the rank and file were essentially lost, having been
> drilled incessently to do and only do what their authorities
> ordered.

Please give an example.

> They never learned to think and act for themselves.
> You guys can be like that if you wish, but my training and
> experience allows me to think for myself when the going gets
> rough. It won't take a truckload of the latest technology to get
> me communicating.

No, just a truckload of code practice tapes and the force of the FCC
regulations on the chance that you'll have someone to communicate with.
Instead of planning for better methods.

You can be as dumb or smart as you want.

2774. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 22:52:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <L8kz8.2288$VF.166610079@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42043

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCCBF72.C878D3F2@townsqr.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >Much of the long-distance fibre infrastructure in the USA follows the
>
> > railroads, just as the telegraph did.
>
> One wonders what the terrorists think of that convenience - they can
take out
> both railroads and communications infrastructure with the same destructive
device.
> Do it at multiple well planned locations and there goes Bill Sohl's "ring"
> redundancy.
> Of course such wouldn't be without precedent, either. It has been done
before
> during wartime, as earlier as the Civil war..

Dick, what rank did you hold in the Civil War?

2775. Re: K1B Baker Island / DXCC #308 for AB7SL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 23:07:54 UTC
From: aa7ya@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3ccdd22b.366723726@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 42044
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Just killfile his callsign, he seems to use it in his subject line all
the time.

AA7YA

2776. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 23:25:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aakkv0cce1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42045

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCCB84A.3BDA003D@townsqr.com...
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > What you soon bump up against is the human factor.
> > > How fast can the fastest typist
> > > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60
> > > word per minute typists? How many large
> > > databases can you generate and forward in any
> > > potential disaster?
> >
> > Well, if you had multiple people with laptops creating files
> > of traffic "off line", and only one ham packet station, you
> > wouldn't have a typist directly driving the computer/TNC/
> > transmitter, but one of those laptops piping stored files
> > over the air..... Of course this would
> > have to be set up in practice sessions before hand, etc.
>
> Only those of us who have lived through "unplanned" real
> emergencies seem to understand that planning is great and
> certainly a of significant benefit. But it can only take you so
> far.

In many cases it covers all that is needed. Are
there unexpected situations that require thinking
to get around? Certainly! Is anyone saying
planning covers everything all the time? No!

> It's like the old German or Soviet armies - when their leaders
> went down, the rank and file were essentially lost, having been
> drilled incessently to do and only do what their authorities
> ordered. They never learned to think and act for themselves.

Is anyone saying we should practice/plan to the
point of Pavlovian response? No. Planning
and practice should also include "unexpected"
events to foster such independent thought.
Planning and practice does NOT imply 100% rote
reactions.

> You guys can be like that if you wish, but my training and
> experience allows me to think for myself when the going gets
> rough. It won't take a truckload of the latest technology to get
> me communicating.

And no one is saying that shouldn't be the case.
The pages of QST and CQ are filled with
emergency activities with all sorts of "field
work-a-rounds" that were done to address a problem.

You appear from your ongoing litany to believe
that in such cases, the immediate "fix" will
be morse code (CW). The pages of QST and CQ
do not, historically, support that perception.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2777. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 23:40:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aakm0a$ap0$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42046

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020428213011.19000.00001280@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <aaepmcuap1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> news:20020427120721.09489.00000900@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> And if you need another 1.6T, just pull another fibre through the duct.
> >
> >In reality the fiber is already there. Typically a multi-fiber
> >cable is run with spare fibers then available for growth of
> >capacity.
>
> Yup. Also spare ducting is usually installed if new duct has to be put in.
My
> basic point is that it's not like the RF spectrum where reuse is an issue.

The spare ducting reached an exhaust level in the late 60's/70's
in NY city. The advent of digital multiplexers and fiber optics
allowed the recouping of considerable duct space by
pulling out the old "copper" cables.

> >> >> high reliability and security. Fiber is also almost immune to RFI,
> >> >> EMI and EMP.
>
> It is also somewhat more resistant to being tapped. During the Cold War,
US
> Navy submarines "tapped" Soviet undersea comm cables by means of pods
placed
> alongside the Soviet cables. The "taps" worked by induction. (See
> "Blind Man's Bluff", now out in paperback, for lots more detail).

Outstanding book. I read it a few months ago.
The tapping of the undersea Soviet telephone cable
was absolutly amazing...especially when you consider
the recording equipment needed to "tape" the
bandwidth for months at a time.

> >Exactly. Many people have now found they get all the
> >service they need with greater flexibility using only
> >a cellphone. One of the baby bells actually
> >incurred a negative growth of their hard wired
> >(i.e. traditional POTS) access lines during 2001.
>
> All depends what the customer wants and needs.

> A person who travels a lot
> may actually save money by using a cell
> phone and a coast-to-coast one-rate
> plan. In other cases, the cost of having more
> lines installed may exceed the
> cost of a cellphone.
>
> But most of the communications (in terms of circuit-miles) is fibre.

True.

> >> But even that is changing. How long
> >> before we see each home or business wired
> >> ("fibred"?) with its own direct optical
> >> connection to the infrastructure, with
> >> the end user providing whatever
> >> terminal equipment is needed for voice
> >> telephone, data, entertainment, etc.?
> >> One fibre will do all that and much more.
> >
> >I agree. The hold-up is and has been the cost of deploying
> >separate fibers then to each individual home, especially
> >in residential and rural areas.
>
> Of course - but those costs will drop over time. Glass is cheaper than
copper.
> There was a time when it was predicted by knowledgeable folks that cable
TV
> would flop in areas where good reception could be had with "rabbit ears".
> Nobody thinks that way anymore!

The cost factor of the last mile is not that easy
to reduce. Many communities mandate all
buried services. It's relatively easy (and cheaper)
to run aerial cable (where the poles and
infrastructure permit) as opposed to trenching
new cables.

> New telecomm laws may make it more
> economic to run a single fibre rather than
> multiple pairs for telephone service, coax
> for cable TV, etc.

You can also run everything (include telephony)
over coax. Some places have tried "fiber
to the curb" with the last part of the "drop"
to the home being convential twisted pair or coax.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2778. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 23:45:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aakm3jlqm1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42047

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCCBF72.C878D3F2@townsqr.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >Much of the long-distance fibre infrastructure in the USA follows the
>
> > railroads, just as the telegraph did.
>
> One wonders what the terrorists think of
> that convenience - they can take out
> both railroads and communications infrastructure
> with the same destructive device.
> Do it at multiple well planned locations and
> there goes Bill Sohl's "ring" redundancy.

The railroads initially offered an easy path for
alternative carriers to deploy long distance
connectivity. The existing telcos have routes all
over the place and most don't follow RR routes.

To take down a major metro area would require
considerable knowledge, time, evil talent, etc.

> Of course such wouldn't be without precedent,
> either. It has been done before
> during wartime, as earlier as the Civil war..

Throughout the Gulf war, the US was unable to
effectively take out the communications of
IRAQ... and that was 10 years ago.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2779. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-29 23:52:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCDDCB5.DAFE60AF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42048

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I was aware he was relating an earlier experience. All I was asking was:
> > Was that his latest experience?
>
> Cecil how you sure are you that I don't have a whole lot more experience than
> you in many areas including that one?

I'm not, Dick. That's why I ask questions.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

2780. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 01:32:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020429213246.01774.00002270@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42049

In article <3CCC5D6A.76D1D64A@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>I was in that area about 20 years ago. Some company in or near
>Reholoth Beach had me come to town for a job interview. Not
>much there, small towns and lots of empty land like
>farms and such. Cost of living should be fairly low, though...

Bob:

It may have been like that 20 years ago, but it's being paved over
at an alarming rate now.

>I wouldn't think any of those small towns would have a bus
>system of their own. Larry must be on a county-wide
>system.

I work for a State transit agency, and we have State-wide
door-to-door Paratransit service -- the only state in the country that
does.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2781. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 01:32:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020429213246.01774.00002269@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42050

In article <3ccbf597_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>> No loogie spitting on MY bus -- they go into the empty Diet Pepsi
>> Twist can!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Now THERE's an image I could have lived without ... but it does
>go to show that Larry is truly a "class act" (NOT!) :-)
>
>Carl - wk3c

It's nice to know that Carl's buttons can be so easily pushed!
I'll never miss Kim now that he's back!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2782. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 01:32:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020429213247.01774.00002271@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42051

In article <JeRy8.1561$_N.65875184@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Wrong-O Big Boy. I'll support mode endorsements based upon mode exams.

Brian:

OK then I guess you support the Morse code testing requirement.

> I don't support a single mode exams that excludes people from operating other
>modes.

Which exams would those be? Without ever taking a Morse code test,
it is possible for an entry-level Technician-class amateur to operate any
mode conceived of in the history of the ARS.

>None-the-less, Morse Code has nothing to do with electronics, radio
>theory, rules, safety, etc. It's merely an encoding scheme.

I'm glad to see you got something right. Now all we gotta do is get you
to stop whining about taking a test for it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2783. Re: Larry's attitude STILL sucks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 01:32:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020429213248.01774.00002272@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42052

In article <3ccbf098_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>
>Larry,
>
>How *benevolent* of you, oh exhaulted one! (NOT! on both counts!)
>
>"... willing to limit themselves to life as a No-code Tech ..." were your
>words.
>
>Translation: As long as those who don't share your propensity for Morse
>code "stay in their place," like the colonial slave-master relationship, or
>the "back of the bus" thing, "you'll be benevolent enough" to "allow them
>the privilege" (which they've earned with no help from you) of VHF/UHF
>only operation (the back of the bus, in effect).
>
>However, if they should feel that Morse is irrelevant, and should not
>be an artificial barrier holding them back from HF privileges, then THAT
>flies in the face of your "exhalted" status and is "stepping over the
>boundary"
>(that you view as existing between "exhalted beings" such as yourself and
>"lower life forms" who haven't passed a high speed code test ...)
>
>I don't see that as a "live and let live" attitude at all ... it's clear
>from your words
>and actions here that your attitude is TRULY that you and others who have
>passed a high speed code test are, indeed, "exhaulted" in some perverse way
>and because of that (delusion), you feel that it's OK to dump at will on
>those
>who you view as being "inferior" ...
>
>Your attitude STILL sucks, Larry.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Nothing new here, Carl -- you whine just about as well as any other
NCTA I've ever seen! All this personal stuff against me is just going
one step further to prove my point.

When I said I have a "live and let live" attitude toward no-coders
who DON'T whine about code, I meant just that. Nothing more,
nothing less. When they start whining and blaming me for everything
from ethnic cleansing to global warming, then they're fair game.
My attitude and my actions are perfectly fair and two-way. If you

don't see it that way, then go ahead and whine. I'm sure it makes you feel better.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2784. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 01:49:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020429214928.20703.00001230@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 42053

In article <20020429065607.00704.00005058@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)

Yeah, I know somebody like that. Called me "jerk", "idiot", "anal retentive" and a bunch of other names in this ng, just for pointing out some simple facts and asking a few simple questions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2785. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 01:55:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204291755.58b691ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42054

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020425061608.06846.00005546@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >There hasn't been a new HF mode developed or adopted in ham radio yet
> >which needed any setaside spectrum space to "flourish", every one of
> >'em has sucessfully duked it out with modes which were already in use
> >in the same space going back to AM, then ssb, and more recently PSK31.
>
> If you give a listen to the commercial bands around our bands, you will hear
> all sorts of signals that are not permitted on our bands under the current
> rules. The limitations on modulation modes and data rates preclude the
> development of new HF modes in ham radio that could "flourish" in a setaside
> spectrum place.
>
I tune, belive me, I'm half ham and half swl. Specifically what
commercial modes are you talking about?? Which are used below 30Mhz.
What rules would have to be changed in order to allow these modes to
be used in the refarmed HF Novice Bands? Just open up those segements
and let 'er rip between those freq limits? Or what?
>
>
Actually I wouldn't have any problem with that scenario at all. With a
few notable exceptions every time I've surfed the Novice bands looking
for contacts in the past few years nobody wuz home. If the Novice
setasides are functionally dead space then why not?
>
>
Because: No more benefit will accrue ham radio taken as a whole than
it has where similar "new" modes have been allowed for eons above
30Mhz. Where precisely nothing new has happened too. OR what's the
point to dedicating ham spectrum space just so that a few
"experimenters" MIGHT emulate what the commecials are already doing?
This is "advancement of the state of the art"??
>
>
What rationales would those who advocate refarming the Novice bands to
unspecified "new" modes offer the FCC which would convince the FCC to
get tangled up in the inevitable resulting regulatory hassles? Versus
the FCC just saying screw it, just expand the phone bands like the
ARRL is recommending along with prolly 99% of the HF ops in this
country.
>
>

Pragmatism prevails, RRAP does not and never will.
>
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
w3rv

2786. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 01:56:22 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCDF9C6.7D5B97E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42055

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> >I wouldn't think any of those small towns would have a bus
> >system of their own. Larry must be on a county-wide
> >system.
>
> I work for a State transit agency, and we have State-wide
> door-to-door Paratransit service -- the only state in the country that
> does.

Delaware must have a good budget for public transit. My brother
does transportation planning for one of the counties in NJ (bus
schedules, traffic intersection planning, and various civil engineering
tasks) and might be interested in such in Delaware.

2787. Re: K1B Baker Island / DXCC #308 for AB7SL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 01:59:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020429215941.01774.00002273@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42056

In article <ix_y8.11589$iU4.1007064@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>
>"CJ" <andy@livewire.com> wrote in message
>
>> Oh yeah!!! My W9INN dipole at 54ft served me well again today
>
>Your *bought* a DIPOLE???????

Hansl:

Prepare yourself, because I'm about to do likewise! After pricing out the wire, connectors, components, and my time to produce a G5RV for my Field Day digital station, I decided it's way cheaper to buy one in a plastic bag, all ready to go! I will, however, be using a home-brewed Delta Loop.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2788. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 01:59:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020429215942.01774.00002274@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42057

In article <3CCC87C2.E4150087@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>PACTOR III is here and runs on the existing SCS modems. It has a raw
>throughput
>of 3600 baud which is high enough for digitized voice with a speech
>compression/
>coding PC-based front end. PACTOR III is described at http://www.scs-ptc.com
>
>Is a 2.2 kHz wide digital signal allowed on HF?

Cecil:

If not, they should be! I say, just plunk 'er down in the middle of
any of the 'fone bands, and let 'er rip (literally)!!!

BTW would digial voice modes give us the ability to use DSP to
filter out bowel and bladder reports?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2789. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 02:07:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <20nz8.2454$0j3.174775453@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42058

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020429214928.20703.00001230@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <20020429065607.00704.00005058@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)
>
> Yeah, I know somebody like that. Called me "jerk", "idiot", "anal
retentive"
> and a bunch of other names in this ng, just for pointing out some simple
facts
> and asking a few simple questions.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times. Besides, I don't see you asking these types of questions of your cronies.

73, Brian

2790. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 02:13:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <X4nz8.2464$8O2.173117491@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42059

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0204291755.58b691ce@posting.google.com...

> Because: No more benefit will accrue ham radio taken as a whole than
> it has where similar "new" modes have been allowed for eons above
> 30Mhz. Where precisely nothing new has happened too. OR what's the
> point to dedicating ham spectrum space just so that a few
> "experimenters" MIGHT emulate what the commecials are already doing?
> This is "advancement of the state of the art"??

Is what we're doing now "advancement of the state of the art?"

Lets give Hans' plan a chance. It might actually amount to something,
someday.

2791. Re: Single unifying thread

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 02:20:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <obnz8.2469$Ov3.175456436@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42060

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020429213247.01774.00002271@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <JeRy8.1561$_N.65875184@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Wrong-O Big Boy. I'll support mode endorsements based upon mode exams.
>
> Brian:
>
> OK then I guess you support the Morse code testing requirement.

Only when I see other mode exams. How many modes can you name?

> > I don't support a single mode exams that excludes people from operating
other
> >modes.
>
> Which exams would those be? Without ever taking a Morse code test,
> it is possible for an entry-level Technician-class amateur to operate any
> mode conceived of in the history of the ARS.

Spark? Snap out of it Larry, you know a Tech cannot get on HF outside of
Part 15. Why is that?

> >None-the-less, Morse Code has nothing to do with electronics, radio
> >theory, rules, safety, etc. It's merely an encoding scheme.
>
> I'm glad to see you got something right. Now all we gotta do is get you
> to stop whining about taking a test for it.

Who'se whining? Who'se bullying?

2792. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 02:52:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204291852.3bd6e861@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42061

>
> Let's do some approximate numbers....
>
> Let's say they have a 2 megawatt backup diesel plant. Such a setup might
> consist of a single 3000 hp prime mover turning an alternator at 900 rpm.
> Depending on the load, such a setup might use 1-2 gallons per hour upwards.
>
. . ."upwards"? . .
>
>
Hint: A 1000 watt (0.001 megawatt)four-stroke spark engine Field Day
genset gobbles 1-2 gallons per hour. OK, so since I'm in a really
generous mood tonite divide that by five to account for the scaling of
effieciencies for large diesels and you get how many gallons per hour
. . . ?
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
w3rv

2793. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 03:18:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <s2oz8.57927$QC1.4296869@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42062

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0204291852.3bd6e861@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Let's do some approximate numbers....
> >
> > Let's say they have a 2 megawatt backup diesel plant. Such a setup
might
> > consist of a single 3000 hp prime mover turning an alternator at 900
rpm.
> > Depending on the load, such a setup might use 1-2 gallons per hour
upwards.
> >
> . . ."upwards"? . .
> >
> >
> Hint: A 1000 watt (0.001 megawatt)four-stroke spark engine Field Day
> genset gobbles 1-2 gallons per hour. OK, so since I'm in a really
> generous mood tonite divide that by five to account for the scaling of
> effieciencies for large diesels and you get how many gallons per hour
> . . . ?
> >
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> w3rv

A 3khp diesel would probably take that to idle and spin field current to a
two MW plant. Diesels are good and idle cheap but they ain't that good.
Yes I know, the initial field current would more than likely come from the
batts that started Dr. Diesel's Wundermachin but they do need to be
recharged.

2794. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 04:05:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204292005.93ba862@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42063

"K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<wMly8.7630$8p3.583819@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote
>
> > If a new mode has sufficient merit to capture enough market
> > share in competition with the rest of the available choices the
> > results will be obvious.
>
> Are you suggesting that a "national park" for experimenters, consisting of
> perhaps 5% of the spectrum below 220MHz, is a poor use of our resources?
>
>
Just had to toss my old "national park" thing at me din ya Hans? You
got a LONG memory. Heh.
>
>
It's obvious as hell that the gist of those looking for "HF
experimental space" are talking wide modes. That's fine and per se I
don't have a problem with that because at least within the US the
Novice bands are dead space so who really cares who does what in those
spaces? Except the FCC who has to be able to ID the stuff, make
significant exceptions to the existing regs, etc. What incentive does
the FCC have to get into that endless rat's nest?
>
>
Beyond that there are two other major factors mitigating against any
such implementatations. First being that the few members of
"experimenter class" amongst us have had official blessing to do
"their wide things" in the vhf/uhf bands for eons and have have
produced absolutely zilch except great volumes of hot air and
"technical papers". What indications do you have that they would
actually do "their thing" on the HF bands which they have demonstrably
failed to do where they already have had the bandwidth for years??
>
>
Two, the avilablity of the Novice bands for refarming purposes at
least in this whacked-out USENET tower of babble in the current
timeframe gets down to a discussion abt whether or not to open up the
Novice bands to the hordes of 5wpm Extra Lite motormouths clamoring
for that space vs. more dead "experimental" space. Game over. Imsert
another quarter.
>
>
> Hell, we've got many times more than that reserved for FM repeaters so you

> can phone patch your wife to see if you should get bred (did I spell that
> right) on the way home from work!
>
>
. . . cute . .
>
>
The space sucked up by unused machines is an abomination that has to
go. So that the commercials can glom the top half of the 2M band of
course.
>
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
w3rv

2795. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 04:22:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204292022.1fb0efc1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42064

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message news:<3ccbf626_2@news7.fast.net>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020427235558.04364.00002307@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >
> > Brian:
> >
> > Not to worry; I would never "hock a loogie" on one of my passengers,
> > but I can nail a Telefon Pole with a wad of chewing gum at fiftah mile
> > an aour! (said with strong Sussex County, Delaware accent)
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> More supporting evidence for my last post ...
>
> Please give us a break and stop being so revoltingly graphic, Larry ...
>
> And, if I am ever unfortunate enough to have to visit Sussex County,
> DE, you can clean the gum off of my shoes at the county line as I
> leave ...
>
>
Done Sussex County in spades, your problem would not be the chewing
gum, your problem would be getting out alive Sweetums. Kent county is
the REAL trip though.
>
>
Last I heard Sussex County has the biggest brassiere factory in the
world, it ain't all bad.
>
>
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
>
w3rv

2796. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 04:24:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <a0pz8.930$Wd5.80138@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42065

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote

> Just had to toss my old "national park" thing at me din ya Hans? You
> got a LONG memory. Heh.

Hey, it's a good metaphor! If you hadn't made it up, I'da had to!

> What indications do you have that they would
> actually do "their thing" on the HF bands which they have demonstrably
> failed to do where they already have had the bandwidth for years??

No indications whatsoever, but I'd the eternal optimist. It just seems like such a great opportunity to kick-start something, that I just would never forgive myself for not trying.

But, hey, I'm starting to get a little bit pumped --- since I put my comments on the FCC web site last week, the tide has turned and there are several word-for-word copycats of my comments, plus another handful of variations on that same theme posted in opposition to the ARRL 'shuffle the boundary' petition. If nothing else, maybe I've delayed the decision so the ARRL can go back and do it right this time.

73, Hans, K0HB

2797. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 04:40:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204292040.2a8a34ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42066

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CCC87C2.E4150087@IEEE.org>...
> PACTOR III is here and runs on the existing SCS modems. It has a raw throughput
> of 3600 baud which is high enough for digitized voice with a speech compression/
> coding PC-based front end. PACTOR III is described at http://www.scs-ptc.com
>
> Is a 2.2 kHz wide digital signal allowed on HF?
>
>
If goofy old 6kHz wide double-sideband plus it's 20 over thud carrier
AM is allowable on the HF ham phone/image bands, which it certainly
is, common sense indicates that this Pactor III thingey gotta be
allowable. *IF* Big Brother can decode it.
>
>
Go for it, take it even up farther the band Cecil, get it the hell
away from me. Dit dit?
>
>
w3rv

2798. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 12:06:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204300406.4dfaaae6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42067

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<s2oz8.57927$QC1.4296869@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0204291852.3bd6e861@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > Let's do some approximate numbers....
> > >
> > > Let's say they have a 2 megawatt backup diesel plant. Such a setup
> might
> > > consist of a single 3000 hp prime mover turning an alternator at 900
> rpm.
> > > Depending on the load, such a setup might use 1-2 gallons per hour
> upwards.
> > >
> . . ."upwards"? . .

Yeah - 1-2 gallons per hour at minimum load, more depending on how
close to capacity it is loaded.

> > Hint: A 1000 watt (0.001 megawatt)four-stroke spark engine Field Day
> > genset gobbles 1-2 gallons per hour. OK, so since I'm in a really
> > generous mood tonite divide that by five to account for the scaling of
> > effieciencies for large diesels and you get how many gallons per hour
> > . . . ?

Little Otto-cycle engines are not very fuel-efficient. Big diesels
are.

The most efficient diesels I have encountered are large 2 stroke
marine engines used to direct-drive the screws. Thermal efficiency of
up to 54% at 75 rpm (not a typo). The cylinders are kinda big, tho.

> A 3khp diesel would probably take that to idle and spin field current to a
> two MW plant. Diesels are good and idle cheap but they ain't that good.
> Yes I know, the initial field current would more than likely come from the
> batts that started Dr. Diesel's Wundermachin but they do need to be
> recharged.

'zactly. The prime mover has some serious accessory loads such as
coolant, lube oil, fule transfer pumps, etc. A transmitter of a few kW
would amount to a tiny load compared to its capacity.

Main point is that it could take many months to go through the fuel
supply that was stipulated.

The real question is, how long would it run without attention before
something failed? Diesel RR freight locos are typically serviced at 90

day intervals to meet federal inspection requirements. In the old days when RRs let diesels idle continuously, this meant they were running for 90 days at a stretch, and most of that time was not at idle.

73 de Jim, "8th notch!" N2EY

2799. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 12:38:44 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204300438.793731fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42068

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<X4nz8.2464$8O2.173117491@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0204291755.58b691ce@posting.google.com...
>
> > Because: No more benefit will accrue ham radio taken as a whole than
> > it has where similar "new" modes have been allowed for eons above
> > 30Mhz. Where precisely nothing new has happened too. OR what's the
> > point to dedicating ham spectrum space just so that a few
> > "experimenters" MIGHT emulate what the commecials are already doing?
> > This is "advancement of the state of the art"??
>
> Is what we're doing now "advancement of the state of the art?"
>
>
Absolutely not. Note that the techies amongst us RRAP dwellers who are
proposing this "experimental subband" thing are dwelling here instead
of beavering away on the bench "advancing the state of the art". The
usual.
>
>
> Lets give Hans' plan a chance. It might actually amount to something,
> someday.
>
>
When was the last time the FCC dedicated HF spectrum space to
something anything which "might happen someday"??
>
>
w3rv

2800. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 12:55:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCE9433.59460EFD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42069

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> BTW would digial voice modes give us the ability to use DSP to
> filter out bowel and bladder reports?

You should be able to run some speech recognition software
and filter out the words that you don't like.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2801. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 13:02:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCE95FE.663DEC8C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42070

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Is a 2.2 kHz wide digital signal allowed on HF?
> >
> If goofy old 6kHz wide double-sideband plus it's 20 over thud carrier
> AM is allowable on the HF ham phone/image bands, which it certainly
> is, common sense indicates that this Pactor III thingey gotta be
> allowable. *IF* Big Brother can decode it.

PACTOR III is presently a purely digital mode and is 2.2 kHz wide.
Is a 2.2 kHz wide *digital* mode allowed in the phone/image bands
if it is not being used for phone or image? e.g. for sending a
text file?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2802. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 15:54:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CCEBE2B.C19E34A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42071

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020429214928.20703.00001230@mb-mw.aol.com...
> > In article <20020429065607.00704.00005058@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI)
> > writes:
> >
> > >My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)
> >
> > Yeah, I know somebody like that. Called me "jerk", "idiot", "anal
> retentive"
> > and a bunch of other names in this ng, just for pointing out some simple
> facts
> > and asking a few simple questions.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times. Besides, I don't see you
> asking these types of questions of your cronies.

You'd have to establish that Jim has cronies here. I really don't think
you find Jim's questions tedious. The tedium probably comes from your
inability to deliver a straight answer.

Dave K8MN

2803. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 16:00:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CCEBFA7.31751BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42072

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <aag08v$1c3t$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis
> Ferguson) writes:
>
> >If amateur experimentation with packet radio was a "failure" then I'd
> >suggest that if experimental failures like this would happen in amateur
> >radio every few years or so the service would be much better off in
> >terms of justifying its existance. In an experimental service even
> >things that don't work out can teach things of great value. The only
> >real "failure" is the failure to attempt anything new at all.

Ya mean like attempting to get a ham ticket?

> Good words. I suspect that the amateur radio community thinking
> won't allow that or "failure." Failure is taken as a "weakness" and
> no self-important radio amateur wants to be "weak" or wimpish.
> Everything new must be laid out for them, already developed, plus
> explanatory articles on the new stuff printed in QST to make it
> "official" for amateur radio use. What will immediately follow are
> ready-made, designed-by-others equipment which the amateurs
> can buy, install, and then brag about their operating on the cutting
> edge of technology...without knowing much about it except for some
> important buzzphrases used to impress others. :-)

The scenario needn't bother you, Len. You aren't a ham and aren't an
ARRL member. You are free to experiment to your heart's content. You'll
just not be able to do any communicating on the ham bands.

Dave K8MN

2804. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 16:02:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204300802.ea09ce4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42073

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<20nz8.2454$0j3.174775453@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020429214928.20703.00001230@mb-mw.aol.com...
> > In article <20020429065607.00704.00005058@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI)
> > writes:
> >
> > >My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)
> >
> > Yeah, I know somebody like that. Called me "jerk", "idiot", "anal
> retentive"
> > and a bunch of other names in this ng, just for pointing out some simple
> facts
> > and asking a few simple questions.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

I forgot "twit".

> Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times.

Only to folks who don't want to answer them. They're simple, straight,
direct questions, with simple, straight, direct answers. Like "what
mode did you use on 30 meters" or "what recent experience do you have
on 80 meters". You can't cheat an honest person.

Wading through numerous reposts of old stuff to get to a comment that
consists of "ROFLMAO" or "LOL" is tedious, too, but you don't see me
calling the author the names I was called.

> Besides, I don't see you
> asking these types of questions of your cronies.

I don't know who you mean. Is there some rule that says if I ask a
question of one person I must ask it of everyone?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2805. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 16:23:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ccec4f6_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 42074

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0204291852.3bd6e861@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Let's do some approximate numbers....
> >
> > Let's say they have a 2 megawatt backup diesel plant. Such a setup might
> > consist of a single 3000 hp prime mover turning an alternator at 900
rpm.
> > Depending on the load, such a setup might use 1-2 gallons per hour
upwards.
> >
> . . ."upwards"? . .
> >
> >
> Hint: A 1000 watt (0.001 megawatt)four-stroke spark engine Field Day
> genset gobbles 1-2 gallons per hour. OK, so since I'm in a really
> generous mood tonite divide that by five to account for the scaling of
> effieciencies for large diesels and you get how many gallons per hour
> . . . ?
> >
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> w3rv

Yes ... the 1-2 gal/hr for a 3000 hp diesel sounds VERY light to me.

The 50 hp Perkins 108 diesel on my 42 ft. cruising sailboat burned
about 0.75 gal/hr at 6-7 kt. cruise ...

Carl - wk3c

2806. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 18:04:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204301004.684d8108@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42075

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CCE95FE.663DEC8C@IEEE.org>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Is a 2.2 kHz wide digital signal allowed on HF?
> > >
> > If goofy old 6kHz wide double-sideband plus it's 20 over thud carrier
> > AM is allowable on the HF ham phone/image bands, which it certainly
> > is, common sense indicates that this Pactor III thingey gotta be
> > allowable. *IF* Big Brother can decode it.
>
> PACTOR III is presently a purely digital mode

"purely digital"? How? It's all a bunch of sine waves.

> and is 2.2 kHz wide.

That's at the highest data rate.

> Is a 2.2 kHz wide *digital* mode allowed in the phone/image bands
> if it is not being used for phone or image? e.g. for sending a
> text file?

The existing US (Part 97) rules are quite clear:

On the HF amateur bands, "RTTY", "data" and "CW" share one part of the bands and "phone" and "image" share the other part. PACTOR III is legal in the 'phone segments of the HF amateur bands ONLY if it's being used for voice or image.

To make matters worse, any RTTY or data mode used on the HF amateur bands
must not have a symbol rate greater than 300 bauds are not allowed on amateur HF at all.

So if you want to run PACTOR III beyond 300 bauds you have to do it in the 'phone bands and you have to use it only for voice or image. Yeah, "bits is bits" but the FCC doesn't see it that way. Yet.

This is one of the reasons for the "experimental farm" idea.

Will PACTOR III running digitized voice outperform SSB using the same bandwidth and power on HF? One way to find out....

Check out Part 97 - ARRL website is one source. Even a dyed-in-the-wool red-blooded All-American ARRL-supporting Morse-code-using mastered-the-Smith-Chart home-brewing pre-restructuring Yankee Extra non-genius like me figured out the

applicable rules in a few minutes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2807. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 18:56:44 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <MNBz8.2172$Wd5.207721@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42076

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Check out Part 97 - ARRL website is one source. Even a
> dyed-in-the-wool red-blooded All-American ARRL-supporting
> Morse-code-using mastered-the-Smith-Chart home-brewing
> pre-restructuring Yankee Extra non-genius like me figured out the
> applicable rules in a few minutes.
>

And your Mom is plumb proud of you too!

Now if we could only get those Connecticutt Yankees to see the light and
support our little attempt at radio agriculture.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2808. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 19:43:37 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <JtCz8.54698$Rw2.4380829@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42077

Brian:
>> Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times.
>> Besides, I don't see you asking these types of
>> questions of your cronies.

Dave, K8MN:
> You'd have to establish that Jim has cronies here.
> I really don't think you find Jim's questions
> tedious. The tedium probably comes from your
> inability to deliver a straight answer.

I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.

What was the question, again?

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2809. Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 20:03:02 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0204301203.2b0c83a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42078

WASHINGTON (AP) - Spurred by the many recent advancements in the Laser ionization technology field, the ITI Corporation (Ionization Technologies, Inc. - Fairfax, VA) has proven that it is now economically feasible to synthetically ionize specific areas of the ionosphere, opening up new many new reliable and low-cost telecommunications applications.

The best frequencies for utilizing this technology lie in the HF portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. While the HF portion of the frequency spectrum has long since been allocated to specific purposes; there are many HF frequencies which could be re-allocated to better serve the nation. The Federal Communication Commission(FCC) is considering re-allocating at least half of the Amateur Radio Service's current HF frequency spectrum to the newly proposed ISS(Ionization Skip Service), where it can better serve the public's telecommunications needs.

Stewart Robertson, President of ITI, says; "The older naturally-induced HF skip communication techniques essentially waste 99.9% of the HF bandwidth, and communications are generally of very poor quality, very unreliable, and end up causing wide-spread interference. Using the new synthetic ionization techniques, we can specifically direct RF energy over great distances, wherever we want it, anytime we want it. Communications are no longer predicated on Solar activity - we can now directly and safely control ionization levels in specific areas of the ionosphere, opening up all kinds of new possibilites in reliable long-range communications applications."

2810. Re: Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 20:28:00 UTC
From: wb0wao@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <18694-3CCEFE50-146@storefull-2157.public.lawson.webtv.net>
Source record: 42079

Ahhh, your a little late for April Fools OM

72 es oo

Dennis - WB0WAO

2811. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 21:12:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0204301312.2c536c9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42080

New Improved Version - almost ready to send.
--

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's)
RM-10413 Amateur Service Rules Governing)
Operating Privileges)
)

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF JAMES MICCOLIS, N2EY

OVERVIEW

These comments are in response to the ARRL proposal for "refarming" the existing HF "Novice sub-bands" on the 80, 40 and 15 meter bands.

I. Discussion:

The ARRL petition does not address the implementation of new technologies by radio amateurs as repeatedly requested by the Commission in WT Docket 98-143. It simply proposes the elimination of the Novice subbands and their reallocation to existing popular modes, primarily analog voice and image. The ARRL polling method did not address any spectrum allocation alternatives other than possible changes to the existing subband structure.

I propose that the Commission take this opportunity to provide the Amateur Radio Service with a new incentive to try out with new modes on the amateur HF bands for experimental and educational purposes.

Advances in technology, changes in the license structure and test requirements have eliminated the need for special HF subbands for Novice and Technician Plus licensees. The "Novice subbands" have outlived their regulatory purpose, so I propose they be converted to a new purpose which will ensure the future Amateur Radio service continues our "proven ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art".

II Proposal:

A. To "de-populate" the current Novice segments, I propose that all Novice (and Technician with code credit) licensees be authorized to use Morse code in all of the MF/HF spectrum now authorized for General class licensees, using the current power output level restriction of 200 watts.

B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be reallocated for non-traditional and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized image, high speed data, and other forward looking communications methods. Modes currently allowed in these segments would continue to be allowed without restriction.

C. I propose that Commission grant broad discretion to amateurs in the technical aspects of mode use in these subbands as to modulation and coding schemes, non-traditional technologies, and data/symbol rates. Specifically, the current limitations on occupied bandwidth and data/symbol rates would not apply to amateurs using experimental modes in these subbands, as long as the occupied bandwidth of the mode is entirely within the experimental subband. The encoding and modulations used would be documented according to current Commission rules. This "broad discretion" would only apply within the experimental subbands, in order to minimize interference.

Respectfully submitted,

James Miccolis, N2EY
136 Morningside Circle
Wayne, PA 19087

2812. Trollin' down the river.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 21:32:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <C3Ez8.28$GY2.2715@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42081

Horseshit7 <horseshit7@yahoo.com> wrote

From: horseshit7@yahoo.com (stewart)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction
Date: 30 Apr 2002 13:03:02 -0700
Organization: http://groups.google.com/
Lines: 27
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0204301203.2b0c83a0@posting.google.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 141.248.186.185
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Trace: posting.google.com 1020196983 16129 127.0.0.1 (30 Apr 2002 20:03:03
GMT)
X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: 30 Apr 2002 20:03:03 GMT

> WASHINGTON (AP) - Spurred by the many recent advancements in the Laser
> ionization technology field, the ITI Corporation (Ionization
> Technologies, Inc. - Fairfax, VA) has proven that it is now
> economically feasible to synthetically ionize ....

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
1.4.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious.
It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly
lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful
troll. Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the
premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their
hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform
the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2813. Re: Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 21:43:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <2eEz8.49$GY2.4177@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42082

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

> WASHINGTON (AP) - Spurred by the many recent advancements in the Laser
> ionization technology field, the ITI Corporation (Ionization
> Technologies, Inc. - Fairfax, VA) has proven that it is now
> economically feasible to synthetically ionize specific areas of the
> ionosphere, opening up new many new reliable and low-cost
> telecommunications applications.

Posted from:

General Atomics (NET-GASD)
10955 John Jay Hopkins Drive
San Diego, CA 92121
US

Netname: GASD
Netblock: 141.248.0.0 - 141.248.255.255

Coordinator:
Williams, Rob A. (RAW12-ARIN) [No mailbox]
213 257-3268

Domain System inverse mapping provided by:

NAMESERV.GAT.COM 141.248.128.2
GAK.GAT.COM 192.5.166.12

Record last updated on 24-Feb-1992.
Database last updated on 29-Apr-2002 20:00:55 EDT.

2814. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 23:03:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430190352.11987.00007014@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 42083

From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>Now if we could only get those Connecticutt Yankees to see the light and
>support our little attempt at radio agriculture.

The only Connecticut Yankee that you need to convince is K1KI...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2815. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 23:04:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430190446.11987.00007015@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 42084

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Yeah, I know somebody like that. Called me "jerk", "idiot", "anal retentive"
>and a bunch of other names in this ng, just for pointing out some simple
>facts
>and asking a few simple questions.

Seems to be more than enough "testy" to go around.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2816. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 23:05:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430190529.11987.00007016@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 42085

From: "K7JEB" k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net

>I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.

As am I.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2817. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 23:49:37 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <l4Gz8.4$964.1@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42086

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> The only Connecticut Yankee that you need to convince is K1KI...
>

If I can finger out a way to turn it into points for YCCC, then Tom will
sign up in a heartbeat. :-)

73, Hans, K0HB

2818. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-04-30 23:53:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <y7Gz8.6$964.1@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42087

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> The only Connecticut Yankee that you need to convince is K1KI...
>

Uh, that's your jurisdiction anyhow, Ed.

It's considered bad form to lobby outside your home division.

dit dit

de Hans, K0HB

2819. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 00:00:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCF3003.6CFDAEB1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42091

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

>
>
> But, hey, I'm starting to get a little bit pumped --- since I put my
> comments on the FCC web site last week, the tide has turned and there are
> several word-for-word copycats of my comments, plus another handful of
> variations on that same theme posted in opposition to the ARRL 'shuffle the
> boundary' petition. If nothing else, maybe I've delayed the decision so the
> ARRL can go back and do it right this time.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Maybe a likely outcome is that new experimental modes are
allowed wide bandwidth up to the entire subband, and that
old modes are afforded no protection, and maybe yield
the bandwidth when an experimenter wishes the use of
the bandwidth, excepting emergency communications.

2820. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 00:01:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0204301601.3b48179d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42088

>
> Yeah - 1-2 gallons per hour at minimum load, more depending on how
> close to capacity it is loaded.
>
>
There's a lot more "loading" on a 3Mw plant than just the electrical
load. And it ain't just the engine efficiency which has to be
considered wrt to fuel rates. Those big generators don't spin in
virtually frictionless rolling element bearings like yer skateboard
does. They run in tilting-pad hydrodynamic or sometimes hydrostatic
oil film bearings which in themselves as subsystems have horrendous
losses in the context of this thread. Merely supporting the shaft of a
3Mw class generator at zero electrical load costs beaucoup Kw worth of
fuel/hr alone. Ain't never gonna cost only 1-2 gallons/hr to spin one
of those suckers. No matter what the prime mover might be.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, "8th notch!" N2EY
>
>
Ya got me by one, I only got the Boy Scout Seven Year Camper patch.
>
>
w3rv

2821. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 00:07:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430200703.06141.00000277@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42090

In article <nX8z8.52361$Rw2.4140284@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>I keep thinking of Randolph Scott and Western Union laying telegraph lines
>across the great treeless praries where you had to bring in everything on
>wagons as the Onion Pacific had not yet been invented.

Yup. Not only bring it in but maintain it.

>The work trains
>are slick, the wagon-schtick is monumental.

Right up there with digging the RR tunnels with nitro and hand labor, the
Horseshoe Curve, the Brooklyn Bridge, and other achievements of that age.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2822. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 00:07:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430200704.06141.00000278@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42089

In article <MNBz8.2172$Wd5.207721@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>>
>> Check out Part 97 - ARRL website is one source. Even a
>> dyed-in-the-wool red-blooded All-American ARRL-supporting
>> Morse-code-using mastered-the-Smith-Chart home-brewing
>> pre-restructuring Yankee Extra non-genius like me figured out the
>> applicable rules in a few minutes.
>
>And your Mom is plumb proud of you too!

I sure hope so! Kinda hard to ask her, though.

>
>Now if we could only get those Connecticutt Yankees to see the light and
>support our little attempt at radio agriculture.

Most of those folks in Connecticut aren't Yankees. They're from all over.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2823. Re: Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 00:08:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCF3217.869F4178@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42092

Nice troll. The amount of energy required to ionize a portion
of the ionosphere would run up the electric bill so high it would
be cheaper to make a phone call or lease dedicated fibre for
that matter......

If somehow the amount of energy required was low enough,
hams could make their desired propagation if necessary
for some interesting DX......

If some company actually did this, hams could piggy back on
that ionized patch for some interesting off-peak DX....

2824. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 00:12:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCF32FF.2D0D6336@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42093

Sounds good, do it. I'd add something to the effect that
experimental modes have priority over legacy modes
except for emergency
traffic in the subbands.

N2EY wrote:

> New Improved Version - almost ready to send.
> --
>
> Before the
> Federal Communications Commission
> Washington, DC 20554
>
> In the Matter of)
>)
> Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's)
> RM-10413 Amateur Service Rules Governing)
> Operating Privileges)
>)
>
> PERSONAL COMMENTS OF JAMES MICCOLIS, N2EY
>
> OVERVIEW
>
> These comments are in response to the ARRL proposal for "refarming" the
> existing HF "Novice sub-bands" on the 80, 40 and 15 meter bands.
>
> I. Discussion:
>
> The ARRL petition does not address the implementation of new technologies by
> radio amateurs as repeatedly requested by the Commission in WT Docket 98-143.
> It simply proposes the elimination of the Novice subbands and their
> reallocation to existing popular modes, primarily analog voice and image.
> The ARRL polling method did not address any spectrum allocation alternatives
> other than possible changes to the existing subband structure.
>
> I propose that the Commission take this opportunity to provide the Amateur
> Radio Service with a new incentive to try out with new modes on the amateur
> HF bands for experimental and educational purposes.
>
> Advances in technology, changes in the license structure and test requirements
> have eliminated the need for special HF subbands for Novice and Technician Plus
> licensees. The "Novice subbands" have outlived their regulatory purpose, so I
> propose they be converted to a new purpose which will ensure the future Amateur

> Radio service continues our "proven ability to contribute to the advancement
> of the radio art".
>
> II Proposal:
>
> A. To "de-populate" the current Novice segments, I propose that all Novice (and
> Technician with code credit) licensees be authorized to use Morse code in
> all of the MF/HF spectrum now authorized for General class licensees, using
> the current power output level restriction of 200 watts.
>
> B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be reallocated for non-
> traditional and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized
> image, high speed data, and other forward looking communications methods.
> Modes currently allowed in these segments would continue to be allowed
> without restriction.
>
> C. I propose that Commission grant broad discretion to amateurs in the
> technical aspects of mode use in these subbands as to modulation and coding
> schemes, non-traditional technologies, and data/symbol rates. Specifically,
> the current limitations on occupied bandwidth and data/symbol rates would
> not apply to amateurs using experimental modes in these subbands, as long
> as the occupied bandwidth of the mode is entirely within the experimental
> subband. The encoding and modulations used would be documented according to
> current Commission rules. This "broad discretion" would only apply within
> the experimental subbands, in order to minimize interference.
>
> Respectfully submitted,
>
> James Miccolis, N2EY
> 136 Morningside Circle
> Wayne, PA 19087

2825. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 00:23:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCF3566.A6E94D42@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42095

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> 'zactly. The prime mover has some serious accessory loads such as
> coolant, lube oil, fule transfer pumps, etc. A transmitter of a few kW
> would amount to a tiny load compared to its capacity.
>
> Main point is that it could take many months to go through the fuel
> supply that was stipulated.
>
> The real question is, how long would it run without attention before
> something failed? Diesel RR freight locos are typically serviced at 90
> day intervals to meet federal inspection requirements. In the old days
> when RRs let diesels idle continuously, this meant they were running
> for 90 days at a stretch, and most of that time was not at idle.

Something else: Commercial power plants need human supervision
to keep running for more than several hours at least. If no operator
were on duty, the variations of load would either under or overload
the plant, causing automatic shutdowns. Presumably an oil refinery
would be a fairly constant load, but there probably are things like
thermostatically controlled electric heaters and stuff like streetlights
that vary according to the weather and time of day that could
make the total load wander out of the automatic shutdown
tolerance windows. And if there's a local town is also on line,
lightbulbs burning out and not getting replaced will lighten the
load over time, also pushing the system to shut down.

Movies tend to depict the electric and phone systems being
fully automatic and autominious, requiring no human supervision
other than collecting payment for electric and phone bills....

2826. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 00:25:19 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <PBGz8.50$%i4.5@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42094

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> Sounds good, do it. I'd add something to the effect that
> experimental modes have priority over legacy modes
> except for emergency
> traffic in the subbands.

How about "legacy modes can only be used in these sub-bands to coordinate
ongoing experiments in new modes"?

73, Hans, K0HB

2827. There's a challenger, CAM!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 00:39:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <HOGz8.101$%i4.2@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42096

RRAP Top 10 Users April 2002

[314] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 11.1%
[275] Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> 9.7%
[195] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 6.9%
[194] Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> 6.8%
[194] W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 6.8%
[170] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 6.0%
[158] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 5.6%
[144] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 5.1%
[122] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.3%
[97] Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com>

RRAP Top 10 Message Threads April 2002

[591] Novice Sub-band Refarming 20.85%
[371] A Tale of Two Magazines: QST vs S&T! 13.09%
[225] Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review! 7.94%
[166] Automobile Traffic Reporting among hams 5.86%
[163] Congratulations to KC0MUB 5.75%
[142] ARS License Numbers 5.01%
[95] What's It All About, Alfie? 3.35%
[91] FCC Amateur Technician Class 224 MHz Question... 3.21%
[75] Re-Positioning Amateur Radio 2.65%
[62] Birthplace of NTI 2.19%

2828. Re: Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 01:05:15 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0204301705.10fd1c53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42097

wb0wao@hotmail.com (Dennis Ponsness) wrote in message
news:<18694-3CCEFE50-146@storefull-2157.public.lawson.webtv.net>...
> Ahhh, your a little late for April Fools OM
>
> 72 es oo
>
> Dennis - WB0WAO

How about May Day?

2829. Re: Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 01:06:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020430210616.06878.00001546@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 42098

In article <5f4fe4c2.0204301203.2b0c83a0@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>Stewart Robertson, President of ITI, says; "The older
>naturally-induced HF skip communication techniques essentially waste
>99.9% of the HF bandwidth, and communications are generally of very
>poor quality, very unreliable, and end up causing wide-spread
>interference. Using the new synthetic ionization techniques, we can
>specifically direct RF energy over great distances, wherever we want
>it, anytime we want it. Communications are no longer predicated on
>Solar activity - we can now directly and safely control ionization
>levels in specific areas of the ionosphere, opening up all kinds of
>new possibilites in reliable long-range communications applications."

I've really got to get my Trollometer fixed. This didn't even register.

BTW -- I pronounce it "tro-lom-eter" as opposed to "troll-oh-meter."

73 de Larry, K3LT

2830. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 01:13:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430211356.20470.00001201@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 42152

In article <9f4bfe89.0204290358.399515a8@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:<3CCC87C2.E4150087@IEEE.org>...
>
>> Is a 2.2 kHz wide digital signal allowed on HF?
>
>It is my understanding that such a signal would be allowed on the
>amateur HF voice subbands. It would not be allowed outside those
>subbands, even if used for data.

It's my understanding that a proposal is just a proposal. There's no RM for it yet...yet the Radio Kops are making pronouncements.

Well, the 2.2 KHz kills any hope of modifying RM-9404...it was only 2.1 KHz wide for 136 KHz band. :-)

>Under the proposal for the "experimental farm" reallocation of the
>Novice subbands, it could be used in those subbands for voice, data,
>etc., at any desired data rate as long as the entire signal was inside
>the subband.

By all means, SEGREGATE those bands! Demand EM-ethnic purity! Make the experimenters ride way in the back of the bus! Keep "the bands" clear for the legacy modes!

You showem which side of the white bread is buttered, paleface. :-)

beep, beep

2831. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 01:13:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430211357.20470.00001202@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 42100

In article <aajbu021ohp@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Alrighty.... I have to ask the question..... Allegedly the ARRL supposedly
>is defending ham radio.... I would like to know how they are supposedly
>spending the money of it's members.
>
>Who is getting the money... are Congresspersons.... or Senators being
>bribed?

"Details upon request" is written down on several of the 26 pages of
the ARRL FY2000 tax return forms. Lobbying expenses are reported
as a bit over $90K.

The rationale possible from the ARRL is "that works out to only about
half a dollar per member, very cheap." :-)

[attention Ed, that's a freebie rationale for the League] :-)

2832. Re: Good Idea, Except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 01:13:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430211357.20470.00001203@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 42153

In article <20020429064227.26630.00000010@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Much of it, anyway. Look at the hit movies for the past few years and see how
>few of them are based on any sort of reality.

You mean...(!)...morse code will not save the world from alien invaders?!?!? [you are shattering illusions here, Jimmie]

>Even when a film is based on
>history, like "Titanic", it has to be jazzed up with a phony love story.

The sparkies on the Titanic weren't in love with morsemanship?!?

[illusions and delusions falling right and left!]

>Or, as
>in the case of "A Beautiful Mind", the nasty rough edges of the real story
>are glossed over to make the characters more likeable,

...and, in the memorable TV film version of "The French Atlantic Affair" of over 15 years ago, the heroes were a girl and boy who had 1x2 calls and were under twelve. "The French Atlantic Affair" was written by a ham and had at least one ham actor. [I think it got a review in QST or some ham publication way back when...picture of smirking female interviewer with author]

Well, it goes to show ya that any time you have hijacked ocean liners, hijacked airliners, iceberg-hitting ocean liners, firemen time traveling, aliens invading the earth, and worldwide apocalyptic catastrophy, good old morse cod will show its usefulness! [something fishy there]

beep, beep

2833. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 01:13:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430211358.20470.00001204@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 42099

In article <520A49981C43759F.A5371C7B0D9F3CDF.3D1396C70B7053E1@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 22:18:32 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
><bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
>>"Society for Uncreative Radio Anachronism" There's just something about
>>that that I don't like.
>
>But does it still have the belly dancers, mead, and coed topless
>wrestling?

The belly dancers are over 60, the mead is only 3.2, and the coed
topless wrestlers are all male... :-)

2834. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 01:13:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020430211359.20470.00001205@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 42151

In article <nX8z8.52361$Rw2.4140284@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>I keep thinking of Randolph Scott and Western Union laying telegraph lines
>across the great treeless praries where you had to bring in everything on
>wagons as the Onion Pacific had not yet been invented. The work trains
>are slick, the wagon-schtick is monumental.

You hang in there, old timer. Git yer eddycasion from da moom
pitchas.

Just think -
Drugs, sex, killing, swinging and CW in "The French Atlantic Affair."
[the book, not the movie]

Hopelessness, despair, and a dash of CW in "On The Beach."
[photographed in black and white...ham radio is primarily white]

Huge flying saucers, alien domination, and CW saving the
world in "Independence Day."
[I have to admit it had a black fresh prince as a jet jock but then
Data was hiding in Area 51 and the US president was also a
jet jock and Jeff Goldblum knows all about 'puters...]

Radio time travel and disturbed mentalities in "Frequency."
[Dennis Quaid's character must have been disturbed that his
"son" didn't look at all like him and that Benton Harbor products
are timeless...]

Flashing tail lights in morse save an about-to-be shot down
hijacked 747 in "Executive Decision."
[even Kurt Russell and Halle Berry have to work in potboilers
to make $$$]

Monumental special effects and monumental public relations
along with a sound-over byte of a morse sparky save James
Cameron in "Titanic."
[shows to go ya that morsemanship, however slight, can earn
an Oscar, kingdom of the world...and result in a divorce and
exile to syndicated TV series production]

All of that is so...so...AUTHENTIC! :-)

2835. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 02:09:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <97Iz8.55368$Rw2.4424806@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42154

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204300406.4dfaaae6@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<s2oz8.57927$QC1.4296869@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0204291852.3bd6e861@posting.google.com...
> > > >
> > > > Let's do some approximate numbers....
> > > >
> > > > Let's say they have a 2 megawatt backup diesel plant. Such a setup
> > might
> > > > consist of a single 3000 hp prime mover turning an alternator at
900
> > rpm.
> > > > Depending on the load, such a setup might use 1-2 gallons per hour
> > upwards.
> > > >
> > . . ."upwards"? . .
>
> Yeah - 1-2 gallons per hour at minimum load, more depending on how
> close to capacity it is loaded.
>
> > > Hint: A 1000 watt (0.001 megawatt)four-stroke spark engine Field Day
> > > genset gobbles 1-2 gallons per hour. OK, so since I'm in a really
> > > generous mood tonite divide that by five to account for the scaling
of
> > > effieciencies for large diesels and you get how many gallons per
hour
> > > . . . ?
>
> Little Otto-cycle engines are not very fuel-efficient. Big diesels
> are.
>
> The most efficient diesels I have encountered are large 2 stroke
> marine engines used to direct-drive the screws. Thermal efficiency of
> up to 54% at 75 rpm (not a typo). The cylinders are kinda big, tho.
>
> > A 3khp diesel would probably take that to idle and spin field current
to a
> > two MW plant. Diesels are good and idle cheap but they ain't that
good.
> > Yes I know, the initial field current would more than likely come from
the
> > batts that started Dr. Diesel's Wundermachin but they do need to be

> > recharged.
>
> 'zactly. The prime mover has some serious accessory loads such as
> coolant, lube oil, fule transfer pumps, etc. A transmitter of a few kW
> would amount to a tiny load compared to its capacity.
>
> Main point is that it could take many months to go through the fuel
> supply that was stipulated.
>
> The real question is, how long would it run without attention before
> something failed? Diesel RR freight locos are typically serviced at 90
> day intervals to meet federal inspection requirements. In the old days
> when RRs let diesels idle continuously, this meant they were running
> for 90 days at a stretch, and most of that time was not at idle.
>
> 73 de Jim, "8th notch!" N2EY

The only real constraint is lubrication; diesels are hell on lube oil from shearing. Beyond that the fuel feeding pumps run in what is in effect their own lubricant and coolant. Kind of like the Waterbury pump on a ship: you could damn near seal it in for the life of the vessel.

I can see why they let it idle, particularly in cold weather. Not only for the engine but for aux systems like air. You ain't never had fun like air brakes that have not had the moisture bled off on a cold winter's nite.

A local dairy had a dried milk plant using an old Ford V8-60 running on natural gas that ran continuously from the plant's construction in 1938 to tear-down in the 70s when dry milk could not turn a profit. They did have to do things like a dry sump oil system with two tanks to allow a running change and I would imagine plugs were interesting as well as breaker points.

2836. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 02:14:54 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <yclz8.55378$Rw2.4425549@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42155

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020430200703.06141.00000277@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <nX8z8.52361$Rw2.4140284@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >I keep thinking of Randolph Scott and Western Union laying telegraph
lines
> >across the great treeless praries where you had to bring in everything
on
> >wagons as the Onion Pacific had not yet been invented.
>
> Yup. Not only bring it in but maintain it.
>
> >The work trains
> >are slick, the wagon-schtick is monumental.
>
> Right up there with digging the RR tunnels with nitro and hand labor,
the
> Horseshoe Curve, the Brooklyn Bridge, and other achievements of that
age.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Don't have a clue how the various pyramids in the world were done but for sheer range and technical couth, it is really tough to beat Teddy's Canal.

2837. Re: Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 02:15:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205010214380.29336-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42156

On 1 May 2002, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>In article <5f4fe4c2.0204301203.2b0c83a0@posting.google.com>,
>horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:
>
>>Stewart Robertson, President of ITI, says; "The older
>>naturally-induced HF skip communication techniques essentially waste
>>99.9% of the HF bandwidth, and communications are generally of very
>>poor quality, very unreliable, and end up causing wide-spread
>>interference. Using the new synthetic ionization techniques, we can
>>specifically direct RF energy over great distances, wherever we want
>>it, anytime we want it. Communications are no longer predicated on
>>Solar activity - we can now directly and safely control ionization
>>levels in specific areas of the ionosphere, opening up all kinds of
>>new possibilites in reliable long-range communications applications."
>
>I've really got to get my Trollometer fixed. This didn't even register.

Just the mailbox address of the poster was enough to set mine off. However,
"troll" isn't really the correct word for him. SPAMMER is.

2838. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 02:52:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCF586D.68F9C047@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42157

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > PACTOR III is presently a purely digital mode
>
> "purely digital"? How? It's all a bunch of sine waves.

The information content is purely digital.

> Will PACTOR III running digitized voice outperform SSB using the same
> bandwidth and power on HF? One way to find out....

PACTOR III only transfers digital information. A voice would have to
be digitized/compressed/coded and then sent over PACTOR III. There are
a number of digitized voice compression techniques/specs available.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2839. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 03:04:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCDC7F9.697BF5DE@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42158

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3CCBFD0D.904CC667@townsqr.com...
> >
> > Dennis- thanks for the insight, you have explained some things that needed
> > explaining.
> > The only failure I found in packet radio on VHF (not HF) was the
> > narowmindedness of certain operators in that they abused the system to the
> > point that it was useless to everyone else.
>
> Pot calls kettle black ... Dick, you have some gall in calling ANYONE
> "narrowminded."
>

You, the most narrowminded SOB on the planet- the dingaling for whom if it
isn't from the very latest technology it's only useless, even suggesting anyone
else might be?????

Har-de har har!!!!!

>
> How did these operators "abuse the system?" Your previous reference
> was WRT message forwarding ... clearly a highly useful application.
>

So you're an eager proponent of SPAM, just like what we see on the net
daily. No surprise whatever, in fact just what we've learned to expect from you.

> > Carl seems to think that the answer
> > was for the handful of hams involved to fund some AT&T version of packet
> radio
> > that would have worked at Internet speeds.
>
> What I said was that the "system" stagnated at 1200 baud and didn't
> have enough capacity to provide an acceptable level of service to
> the large number of people who tried to use it ... that's just a fact and
> is indisuptable, except perhaps in Dick's fantasy world.
>
>
> The problem is that too many users of packet radio did not bother
> to become sufficiently technically knowledgable to be able to comprehend
> the nature of the problems, recognize that they could be simply and
> relatively economically solved to a very large degree, and see the benefit
> to all in doing so ... thus it didn't get done and packet pretty much died.
>

Ah, get with those generalities! Not a specific fact to be found! Amazing! When there are NO specifics to toss out, generalize your way onto the High Ground. Didn't work, Karl, we all know what the situation was. THAT wasn't it.

> > > I couldn't agree more that the only real failure is to fail to attempt
> > > anything new at all.
> >
> > Your continued protestations here that things modern and useful
> > (or even basic fundamentals of communications, such as Shannon)
> > are "irrelevant" to amateur radio show that your statement is less
> > than totally honest.
> >

You're such an one-demensional jerk you can't begin to comprehend anything about the overall state of ham radio or what is involved in making it go on a daily basis. If you were you'd know that it operates quite well with no mention of anyone named Shannon, and has for a hundred years. If Shannon was never again even considered that wouldn't change. Long ago that was analyzed here on rrap and the concensus from those who know is that Shannon is first mentioned in a university EE program in the third year. A long search through my personal library of ARRL publications found no mention whatever of that name through the latest handbook I had, and I finally found a couple pages on his theory in my copy of
Electrical Engineers Handbook, which was only a couple of years old. Do YOU own a copy of the Electrical Engineers handbook? I doubt it, you already know everything, why waste a copy?

> That doesn't HAVE to be true, Dick ... first, it's easier (and cheaper) than
> ever
> to "do advanced digital experimentation," with the availability of very
> inexpensive
> DSP development kits and FPGA development kits (hardward and software).
>
> The issue is NOT the availability of suitable hardware and software ... for
> a couple of hundred bucks you can set up to do your own DSP development
> and design and program custom ASICs using FPGAs ... in your ham shack lab
>

Who the hell are you to tell other hams what they should do with their hobby time? You happen to work in your favorite wallow, so that's what you want to do. Others are free do to likewise without you haranguing them nonstop. So stuff it back where it belongs.

>
> The ISSUE is that too many people (like you) haven't expended the effort
> to stay anywhere NEAR current with such technology and therefore can't
> even begin to envision what is possible and easily within reach ... if only
> one has the knowledge ...

The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit who thinks every other ham MUST be interested and involved in exactly the same thing you are. In other words, you are pretty stupid.

>

>
> Being so woefully lacking in relevant, useful knowledge (and it does NOT
> require an EE degree) is the biggest impediment

Yep, that's our boy...if it isn't what he's doing, it just ISN'T worth
mentioning, much less keeping. What a sad case he is.

>
> from, Dick ... unfortunately, there are lots of hams like you ... which
> bodes
> poorly for amateur radio.

Comes the day we have too many like you there will BE NO ham radio.

2840. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 03:05:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCDC89B.96FF32F1@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42159

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3CCC5498.C2BF9247@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > What you soon bump up against is the human factor. How
> > > fast can the fastest typist
> > > type? Why do we need 56k circuits for 60 word per minute
> > > typists? How many large
> > > databases can you generate and forward in any potential
> > > disaster?
> >
> > Well, if you had multiple people with laptops creating files
> > of traffic "off line", and only one ham packet station, you
> > wouldn't have a typist directly driving the computer/TNC/
> > transmitter, but one of those laptops piping stored files
> > over the air..... Of course this would
> > have to be set up in practice sessions before hand, etc.
>
> Bob,
>
> Something like what you describe is clearly beyond Dick's
> ability to comprehend ... he is stuck in the past in the "everything
> must be one on one and done manually ...

Carl, Kind Sir, I have some very bad news for you - in ham radio
almost every contact you make is one on one. Most of it is even done
manually.

Of course, we really don't expect you to actually know anything about
ham radio.

2841. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 03:05:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCDC9E5.F7C42545@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42160

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> While I'm not conceding that 33.6 is the limit on HF data rates,
> even that would be a SIGNIFICANT improvement over 300
> baud HF packet, right?
>

Uh-huh. When caught with your pants down around your knees
you try a quick
Cecilian Texas two-step. Right. We noticed.

2842. Re: Trollin' down the river.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 03:53:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aanp0k$qt3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42161

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:C3Ez8.28$GY2.2715@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> Horseshit7 <horseshit7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> From: horseshit7@yahoo.com (stewart)
> > WASHINGTON (AP) - Spurred by the many recent
> > advancements in the Laser
> > ionization technology field, the ITI Corporation (Ionization
> > Technologies, Inc. - Fairfax, VA) has proven that it is now
> > economically feasible to synthetically ionize ....
>
>
> The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
> they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
> 1.4.
>
> The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!
>
> It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious.
> It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly
> lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful
> troll. Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the
> premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their
> hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform
> the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

But what did the French judge say?

Cheers, :-)

Bill K2UNK

2843. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 04:04:18 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <809F969C68149A70.D9C5ABB8B234117E.8AF5B1CD0BD6B3E7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42162

On 01 May 2002 01:13:58 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <520A49981C43759F.A5371C7B0D9F3CDF.3D1396C70B7053E1@lp.airnews.net>,
>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:
>
>>On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 22:18:32 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
>><bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>>
>>>"Society for Uncreative Radio Anachronism" There's just something about
>>>that that I don't like.
>>
>>But does it still have the belly dancers, mead, and coed topless
>>wrestling?
>
>The belly dancers are over 60, the mead is only 3.2, and the coed
>topless wrestlers are all male... :-)

Well, we've found ways to fix that...but somehow it always comes down
to me wandering around with a flaming mug of Bacardi 151 and no clue
where my tent is...

...I can live with that.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2844. Re: The new DXer - Reach out and REALLY touch someone!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 04:23:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CCF6DA4.6CC374E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42163

K0HB wrote:

>
>
> Who says you'd necessarily be shaking their *_hand_*?
>

I can see it now, a new feature for those 1-900 numbers to
exploit........

2845. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 04:48:15 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <7DCF58EFB8D17341.6046EBBF468CB530.029639644D2F8521@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42164

On Fri, 19 Apr 2002 17:46:19 GMT, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
wrote:

>Because I envision these sub-bands to be a reservation for
>experimenters.

What could be more experimental than QLF? :)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2846. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 05:32:43 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CCF7DD8.27DCE834@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42165

Excuse me but I am not sure the poster, in spite of his
excellent pedigree, has it right. I think Morse CW is
allowed everywhere on amateur HF freq.s by the regs. It is
only by gentlemen's agreement that Morse CW does not appear
much in the phone segments.

I would like to see gentlemen's agreements control what goes
on in the refarmed novice slivers, not have the FCC get a
headache trying to rewrite the rules. Unless there is some
way to keep commission rules for the proposed "experimental
zones" very simple, I think they will opt for the easy way
out by extending phone edge down and rtty/data edge up.

73,
Clay N4AOX

N2EY wrote:
>

> The existing US (Part 97) rules are quite clear:
>
> On the HF amateur bands, "RTTY", "data" and "CW" share one part of the
> bands and "phone" and "image" share the other part. PACTOR III is
> legal in the 'phone segments of the HF amateur bands ONLY if it's
> being used for voice or image.
>
> To make matters worse, any RTTY or data mode used on the HF amateur
> bands
> must not have a symbol rate greater than 300 bauds are not allowed on
> amateur HF at all.
>
> So if you want to run PACTOR III beyond 300 bauds you have to do it in
> the 'phone bands and you have to use it only for voice or image. Yeah,
> "bits is bits" but the FCC doesn't see it that way. Yet.
>
> This is one of the reasons for the "experimental farm" idea.

2847. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 05:44:26 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <80B708D23DADC758.3FF42D573922C7FA.F4BEFC59E2E95778@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42166

On Wed, 24 Apr 2002 21:34:04 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>Keeping the Novice power limits in the new "phone" band is not lead, if I
>read here correctly, especially when the Novices are relocated and cannot
>use the old authorization anyway. Help me out if I got it wrong.

Ok, let's toss the whole licensing system and start over: Technicians
get all above 30MHz, Generals get everything, and Extras, who must
swear never to *ever* use any phone mode or a computer ever again, get
the right to bitch about 5WPM CW tests being too easy.

Preexisting Extras, of course, would be allowed to downgrade.

:)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2848. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 05:48:08 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <2B64CF4ACD9CE05C.3C812C268EE979F3.E7EB2A5E31506A03@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42167

On Sat, 20 Apr 2002 16:55:32 GMT, Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
wrote:

>28100 to 28500 KHz
>subbands. Perhaps there should be some restrictions on max.
>power, and using private encoding schemes, but nothing more.

Max power = 10X whatever the CBers are running outside their band at
any given time.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2849. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 05:57:02 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <ABDF0ADA35326E4B.B6A9AA24FD54E8F7.6EB604BFDD564A4E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42168

On Mon, 22 Apr 2002 18:26:42 GMT, "K0HB" <KAYZEROHB@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
wrote:

>Maybe the tide is turning! Since my earlier tally (above) there have been
>23 new comments at the FCC web site.

>Of those 13 opposed:

> 1 I didn't understand.

Obviusly, then, the FCC will pick this one, since it's already in
final form.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2850. We do already....It's called "HAARP"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 06:27:07 UTC
From: gleanersofthe20M <provgetlights@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <%ULz8.417$nY5.34283@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42169

Mabey he's posting for "May the 1st" ??

Actually they already have an "atmospheric
ionizer" - fully installed and operational...

It's called the HAARP...

GO HERE--> http://www.brojon.com/frontpage/bj1204.html

Other References:

http://www.brojon.org/frontpage/bj0202.html

http://www.geocities.com/brojongazette/frontpage/bj0201.html

http://www.geocities.com/brojongazette/frontpage/bj101901.html

"Dennis Ponsness" <wb0wao@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:18694-3CCEFE50-146@storefull-2157.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> Ahhh, your a little late for April Fools OM
>
> 72 es oo
>
> Dennis - WB0WAO
>
>

2851. Re: Trollin' down the river.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 06:32:39 UTC
From: gleanersofthe20M <provgetlights@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <b_Lz8.428$nY5.35571@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42170

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:aanp0k$qt3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> But what did the French judge say?
>
> Cheers, :-)
>
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
> "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
> news:C3Ez8.28$GY2.2715@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> >
> > The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
> > they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
> > 1.4.
> >
> > The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!
> >
> > It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious.
> > It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly
> > lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful
> > troll. Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the
> > premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their
> > hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform
> > the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!

Good points, and quite amusing also....but you may want to
look at this link:

http://www.brojon.com/frontpage/bj1204.html

(if anything, this guy would make a GREAT GUEST on the
Art Bell show or would pack-em-in as a speaker at the 2002
Hamvention! - He'd be more fun than gettin dissapointed at
all the computer junk I saw at past year's Dayton Hamvention.
Hope they have more radio "junk" this year than redundant PC
stuff, else I'm givin up on hamfests all together)

2852. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 09:23:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501052312.22551.00005759@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 42171

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Lobbying expenses are reported
>as a bit over $90K.
>
>The rationale possible from the ARRL is "that works out to only about
>half a dollar per member, very cheap." :-)

>[attention Ed, that's a freebie rationale for the League] :-)

I think that I will let your words speak for your views and let it go at that.
I don't think that ARRL needs any rationale for its lobbying efforts with
congress.

>"Details upon request" is written down on several of the 26 pages of
>the ARRL FY2000 tax return forms.

You can't be seriously suggesting that ARRL's tax returns be considered as a
good answer to his question.

I think my answer was a bit more useful to him than yours.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2853. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 09:29:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501052942.22551.00005761@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 42172

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Who the hell are you to tell other hams what they should do with their hobby
>time? You happen to work in your favorite wallow, so that's what you want to
>do. Others are free do to likewise without you haranguing them nonstop. So
stuff
>it back where it belongs.

But you must remain free to tell hams that they must do what YOU like to do
with ham radio -- learn and use Morse code, eh?

Is this another one of those double-standard things?

>The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit who thinks every other ham
>MUST be interested and involved in exactly the same thing you are. In other
>words, you are pretty stupid.

Yes, I guess it is.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2854. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 10:21:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205010221.2e875c97@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42173

>
>
> Yes ... the 1-2 gal/hr for a 3000 hp diesel sounds VERY light to me.
>
> The 50 hp Perkins 108 diesel on my 42 ft. cruising sailboat burned
> about 0.75 gal/hr at 6-7 kt. cruise ...
>
>
Sweet little engines and they were designed back in the stone age. My only encounter with one of 'em was when I skippered a chartered Columbia out of Rock Hall for a couple elderly $$buddies and did the Annapolis-Inner Harbor three-day weekend circuit for 'em. The WX was fershtink most of the time and the traffic was heavy so I spent a lot of the trip with the rags on the deck and running under power. Which is my "natural mode" anyway. Got back to the dock and refueled the thing - it only took 12 gallons. Dayum!
>
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
>
w3rv

2855. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 10:59:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501065939.16837.00006398@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 42174

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>Unless there is some
>way to keep commission rules for the proposed "experimental
>zones" very simple, I think they will opt for the easy way
>out by extending phone edge down and rtty/data edge up.

They could also stipulate that the sub-band is a free-for all, with no restrictions as to mode or bandwidth. Doesn't get more simple than: "These are your band edges. This is your power limit. Stay within them."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2856. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 11:01:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501070114.16837.00006399@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 42175

From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>> The only Connecticut Yankee that you need to convince is K1KI...

>Uh, that's your jurisdiction anyhow, Ed.

My proposal to Tom was not very different from yours. The only major
difference is that I had proposed a "free for all," irrespective of mode.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2857. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 11:15:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501071557.26630.00000084@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 42178

In article <3CCF586D.68F9C047@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> > PACTOR III is presently a purely digital mode
>>
>> "purely digital"? How? It's all a bunch of sine waves.
>
>The information content is purely digital.

And the signal itself is purely analog.
>
>> Will PACTOR III running digitized voice outperform SSB using the same
>> bandwidth and power on HF? One way to find out....
>
>PACTOR III only transfers digital information. A voice would have to
>be digitized/compressed/coded and then sent over PACTOR III. There are
>a number of digitized voice compression techniques/specs available.

Of course - and trying out various schemes would be part of the fun of using
"PacVoice".

But under current rules ya gotta do it in the 'phone subbands if ya wanna try
it on the HF ham bands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2858. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 11:15:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501071557.26630.00000083@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 42179

In article <3CCF7DD8.27DCE834@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
<wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Excuse me but I am not sure the poster, in spite of his
>excellent pedigree, has it right. I think Morse CW is
>allowed everywhere on amateur HF freq.s by the regs. It is
>only by gentlemen's agreement that Morse CW does not appear
>much in the phone segments.

(Ed McMahon mode on):

"YOU ARE CORRECT, SIR!!"

(Ed McMahon voice off)

CW is indeed allowed almost everywhere on the ham bands (two exceptions being
the Alaska emergency frequency and the 219 MHz allocation). Upon rereading I
can see where my post would tend to convey the impression that CW is not
allowed in the 'phone bands because RTTY and data modes are not allowed there.

Sorry for the confusion.
>
>I would like to see gentlemen's agreements control what goes
>on in the refarmed novice slivers, not have the FCC get a
>headache trying to rewrite the rules. Unless there is some
>way to keep commission rules for the proposed "experimental
>zones" very simple, I think they will opt for the easy way
>out by extending phone edge down and rtty/data edge up.

My rewritten proposal is shorter than the original, and involves just two basic
points:

1) allow Novices and Techs to use CW on all General frequencies, 200 W power.
2) remove the bandwidth and symbol rate restrictions in the former Novice bands

to encourage the use of new modes.

That's really all there is to it. As long as a mode meets the other applicable
FCC regs such as using a published encoding/modulation scheme, it would be
allowed in those subbands.

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>
>> The existing US (Part 97) rules are quite clear:
>>
>> On the HF amateur bands, "RTTY", "data" and "CW" share one part of the
>> bands and "phone" and "image" share the other part. PACTOR III is

>> legal in the 'phone segments of the HF amateur bands ONLY if it's
>> being used for voice or image.

This part would be much more clear if it was written like this:

On the HF amateur bands, "CW" is allowed practically everywhere.
"RTTY", "data" and "CW" share one part of the bands and "phone", "image" and
"CW" share the other part. By gentleman's agreement, however, "CW" is
rarely used in the phone/image parts of the bands.

>> PACTOR III is
>> legal in the 'phone segments of the HF amateur bands ONLY if it's
>> being used for voice or image.
>>
>> To make matters worse, any RTTY or data mode used on the HF amateur
>> bands
>> must not have a symbol rate greater than 300 bauds
>> are not allowed on
>> amateur HF at all.

Rewrite this as:

To make matters worse, any RTTY or data mode used on the HF amateur
bands must not have a symbol rate greater than 300 bauds. Faster RTTY/data
modes are not allowed on amateur HF at all, regardless of subband used or
actual bandwidth occupied by the mode.

You can run 60 wpm Baudot RTTY with 850 Hz shift (actually, the shift can be
anything less than 1000 Hz) but if you come up with a version of PSK31 or one
of the TOR modes that runs faster than 300 you're not allowed to use it on
amateur HF in the USA.

Thanks for the pointers, Clay.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2859. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 11:15:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501071558.26630.00000085@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 42176

In article <PBGz8.50$%i4.5@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote
>
>> Sounds good, do it. I'd add something to the effect that
>> experimental modes have priority over legacy modes
>> except for emergency
>> traffic in the subbands.
>
>How about "legacy modes can only be used in these sub-bands to coordinate
>ongoing experiments in new modes"?
>
Folks,

I see your point, but such things are not necessary as part of the regulations. We don't have a rule that says CW must stay out of the 'phone bands except when needed because SSB won't get through. But that's pretty much what goes on, by gentleman's agreement.

Simple changes have the best chance.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2860. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 11:15:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501071558.26630.00000086@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 42177

In article <ycIz8.55378$Rw2.4425549@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Don't have a clue how the various pyramids in the world were done but for
>sheer range and technical couth, it is really tough to beat Teddy's Canal.

There's an old joke in these parts that has the civil engineering student
asking " how did they build the pyramids without state-of-the-art construction
equipment?" Professor replies "they had state-of-the-art whips, that's how..."

The French spent an enormous amount of time, money and lives in Panama before
giving up on a sea-level canal. The American success was built on two great
advances - control of disease by controlling insects that spread it and a
design that used the abundant rainfall to power a system of locks rather than
trying to just dig an enormous ditch.

Then there's Hoover Dam....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2861. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 12:23:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCFDC8A.6E08B678@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42180

N2EY wrote:

> New Improved Version - almost ready to send.
> --

There's basically only one problem I have with all this, aside from agreeing completely with W3RV's analysis. That is- It concerns me when we ask for specific spectrum for experimentation that we open ourselves to the unintended consequence of all other amateur spectrum being thus routinely, over time, becoming considered as NON experimental.

I Can hear it now-

"Testing, one two three." "Hey, ya lid, take your testing to the *experimental* band segment!!!".

I wonder if it isn't a mistake to even go there.

W0EX

2862. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 12:53:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205010453.67d107cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42181

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<97Iz8.55368$Rw2.4424806@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...

> The only real constraint is lubrication; diesels are hell on lube oil from
> shearing. Beyond that the fuel feeding pumps run in what is in effect
> their own lubricant and coolant. Kind of like the Waterbury pump on a
> ship: you could damn near seal it in for the life of the vessel.

Shall we have a rousing rendition of MacAndrews' Hymn, then, me bucko?

Typical EMD locos have lube oil capacity of 250 gallons or so. And
they have a large sump option.

EMD 2-stroke locos idle at about 4 gallons per hour, driving all the
accessories (air compressor, battery charging, lights, etc.) So my
figure of 1-2 GPH is probably an order of magnitude low.
>
> I can see why they let it idle, particularly in cold weather. Not only
> for the engine but for aux systems like air. You ain't never had fun like
> air brakes that have not had the moisture bled off on a cold winter's
> nite.

AMEN! Plus the batteries and other systems. Most importantly, until
recently diesel locos did not use antifreeze in the coolant.

Newer locos are shut down in above-freezing weather nowadays. Improved
designs are easier to restart. Many locos are now equipped with a
small auxiliary engine so that the prime mover can be shut down, even
in cold weather. The auxiliary keeps the battery and air charged and
the coolant above freezing temperature, at a cost of 1/2 to 1 GPH.
Also reduces wear on the prime mover.
Kim HotStart is one such system.

The ultimate surface transportation solution is the electrified
railroad, as demonstrated today in Europe and Japan, and for almost
100 years by the LIRR, PRR and others.

So let's say our hypothetical 2 megawatt diesel plant is burning 10
GPH running the derelict transmitter and some other loads. If
connected to a 100,000 gallon tank, it could run for 10,000 hours -
over a year. Load variations are not that uch of a problem because the
diesel has a governor to keep its speed constant. Line voltage might
wander a bit if automatic compensation was not employed.
>
> A local dairy had a dried milk plant using an old Ford V8-60 running on
> natural gas that ran continuously from the plant's construction in 1938 to
> tear-down in the 70s when dry milk could not turn a profit. They did have

> to do things like a dry sump oil system with two tanks to allow a running
> change and I would imagine plugs were interesting as well as breaker
> points.

Natural gas burns much cleaner than gasoline or diesel. Lube oil and
spark plug contamination are much lower. But the breaker points?

--

For a surreal example of environmentalism romancing smokestack
industry, search on "biodiesel" at your favorite search engine. Only
real problem with biodiesel is the high cost of the raw veggie oil,
which the BD folks get around by using old oil from the deep fryers of
restaurants. Such oil is usually a pain in the neck to get rid of. The
exhaust smells like french fries but that's not bad thing.

However, it is my understanding that the oil uses by McDs is so loaded
with additives that it cannot be used for biodiesel purposes. Gums up
everything. Add that info to W3RV's sauce story. Moral: Eat at the
real greasy spoons, not the imitations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2863. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 13:10:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCFE91A.1C23A13C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42182

N2EY wrote:

>
> For a surreal example of environmentalism romancing smokestack
> industry, search on "biodiesel" at your favorite search engine. Only
> real problem with biodiesel is the high cost of the raw veggie oil,
> which the BD folks get around by using old oil from the deep fryers of
> restaurants. Such oil is usually a pain in the neck to get rid of. The
> exhaust smells like french fries but that's not bad thing.
>
> However, it is my understanding that the oil uses by McDs is so loaded
> with additives that it cannot be used for biodiesel purposes. Gums up
> everything.

When I was a kid I knew an OT (a ham of course) who used to dispose of his used engine oil by letting it set for a few days to settle
out the heavy stuff, then he'd pour it off into his fuel oil tank for the household oil furnace. Diluted with a couple hundred gallons of
fuel oil, the furnace never knew the difference. (He was also in the heating and air conditioning business.)

2864. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 13:51:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCFF2C6.70F282EE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42183

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If you were you'd know that it operates quite well with no mention
> of anyone named Shannon, and has for a hundred years.

Dick, if you want to be a button-pushing copy cat with your head buried in the sands of time, that's your right. But some of us seek to gain knowledge of how and why ham radio works and how we can introduce some progress into the hobby, you know the kind of things hams did before incentive licensing caused you to rest on your laurels.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2865. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 13:58:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCFF46C.5E94F0A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42184

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit who thinks every other ham
> MUST be interested and involved in exactly the same thing you are.

Dick, aren't you describing your exact attitude about Morse code testing?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2866. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 14:04:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CCFF609.3DE2986@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42185

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >The information content is purely digital.
>
> And the signal itself is purely analog.

Of course, that goes without saying. It's a necessary characteristic of narrow band RF signals. Third, fifth, seventh, etc harmonics tend to get lost in space.

> But under current rules ya gotta do it in the 'phone subbands if ya wanna try
> it on the HF ham bands.

But is PACTOR III legal in the phone subbands if it does not contain voice or image information? PACTOR III, as it is being offered, does not contain voice or image information. As it is being presently offered, it is a keyboard mode. Is PACTOR III legal in the USA?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2867. Re: Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 14:29:55 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205010629.69b5127d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42186

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.44.0205010214380.29336-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>...
> >
> >I've really got to get my Trollometer fixed. This didn't even register.
>
> Just the mailbox address of the poster was enough to set mine off. However,
> "troll" isn't really the correct word for him. SPAMMER is.

Ah, yes. Thanks for reminding me...

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN/

MURS (Multi-Use Radio Service) is a fairly new no-license VHF personal
radio service which operates on 151.820, 151.880, 151.940, 154.570,
and 154.600 MHz with a maximum ERP (Effective Radiated Power) of 2
watts. The FCC MURS rules permit voice, data, and image communication;
as well as external antennas. Unlike the Amateur Service, there are no
restrictions on business activities with MURS, and the 2W ERP limit
works as a major benefit for building a nationwide Internet-backboned
public-access wireless network. Any low-power VHF business radio
capable of meeting the newer FCC-mandated 7.5Khz channel spacing and
11.25Khz bandwidth limitations(most manufacturers refer to this as
12.5Khz channel spacing), can be used on the MURS frequencies; this
includes most handheld business radios built after 1995.

... also, a modified VX5 could also meet all the MURS regs(except the
"type accepted" one).

...BTW, if you substitute "Internet Gateway" for "Synthetically
Ionized Region of the Ionosphere", things work out about the same...
except for Alaska and a few parts of Montana, Wyoming, and Alaska ;^)

2868. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 14:30:01 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <JZSz8.295$6T5.40619@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42187

> So let's say our hypothetical 2 megawatt diesel plant is burning 10
> GPH running the derelict transmitter and some other loads. If
> connected to a 100,000 gallon tank, it could run for 10,000 hours -
> over a year. Load variations are not that uch of a problem because the
> diesel has a governor to keep its speed constant. Line voltage might
> wander a bit if automatic compensation was not employed.

The whole scenario goes out the window (past the shade and the
coke bottle) if you hypothesize that the diesel engine driving
the generator could tap into the refinery's product. It would
take quite a while to run through several, 10-million-gallon
tanks of diesel fuel. Then it does become a lubricant- and
coolant-limited problem.

What was the time frame of 'On the Beach' anyway? I'm left
with the impression it was only months' duration - perhaps
a couple of years on the outside. After seeing that movie,
'Waltzing Matilda', no matter how spritingly played, always
sounds like a funeral dirge to me.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2869. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 15:34:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3cd00afc_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 42188

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCDC7F9.697BF5DE@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3CCBFD0D.904CC667@townsqr.com...
> > >
> > > Dennis- thanks for the insight, you have explained some things that
needed
> > > explaining.
> > > The only failure I found in packet radio on VHF (not HF) was the
> > > narowmindedness of certain operators in that they abused the system to
the
> > > point that it was useless to everyone else.
> >
> > Pot calls kettle black ... Dick, you have some gall in calling ANYONE
> > "narrowminded."
> >
>
> You, the most narrowminded SOB on the planet- the dingaling for whom if
it
> isn't from the very latest technology it's only useless, even suggesting
anyone
> else might be?????

Dick,

I have never said that "if it isnt' from the very latest technology it's
only useless".

What I *have* said is that we, as amateurs collectively, had better start
adopting
new technology as the FCC has strongly suggested, because clinging virtually
exclusively to stuff that's 50+ years old just isn't going to cut it, either
in terms of
attracting newcomers in the future, or in terms of satisfying the FCC that
we are
truly living up to 97.1 ..

> Har-de har har!!!!!

"Laughing" like the village idiot doing a pirate impression doesn't increase
your
(pitifully low) credibility ...

> > How did these operators "abuse the system?" Your previous reference
> > was WRT message forwarding ... clearly a highly useful application.
>
> So you're an eager proponent of SPAM, just like what we see on the net
> daily. No surprise whatever, in fact just what we've learned to expect
from you.

Where did is say THAT??? What I said was that message forwarding is/was
"clearly a highoy useful application" ... your idea seems to be (again) that
"if
it's not manual, it's no good" ...

Again, how do you think you receive these posts? And your e-mail?
It's done by message forwarding (automatic) between computers.

Are you suggesting that all that should be tossed in the trash and abandoned
because some (spamers) abuse the system? Are you not aware that there
are increasingly intelligent software solutions to SPAM?

Why is the backward way ALWAYS your prefered way, Dick???

[snipped Dick's attempt at denial of the stagnation of packet radio]

[Dick conveniently didn't copy the portion where he asserted that "advanced
digital expermentation" is "beyond the capabilities" of hams ....]

> > That doesn't HAVE to be true, Dick ... first, it's easier (and cheaper)
than
> > ever
> > to "do advanced digital experimentation," with the availability of very
> > inexpensive
> > DSP development kits and FPGA development kits (hardward and software).
> >
> > The issue is NOT the availability of suitable hardware and software ...
for
> > a couple of hundred bucks you can set up to do your own DSP development
> > and design and program custom ASICs using FPGAs ... in your ham shack
lab
> >
>
> Who the hell are you to tell other hams what they should do with their
hobby
> time? You happen to work in your favorite wallow, so that's what you want
to do.
> Others are free do to likewise without you haranguing them nonstop. So
stuff it
> back where it belongs.

Dick ... YOU are the one who is telling everybody that they "can't possibly"
do "advanced digital experimentation" "because it's beyond their
capabilities."

I am merely pointing out that that is NOT TRUE and encouraging those who
are interested to ignore your ignorant pronouncements and have fun advancing

the radio art despite your protestations.

> > The ISSUE is that too many people (like you) haven't expended the effort
> > to stay anywhere NEAR current with such technology and therefore can't
> > even begin to envision what is possible and easily within reach ... if
only
> > one has the knowledge ...
>
> The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit who thinks every other
ham
> MUST be interested and involved in exactly the same thing you are. In
other
> words, you are pretty stupid.

No, Dick ... I don't think (or say) that *everyone* "must" be interested or involved ... I merely try to counter your backward-thinking attempts to disuade ANYONE from doing so ...

One has to conclude that your constant attempts to convince everyone that "What we have is good enough." and "You can't possibly participate in advanced digital experiments because it's beyond your capabilities." must be a reflection of your own inability to understand advanced technology and its value/utility, resulting need to attempt to pull everyone down to your own level so you won't have to face your own inadequacies.

Carl - wk3c

2870. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 16:09:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <erUz8.1097$8S5.273@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42189

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote

> What I *have* said is that we, as amateurs collectively, had better start
> adopting new technology as the FCC has strongly suggested, because
> clinging virtually exclusively to stuff that's 50+ years old just isn't
going
> to cut it, either in terms of attracting newcomers in the future, or in
terms
> of satisfying the FCC that we are truly living up to 97.1 ..

"Virtually exclusively"? Carl, I think you grossly overstate your case!

While the majority of hams are content to use modes and methods
pioneered decades ago, there is a significant (and I think growing)
minority who are not.

While the amateur community may not include hundreds of bona fide
inventors, we are blessed with hosts of tinkerers and innovators who,
seeing some new gimmick or technology say "Aha, I know what practical
use I could make of that".

I concede we will not be able to base our "technical worth" to society
on our bleeding edge inventiveness (and we never have) but rather on
our proven ability to reduce new and exotic technologies to practical
and cost effective applications which can be adopted by other industries.
Art Collins and his cohorts didn't invent SSB, but they sure proved it as
a practical HF application and revolutionized long distance voice
communications for a generation.

AMSAT and their counterparts didn't invent satellites, but they proved
the value of low cost LEO technology and a new industry now has
sprung up based on that amateur "tinkering", and not coincidentally
we had to fight a mini-battle to keep them from gobbling up the very
spectrum space we used to prove-in the concept.

We didn't invent packet switching, but we figured out low cost ways
of transplanting it from copper to RF. Many mobile data services can
thank us for "proving the concept".

WA4APR and friends didn't invent GPS, but they deduced a cheap
way to marry that technology with packet radio to come up with APRS.
That tinkering now founds a new capability in use by public service
agencies, so the local sheriff need no longer yell "Car 54, where
are you?, and the copy-cat commercial service "AVL" which helps
shippers locate their trucks on our vast highway system to within
a couple of meters.

In those examples lies the seed we need to nurture for our future
contributions to the state of the radio art, and as an added bonus,
out of that mass of "tinkerers" will also certainly step a small number
of bonafide "inventors" and scientists.

73, de Hans, K0HB

~~~
A rock pile ceases to be a rock pile the moment a single man
contemplates it, bearing within him the image of a cathedral.
-- Antoine de Saint-Exupery
~~~

2871. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 16:31:06 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <eLUz8.535$6T5.65479@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42190

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020501071558.26630.00000086@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <ycIz8.55378$Rw2.4425549@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Don't have a clue how the various pyramids in the world were done but
for
> >sheer range and technical couth, it is really tough to beat Teddy's
Canal.
>
> There's an old joke in these parts that has the civil engineering
student
> asking " how did they build the pyramids without state-of-the-art
construction
> equipment?" Professor replies "they had state-of-the-art whips, that's
how..."
>
> The French spent an enormous amount of time, money and lives in Panama
before
> giving up on a sea-level canal. The American success was built on two
great
> advances - control of disease by controlling insects that spread it and
a
> design that used the abundant rainfall to power a system of locks rather
than
> trying to just dig an enormous ditch.
>
> Then there's Hoover Dam....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Some years ago, Nelson's Needle in Trafalgar Square needed a major masonary renewal and the statue needed cleaning badly. Now this had to be put up somewhere after the Napoleonic Battle of Trafalgar and all of the buildings there now were there then. No one had a clue how the statue was put up there to begin with let alone how to get it down so the USAF and a big cargo helicopter did the deed coming and going.

It is incredible how much lore has been forgotten over the years not to mention dirty tricks and trade secrets. A lot of work in the older parts of town has uncovered everything from unknown cable car tracks, cisterns for horses, and other dross none of which was recorded anywhere and Omaha only dates from 1854. If we ever have time travel and really grok the Egyptian pyramids which are rather small change by world standards I suspect an awful lot of civil engineers will ring out with 'Oh, Shit' and

a few labor foremen will wonder what the fuss is about. Remember the first time you put brushes in a generator?

One of the more interesting theories on the Pyramids is that it was a giant make-work project for people during the Nile floods and the rest of the year for the scribes and surveyors needed to determine land allotments after the flood ended. Having worked in an entire corporation of scribes and surveyors I can testify they get surly when unemployed.

Dick N&#65533;BK

2872. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 16:36:11 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%PUz8.544$6T5.67528@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42191

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0205010453.67d107cc@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<97Iz8.55368$Rw2.4424806@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
>
> > The only real constraint is lubrication; diesels are hell on lube oil
from
> > shearing. Beyond that the fuel feeding pumps run in what is in effect
> > their own lubricant and coolant. Kind of like the Waterbury pump on a
> > ship: you could damn near seal it in for the life of the vessel.
>
> Shall we have a rousing rendition of MacAndrews' Hymn, then, me bucko?
>
> Typical EMD locos have lube oil capacity of 250 gallons or so. And
> they have a large sump option.
>
> EMD 2-stroke locos idle at about 4 gallons per hour, driving all the
> accessories (air compressor, battery charging, lights, etc.) So my
> figure of 1-2 GPH is probably an order of magnitude low.
> >
> > I can see why they let it idle, particularly in cold weather. Not
only
> > for the engine but for aux systems like air. You ain't never had fun
like
> > air brakes that have not had the moisture bled off on a cold winter's
> > nite.
>
> AMEN! Plus the batteries and other systems. Most importantly, until
> recently diesel locos did not use antifreeze in the coolant.
>
> Newer locos are shut down in above-freezing weather nowadays. Improved
> designs are easier to restart. Many locos are now equipped with a
> small auxiliary engine so that the prime mover can be shut down, even
> in cold weather. The auxiliary keeps the battery and air charged and
> the coolant above freezing temperature, at a cost of 1/2 to 1 GPH.
> Also reduces wear on the prime mover.
> Kim HotStart is one such system.
>
> The ultimate surface transportation solution is the electrified
> railroad, as demonstrated today in Europe and Japan, and for almost
> 100 years by the LIRR, PRR and others.
>
> So let's say our hypothetical 2 megawatt diesel plant is burning 10
> GPH running the derelict transmitter and some other loads. If

> connected to a 100,000 gallon tank, it could run for 10,000 hours -
> over a year. Load variations are not that uch of a problem because the
> diesel has a governor to keep its speed constant. Line voltage might
> wander a bit if automatic compensation was not employed.
> >
> > A local dairy had a dried milk plant using an old Ford V8-60 running
on
> > natural gas that ran continuously from the plant's construction in
1938 to
> > tear-down in the 70s when dry milk could not turn a profit. They did
have
> > to do things like a dry sump oil system with two tanks to allow a
running
> > change and I would imagine plugs were interesting as well as breaker
> > points.
>
> Natural gas burns much cleaner than gasoline or diesel. Lube oil and
> spark plug contamination are much lower. But the breaker points?
>
> --
>
> For a surreal example of environmentalism romancing smokestack
> industry, search on "biodiesel" at your favorite search engine. Only
> real problem with biodiesel is the high cost of the raw veggie oil,
> which the BD folks get around by using old oil from the deep fryers of
> restaurants. Such oil is usually a pain in the neck to get rid of. The
> exhaust smells like french fries but that's not bad thing.
>
> However, it is my understanding that the oil uses by McDs is so loaded
> with additives that it cannot be used for biodiesel purposes. Gums up
> everything. Add that info to W3RV's sauce story. Moral: Eat at the
> real greasy spoons, not the imitations.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

And never eat at a place called Mom's.

Kind of reminds me of the soybean license plates from WW2. Great idea
unless you owned a goat.

Sherman tanks had a pony engine but Abrams do not. So rather than start a
600+ hp turbine whilst dug into a sand dune, the crews discovered a way to
keep warm in a desert nite. But their requistion for 10k body bags caused
a hell of a stir.

Dick

2873. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 16:46:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205010846.18c150c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42192

Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of April 30, 2002:

Novice - 38,584 (decrease of 10,745)
Tech - 239,555 (increase of 34,161)
Tech Plus - 80,301 (decrease of 48,559)
General - 139,022 (increase of 26,345)
Advanced - 85,691 (decrease of 14,091)
Extra - 100,244 (increase of 21,494)
Total - 683,397 (increase of 8,605)

The number of Extras topped 100,000 on April 23, 2002.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2874. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 17:01:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205010901.36fce9a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42193

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<aajbu021ohp@enews2.newsguy.com>...
> Alrighty.... I have to ask the question..... Allegedly the ARRL supposedly
> is defending ham radio....

That's one thing the ARRL does. There are lots of other things.

> I would like to know how they are supposedly
> spending the money of it's members.

Fair question. Annual report is available to all members.
>
> Who is getting the money... are Congresspersons.... or Senators being
> bribed?

Nope. At least, I have seen no evidence of such.

> Obviously there is a certain about of their revenues that go to the
> manufacture of the magazine and the services around that, as they do sell
> ads also so the magazine is not a total drain on the budget. And obviously
> there is from what I see, people recieving salaries too.... I guess I will
> have to pursue a salary from our local radio club, it is non-profit too. (I
> spend at least 20 hours per week doing various work related to the club.)

I don't have a report handy, but here are some things the money goes
for:

- QST and other mailings members get for free (contest forms, for
example)
- Other services to members and nonmembers
- Salaries, benefits and expenses of ARRL employees
- Expenses of directors, vice directors and other unpaid staff
- Public relations activities (handouts, press releases, etc.)
- W1AW station operation
- Operation of Hq. complex, including everything from salt for the
front steps to buying products to be tested in the lab)
- Field organization
- Defense of amateur radio at all levels of government and industry
>
> If I can get the clear answers, which I do not have a right to being a
> non-ARRL member, but some of you are, as to where the money is going, I will
> send a money order out the next day I get the answers, for the membership.

It is money well spent, Ryan.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2875. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 17:30:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205010930.535cb419@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42194

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CCFF609.3DE2986@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

> > But under current rules ya gotta do it in the 'phone subbands if ya wanna try
> > it on the HF ham bands.
>
> But is PACTOR III legal in the phone subbands if it does not contain voice
> or image information?

I've answered that question about three times already, Cecil. It's
also in Part 97.

The answer is NO. PACTOR III is not legal in the amateur HF phone
subbands if it does not contain voice or image information. None of
the RTTY/data modes are legal in the HF amateur phone subbands.

> PACTOR III, as it is being offered, does not contain
> voice or image information.

Which means if you externally digitize the voice or image, you can use
it in the phone subbands for digitized voice or image. But ONLY for
digitized voice or image.

> As it is being presently offered, it is a
> keyboard mode. Is PACTOR III legal in the USA?

As a "keyboard mode" (Part 97 does not use that term) PACTOR III is
only legal in the US amateur HF bands if:

1) it is used in the non-phone subbands
2) it is used at speedlevel 1 (SLV 1) with the tones set not more than
1000 Hz apart.

Did you read the applicable parts of Part 97 yet, Cecil? The answers
are all there.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2876. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 17:43:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD02938.87197EE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42195

N2EY wrote:
> Did you read the applicable parts of Part 97 yet, Cecil? The answers
> are all there.

Part 97 has changed since my 1989 copy of it so I don't know what parts
are still valid. That's why I'm asking. Here's what SCS sez about PACTOR III.

"PACTOR-III is an offer from SCS to "the world". We cannot say where
inhabitants of countries are allowed to use it or not. I'm sure this
question gets clarification in every country as time goes by.
73, Martin, DL1ZAM, SCS-PACTOR-Team"

--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2877. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 17:57:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501135719.21592.00000949@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 42196

In article <20020501052312.22551.00005759@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>Lobbying expenses are reported as a bit over $90K.
>>
>>The rationale possible from the ARRL is "that works out to only about
>>half a dollar per member, very cheap." :-)
>
>>[attention Ed, that's a freebie rationale for the League] :-)
>
>I think that I will let your words speak for your views and let it go at
>that.
>I don't think that ARRL needs any rationale for its lobbying efforts with
>congress.

There's NO indication on WHERE $90K+ is spent. Is it to "congress?"

More likely it is activities concerned with the FCC, not congress.

It seems unfortunate that details aren't or won't be forthcoming.
Lobbying for the membership is a very valid exercise of influence,
no harm in that. The "it's none yer business" sort of answer on
what the league does is not a good one.

The ARRL is very influential on amateur radio matters, has been
so for decades. That still doesn't justify a minority with a major
influence as being somehow more noble an effort regardless of
the expenditure.

>>"Details upon request" is written down on several of the 26 pages of
>>the ARRL FY2000 tax return forms.
>
>You can't be seriously suggesting that ARRL's tax returns be considered as a
>good answer to his question.

Is this another of those "it's none yer business" answers?

>I think my answer was a bit more useful to him than yours.

Is it? You presented no justification other than a gross generality
which is more of a rationalization than anything.

[Counselor Troi senses pique and aggravation...red alert!]

2878. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 17:57:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501135721.21592.00000950@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 42197

In article <erUz8.1097$8S5.273@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote
>
>> What I *have* said is that we, as amateurs collectively, had better start
>> adopting new technology as the FCC has strongly suggested, because
>> clinging virtually exclusively to stuff that's 50+ years old just isn't going
>> to cut it, either in terms of attracting newcomers in the future, or in terms
>> of satisfying the FCC that we are truly living up to 97.1 ..
>
>"Virtually exclusively"? Carl, I think you grossly overstate your case!

Hans, you are grossly over-reacting.

>While the majority of hams are content to use modes and methods
>pioneered decades ago, there is a significant (and I think growing)
>minority who are not.

While this newsgroup's content is composed mainly of a very tiny slice of all licensed radio amateurs, it is nonethess a sampling.

An observation of that sampling indicates a strong propensity to extremely conservative practices and procedures overlaid with rather gross ignorance of the state of the radio art in general, if there is any evidence of knowledge of radio arts at all beyond the marketing phrases in magazine advertisements.

>While the amateur community may not include hundreds of bona fide
>*inventors*, we are blessed with hosts of tinkerers and innovators who,
>seeing some new gimmick or technology say "Aha, I know what practical
>use I could make of that".

Which is unfortunately counterbalanced by a group of self-promoting patriots claiming to be members of some sort of mythical "service" doing great and valuable things for the country.

>I concede we will not be able to base our "technical worth" to society
>on our bleeding edge inventiveness (and we never have) but rather on
>our proven ability to reduce new and exotic technologies to practical
>and cost effective applications which can be adopted by other industries.

A problem is a lack of public relations to the radio-electronics industry of such "practical and cost effective applications."

>Art Collins and his cohorts didn't invent SSB, but they sure proved it as
>a practical HF application and revolutionized long distance voice
>communications for a generation.

...which would not have happened so soon without Collins Radio
having a development contract for SAC communications equipment.

>AMSAT and their counterparts didn't invent satellites, but they proved
>the value of low cost LEO technology and a new industry now has
>sprung up based on that amateur "tinkering", and not coincidentally
>we had to fight a mini-battle to keep them from gobbling up the very
>spectrum space we used to prove-in the concept.

That is a gross exaggeration which defiles the entire space
communications industry.

The "mini-battle" for the last Low-Earth Orbit satellite communications
spectral bandspace was NOT fought entirely by the ARRL and
AMSAT. The majority of the commentors on public view at the FCC
Reading Room are the corporations and services already directly
involved in space communications that affect more citizens than just
radio amateurs.

>We didn't invent packet switching, but we figured out low cost ways
>of transplanting it from copper to RF. Many mobile data services can
>thank us for "proving the concept".

Flag-waving with just a flagpole. The "low-cost ways" can be ascribed
to the miniaturization of integrated circuitry (microprocessor as a
common example). Time-division multiplexing necessary for packet
switching systems was already beginning in HF data (teleprinter)
communications in the 50s. Think ALOHA as having more influence
on "packet switching" to the industry.

>WA4APR and friends didn't invent GPS, but they deduced a cheap
>way to marry that technology with packet radio to come up with APRS.

A good innovation but impossible without either GPSS or GLONASS.
GPSS started with NAVSTAR, a USN program with strong looking-in
by the USAF and US Army.

>That tinkering now founds a new capability in use by public service
>agencies, so the local sheriff need no longer yell "Car 54, where
>are you?, and the copy-cat commercial service "AVL" which helps
>shippers locate their trucks on our vast highway system to within
>a couple of meters.

As a former member of the Position Location Engineering group at
RCA Electromagnetic and Aviation Systems, Van Nuys, CA, in
the 1970s, I have to state that your summation is GROSS
exaggeration. Several electronics corporations were already in
development of vehicle location systems using many different
concepts in the 1970s when NAVSTAR was first being test flown.
This included position reporting back to a central dispatch point

by radio data in several different parts of the EM spectrum.

Neither the GPSS nor GLONASS systems are intuitive, easy-to-read-directly navigation systems but require dedicated micro-controllers to translate satellite signals to human-readable values. Those have been available for slightly over a decade to consumers as well as vehicle operators. It is hardly an innovation to take available position data and communicate that to a central dispatch point. That was already in systems goals when NAVSTAR was proving successful. See the adaptation already planned for the US Army TACFIRE and the all-service inclusion as part of JTIDS in the late 1970s, early 1980s. See also the US military's use of GPSS in various forms during the Gulf War of 1990-1991, a decade ago.

The same technology base of reduced chip-count ICs that enables $40 microcontroller-driven lawn sprinkler controls enables a $250 portable GPS receiver with LCD readout that includes a simple map display. Radio data transfer was already an accomplished task in many radio services a half century ago, before the GPSS was made possible for all to use.

Investigate Terion Corporation and their new grant of HF frequencies for reporting vehicle positions...just made possible by the FCC.

>In those examples lies the seed we need to nurture for our future
>contributions to the state of the radio art, and as an added bonus,
>out of that mass of "tinkerers" will also certainly step a small number
>of bonafide "inventors" and scientists.

Of course, no doubt aided by the regressive thinking that emphasizes the very first communications mode skill as "so necessary" for all radio amateurs to achieve for licensing.

Support Your Local Legacy Mode Sheriff!

2879. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 18:10:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501141049.14735.00001225@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 42198

In article <%PUz8.544$6T5.67528@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Sherman tanks had a pony engine but Abrams do not. So rather than start a
>600+ hp turbine whilst dug into a sand dune, the crews discovered a way to
>keep warm in a desert nite. But their requistion for 10k body bags caused
>a hell of a stir.

Is this another Kipling story from an armor veteran who "was there?!?"

Tell us all about your experiences at Fort Irwin, old trooper.

2880. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 18:10:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501141049.14735.00001224@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 42199

In article <9f4bfe89.0205010901.36fce9a7@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>> If I can get the clear answers, which I do not have a right to being a
>> non-ARRL member, but some of you are, as to where the money is going, I will
>> send a money order out the next day I get the answers, for the membership.
>
>It is money well spent, Ryan.

Total revenue, FY2000, Part 1, Line 12 = $11,625,723.

Roughly $68 per member...

2881. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 18:32:29 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <1xWz8.2265$nY5.109431@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42200

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> ...which would not have happened so soon without Collins Radio
> having a development contract for SAC communications equipment.
>

Which would not have happened so soon, had not CINCSAC not been Amateur
Radio operator K0GRL, General Curtis E. LeMay, and a close friend of W0CXX,
Art Collins.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2882. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 18:35:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aapcnf$40a$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42101

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020501141049.14735.00001224@mb-fr.aol.com...
> In article <9f4bfe89.0205010901.36fce9a7@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >> If I can get the clear answers, which I do not have a right to being a
> >> non-ARRL member, but some of you are, as to where the money is going, I
will
> >> send a money order out the next day I get the answers, for the
membership.
> >
> >It is money well spent, Ryan.
>
> Total revenue, FY2000, Part 1, Line 12 = $11,625,723.
>
> Roughly $68 per member...

I too agree it is well spent. I have no problem with
ARRL direction (in general). I disagree on one
specific issue (which is why I became a founding
member and am on the BOD of No Code Int'l).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2883. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 18:42:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aapd4lcbo1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42102

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020501052942.22551.00005761@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Who the hell are you to tell other hams what they should
> >do with their hobby time? You happen to work in your
> >favorite wallow, so that's what you want to do. Others are
> >free do to likewise without you haranguing them nonstop. So
> >stuff it back where it belongs.

Did I miss a post or two?

Ed, have you started haranging hams?

> But you must remain free to tell hams that
> they must do what YOU like to do
> with ham radio -- learn and use Morse code, eh?
> Is this another one of those double-standard things?

Sure looks that way.

> >The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit

What great logic, what style, what class...I gotta
remember this great debating technique that Dick
seems to always return to.

> > ...who thinks every other ham
> >MUST be interested and involved in exactly
> >the same thing you are. In other
> >words, you are pretty stupid.

What great logic, what style, what class...I gotta
remember this great debating technique that Dick
seems to always return to.

With comments like that, Dick would lose an argument
with a mirror.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2884. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 19:03:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aapehk$3uh$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42103

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020501065939.16837.00006398@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Unless there is some
> >way to keep commission rules for the proposed "experimental
> >zones" very simple, I think they will opt for the easy way
> >out by extending phone edge down and rtty/data edge up.
>
> They could also stipulate that the sub-band is a free-for all, with no
> restrictions as to mode or bandwidth. Doesn't get more simple than: "These
are
> your band edges. This is your power limit. Stay within them."

Now that's the essense of simplicity. The good thing,
no, the GREAT thing, is that the "experimental zone"
would then be totally encapsulated within the larger
ham bands.

What say Jim, Hans, Carl, et al?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2885. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 19:42:05 UTC
From: Paul S <psorense32@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <hyXz8.2429$nY5.117546@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42104

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020501135719.21592.00000949@mb-fa.aol.com...

> There's NO indication on WHERE $90K+ is spent. Is it to "congress?"
> More likely it is activities concerned with the FCC, not congress.

What's worse, their a 501C3 Tax Exempt Corporation. Not bad for
a publishing company wrapped in ivy covered brick walls...

> It seems unfortunate that details aren't or won't be forthcoming.
> Lobbying for the membership is a very valid exercise of influence,
> no harm in that. The "it's none yer business" sort of answer on
> what the league does is not a good one.

That is the exact reason why I dropped ARRL membership in 1982
and have no regrets whatsoever about doing the same. I've heard
the "it's none of your business" in a roundabout way, from League
Officials at the dozen or so hamfests I go to. They will never see
one red cent of my money, even if it meant the end of ham radio
and the farming out of all the ham bands to commercial interests
by the FCC, which has been happening from 220 mHz and up.
R.H. may have cleaned up HF, especially 75 meters, but in 10 years
ham radio Spectrum will "top-out" at 440 mHz.

2886. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 20:38:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501163855.06459.00001060@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 42105

In article <1xWz8.2265$nY5.109431@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

-- from part of a reply concerning amateur SSB --

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> ...which would not have happened so soon without Collins Radio
>> having a development contract for SAC communications equipment.
>
>Which would not have happened so soon, had not CINCSAC not been Amateur
>Radio operator K0GRL, General Curtis E. LeMay, and a close friend of W0CXX,
>Art Collins.

"CINCSAC?!?" The USAF didn't come out of the USN, mister chief.

Neither you nor I will know of the possible alternative futures at any given time. Please do not use such a self-defining statement to "prove" any point. It does NOT prove your point.

Single Sideband existed first in landline telephony, as part of frequency-multiplexed multiple circuits on one pair of wires. That was dubbed "carrier" equipment by those involved with the hardware. That was before 1930.

The "carrier" equipment was itself carried on Single Sideband radio frequencies after 1930. The Dutch were the pioneers in that. [see the "Collins SSB book" by two who were at Collins Radio, chapter 1] Commercial and military SSB was typically 12 KHz bandwidth, carrying 4 voice-grade circuits simultaneously.

SINGLE CHANNEL SSB didn't become practical on HF until after WW2 when quartz crystal and general frequency control technology could permit easy tuning to within about 100 Hz of any specific frequency in HF. Single-channel SSB on HF is now a standard long-distance communications mode in maritime radio, commercial or private.

Back-room bargaining and buddyism gets one contracts. It does absolutely nothing for electrons and EM waves despite the titles and ascribed importance of the partners in rooms. Trying to equate cronyism, nepotism (of a kind), and under-the-table dealings with the government to "advances in amateur radio" is not a quality item.

Good luck on THAT one, mister chief...

2887. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 20:59:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <qGYz8.2586$nY5.126397@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42106

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> >> ...which would not have happened so soon without Collins Radio
> >> having a development contract for SAC communications equipment.

In the same format, I commented:

> >Which would not have happened so soon, had not CINCSAC been Amateur
> >Radio operator K0GRL, General Curtis E. LeMay, and a close friend of
W0CXX,
> >Art Collins.
>
> "CINCSAC?!?" The USAF didn't come out of the USN, mister chief.

Who mentioned the Navy, Old Soldier? General LeMay was in the Air Force,
and his title was CINCSAC. (But you already knew that!)

> Neither you nor I will know of the possible alternative futures at
> any given time. Please do not use such a self-defining statement
> to "prove" any point.

Proves my point just as well as your own statement of the same construct
your point, Old Organ Grinder.

Good luck on this one now, and don't grind your organ so fast -- it's hard
on your heart.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2888. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 23:07:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501190700.26630.00000096@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 42107

In article <3CD02938.87197EE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Did you read the applicable parts of Part 97 yet, Cecil? The answers
>> are all there.
>
>Part 97 has changed since my 1989 copy of it so I don't know what parts
>are still valid. That's why I'm asking.

As I have pointed out already in an earlier response in this thread, Part 97 is available online at several websites. ARRL is the one I use. FCC and several others have it too.

But I think you know that.

> Here's what SCS sez about PACTOR III.
>
>"PACTOR-III is an offer from SCS to "the world". We cannot say where
>inhabitants of countries are allowed to use it or not. I'm sure this
>question gets clarification in every country as time goes by.
>73, Martin, DL1ZAM, SCS-PACTOR-Team"

Simple boilerplate disclaimer so they don't get complaints.

Say, where did all these primroses come from?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2889. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 23:07:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020501190700.26630.00000095@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 42108

In article <aapehk$3uh$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020501065939.16837.00006398@mb-fx.aol.com...
>> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>>
>> >Unless there is some
>> >way to keep commission rules for the proposed "experimental
>> >zones" very simple, I think they will opt for the easy way
>> >out by extending phone edge down and rtty/data edge up.
>>
>> They could also stipulate that the sub-band is a free-for all, with no
>> restrictions as to mode or bandwidth. Doesn't get more simple than: "These
>are
>> your band edges. This is your power limit. Stay within them."
>
>Now that's the essense of simplicity.

Yup. But such a ruling would guarantee the band would be full of analog voice
signals pretty quick. Such a feature is essentially the same as the ARRL
proposal. If there are no restrictions on mode or bandwidth, some folks may
have a hankering to try out hi-fi AM or wide-deviation FM. Since such modes are
nontraditional in ham radio, they could say they were experimenting.

>The good thing,
>no, the GREAT thing, is that the "experimental zone"
>would then be totally encapsulated within the larger
>ham bands.

Both Hans' and my proposals already include that feature.

One of the reasons the Novice bands are in the middle of the bands was to
encapsulate them. Which was kinda dumb because the real problem in the
early-mid Novice days was harmonics. Crystal control pretty much avoided the
bandedge problem. It would have made more sense to have had the Novice bands be
harmonically related to each other so that the same xtal could have been used
on more than one band.
>
>What say Jim, Hans, Carl, et al?
>
I say all that's needed is the following:

- Give Novices and Tech Pluses use of CW, 200 watts, on all frequencies where
Generals can operate.
- Remove the existing bandwidth and data/symbol rate restrictions on RTTY/data

modes from the former Novice bands ONLY. Digitized voice and image would be allowed in these subbands, too.
- New modes would need to be documented in the same way as before (post a description on a website and send the FCC an email. No STA required. Have fun!

Things like power limits, APC, allowing old modes only for the use of coordinating new ones, etc., just gum up the works.

73 de Jim, N2EY
-

2890. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-01 23:24:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205011524.2ece525@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42109

> > What indications do you have that they would
> > actually do "their thing" on the HF bands which they have demonstrably
> > failed to do where they already have had the bandwidth for years??
>
> No indications whatsoever, but I'd the eternal optimist. It just seems like
> such a great opportunity to kick-start something, that I just would never
> forgive myself for not trying.
>
> But, hey, I'm starting to get a little bit pumped --- since I put my
> comments on the FCC web site last week, the tide has turned and there are
> several word-for-word copycats of my comments, plus another handful of
> variations on that same theme posted in opposition to the ARRL 'shuffle the
> boundary' petition. If nothing else, maybe I've delayed the decision so the
> ARRL can go back and do it right this time.
>
>
I thought you were actaually serious abt this Novice-to-Digigeek farm
Hans. I got trolled agn. Being an annoyance for the sake of being an
annoyance is OK, maybe I'll copy-paste yer stuff over into my own
comments and add to the aggravation level.
>
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
>
w3rv

2891. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 00:11:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD08410.96ED177C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42110

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Who the hell are you to tell other hams what they should do with their hobby
> >time? You happen to work in your favorite wallow, so that's what you want to
> >do. Others are free do to likewise without you haranguing them nonstop. So
> stuff
> >it back where it belongs.
>
> But you must remain free to tell hams that they must do what YOU like to do
> with ham radio -- learn and use Morse code, eh?
>
> Is this another one of those double-standard things?
>
> >The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit who thinks every other ham
> >MUST be interested and involved in exactly the same thing you are. In other
> >words, you are pretty stupid.
>
> Yes, I guess it is.

That's right- YOU GUESS, and as usual, you guess wrong! There's a huge difference in the minds of most of those who have one that is in any way open between believing that a fully qualified ham radio operator should be able to use the most basic radio mode, and Carl insisting that anyone who sees any communications value in CW has no interest whatever in anything more modern.
That is the essense of this scuffle.

2892. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 00:47:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <p00A8.66$ce4.10599@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42111

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote

> I thought you were actaually serious abt this Novice-to-Digigeek farm
> Hans.

I am completely serious! I had some reservations as to whether FCC would buy into my idea, but I get more encouraged that the idea seems to be gaining traction and supporting comments from a wide variety of other amateurs. Maybe, just maybe, this is an idea right for the times. Whatever happens, the comments have discredited the shabby ARRL effort to present the FCC with a 'concensus'.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2893. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 01:18:45 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <Vt0A8.532$vT1.40436@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42112

Jim, N2EY, posted:

> Yup. But such a ruling would guarantee the band
> would be full of analog voice signals pretty quick.
> Such a feature is essentially the same as the ARRL
> proposal. If there are no restrictions on mode or
> bandwidth, some folks may have a hankering to try
> out hi-fi AM or wide-deviation FM. Since such modes
> are nontraditional in ham radio, they could say
> they were experimenting.

Damn! I was going to try to be the first guy in
Arizona to ragchew about lumbago and bowel movements
in CD-quality stereo using DRM encoding (only 9.6 kHz
of pure noise - there'd be room for a couple more
similar QSO's in the 'refarmed' allocations).

Oh, well!

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

--

Jim Bromley
Analog One LLC
3236 E. Chandler Blvd. Suite 2010
Phoenix, AZ 85048
phones - direct: 623-848-8711 mobile: 602-363-8634
E-Mail: jbromley@analogone.com

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020501190700.26630.00000095@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <aapehk$3uh$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020501065939.16837.00006398@mb-fx.aol.com...
> >> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
> >>
> >> >Unless there is some
> >> >way to keep commission rules for the proposed "experimental
> >> >zones" very simple, I think they will opt for the easy way
> >> >out by extending phone edge down and rtty/data edge up.
> >>
> >> They could also stipulate that the sub-band is a free-for all, with no
> >> restrictions as to mode or bandwidth. Doesn't get more simple than: "These

> >are
> >> your band edges. This is your power limit. Stay within them."
> >
> >Now that's the essense of simplicity.
>
> Yup. But such a ruling would guarantee the band would be full of analog voice
> signals pretty quick. Such a feature is essentially the same as the ARRL
> proposal. If there are no restrictions on mode or bandwidth, some folks may
> have a hankering to try out hi-fi AM or wide-deviation FM. Since such modes are
> nontraditional in ham radio, they could say they were experimenting.
>
> >The good thing,
> >no, the GREAT thing, is that the "experimental zone"
> >would then be totally encapsulated within the larger
> >ham bands.
>
> Both Hans' and my proposals already include that feature.
>
> One of the reasons the Novice bands are in the middle of the bands was to
> encapsulate them. Which was kinda dumb because the real problem in the
> early-mid Novice days was harmonics. Crystal control pretty much avoided the
> bandedge problem. It would have made more sense to have had the Novice bands be
> harmonically related to each other so that the same xtal could have been used
> on more than one band.
> >
> >What say Jim, Hans, Carl, et al?
> >
> I say all that's needed is the following:
>
> - Give Novices and Tech Pluses use of CW, 200 watts, on all frequencies where
> Generals can operate.
> - Remove the existing bandwidth and data/symbol rate restrictions on RTTY/data
> modes from the former Novice bands ONLY. Digitized voice and image would be
> allowed in these subbands, too.
> - New modes would need to be documented in the same way as before (post a
> description on a website and send the FCC an email. No STA required. Have fun!
>
> Things like power limits, APC, allowing old modes only for the use of
> coordinating new ones, etc., just gum up the works.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> -
>

2894. I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 02:56:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <eV1A8.309$ce4.32147@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42113

Took the Smoker out on the lake this evening to blow the winterizing fogging oil out of the motor. The rig felt like a thoroughbred horse which had been stabled all winter, and just wanted to run and run and run. What a joy to cruise down the lake making long graceful S-curves under the stars at three-quarter throttle!

Amateur radio .... fugetabowdit till winter.

K0HB
--
"If people concentrated on the really important
things of life, there'd be a shortage of fishing rods."

2895. QST cover art

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 03:02:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CD0AC71.D681B15A@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42114

I had promised a review of the QST cover art for people recently, so after recieving the May issue, here goes:

After doing a diss on the last one, I have to say that the May issue is quite good. My first impression was that I liked the lit interior of the tuner. Then I noted the content lines were not obscuring the photograph.

Next, I really liked the yin-yang effect between the tuner and background. Then the tex for the EZ-tuner casting a shadow from the lit area inside the tuner was a cute effect.

All in all a very good cover.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2896. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 03:32:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CD0B33A.E8C91EB8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42115

K7JEB wrote:
>
> Brian:
> >> Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times.
> >> Besides, I don't see you asking these types of
> >> questions of your cronies.
>
> Dave, K8MN:
> > You'd have to establish that Jim has cronies here.
> > I really don't think you find Jim's questions
> > tedious. The tedium probably comes from your
> > inability to deliver a straight answer.
>
> I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
>
> What was the question, again?

It doesn't really matter, Jim. I think Brian not only believes that Jim has cronies, he probably has cohorts too.

Dave K8MN

2897. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 04:01:33 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <qfe1dugce12okgvmc6trho9i3gavgafh5k@4ax.com>
Source record: 42116

On Thu, 02 May 2002 02:56:10 GMT, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:

>
>Took the Smoker out on the lake this evening to blow the winterizing fogging
>oil out of the motor. The rig felt like a thoroughbred horse which had been
>stabled all winter, and just wanted to run and run and run. What a joy to
>cruise down the lake making long graceful S-curves under the stars at
>three-quarter throttle!
>
>Amateur radio .... fugetabowdit till winter.

Have a great summer. Best wishes.

2898. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 05:29:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD0CE6F.B614FF3E@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42117

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If you were you'd know that it operates quite well with no mention
> > of anyone named Shannon, and has for a hundred years.
>
> Dick, if you want to be a button-pushing copy cat with your head buried in
> the sands of time, that's your right. But some of us seek to gain knowledge
> of how and why ham radio works and how we can introduce some progress into
> the hobby

Why, *of course* you do, Cecil! Carl, too! But I'm sure that most everyone else is still wondering about your credibility, given that you both were singing the same song some five years ago, at least that's how long I've been hearing it since I first landed here on rrap. But for some strange reason, it's all hat and no cattle, or all saddle and no horse, take your choice. Meanwhile you play antennas and do your Novice speed CW between shots of scotch, and Carl yaks on single sideband between loony rants.
We know exactly where you're both coming from.

2899. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 05:42:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCFE28A.E1DEB783@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42118

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Who the hell are you to tell other hams what they should do with their hobby
> >time? You happen to work in your favorite wallow, so that's what you want to
> >do. Others are free do to likewise without you haranguing them nonstop. So
> stuff
> >it back where it belongs.
>
> But you must remain free to tell hams that they must do what YOU like to do
> with ham radio -- learn and use Morse code, eh?
>
> Is this another one of those double-standard things?
>
> >The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit who thinks every other ham
> >MUST be interested and involved in exactly the same thing you are. In other
> >words, you are pretty stupid.
>
> Yes, I guess it is.

So you'd allow him the right but not me. We see.

2900. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 05:42:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CCFE3B6.296FC4B6@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42120

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3CCF586D.68F9C047@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> > PACTOR III is presently a purely digital mode
> >>
> >> "purely digital"? How? It's all a bunch of sine waves.
> >
> >The information content is purely digital.
>
> And the signal itself is purely analog.

Cecil and Carl will *never* be happy until the RF signal itself is digital.

2901. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 05:42:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD08651.5D2984E4@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42119

K7JEB wrote:

> > So let's say our hypothetical 2 megawatt diesel plant is burning 10
> > GPH running the derelict transmitter and some other loads. If
> > connected to a 100,000 gallon tank, it could run for 10,000 hours -
> > over a year. Load variations are not that uch of a problem because the
> > diesel has a governor to keep its speed constant. Line voltage might
> > wander a bit if automatic compensation was not employed.
>
> The whole scenario goes out the window (past the shade and the
> coke bottle) if you hypothesize that the diesel engine driving
> the generator could tap into the refinery's product. It would
> take quite a while to run through several, 10-million-gallon
> tanks of diesel fuel. Then it does become a lubricant- and
> coolant-limited problem.
>
> What was the time frame of 'On the Beach' anyway? I'm left
> with the impression it was only months' duration - perhaps
> a couple of years on the outside.

As I recall, the surviving crew of the sub was enroute from Australia to the US when the nuclear war broke out. When they arrived in San Diego after "driving time" of whatever it took, a couple months seems right, they found the ghost town with the puzzling transmitter being keyed.

Dick

2902. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 05:42:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD08768.75FD9D5@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42121

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote
>
> > What I *have* said is that we, as amateurs collectively, had better start
> > adopting new technology as the FCC has strongly suggested, because
> > clinging virtually exclusively to stuff that's 50+ years old just isn't
> going
> > to cut it, either in terms of attracting newcomers in the future, or in
> terms
> > of satisfying the FCC that we are truly living up to 97.1 ..
>
> "Virtually exclusively"? Carl, I think you grossly overstate your case!
>
> While the majority of hams are content to use modes and methods
> pioneered decades ago, there is a significant (and I think growing)
> minority who are not.
>
> While the amateur community may not include hundreds of bona fide
> *inventors*, we are blessed with hosts of tinkerers and innovators who,
> seeing some new gimmick or technology say "Aha, I know what practical
> use I could make of that".
>
> I concede we will not be able to base our "technical worth" to society
> on our bleeding edge inventiveness (and we never have) but rather on
> our proven ability to reduce new and exotic technologies to practical
> and cost effective applications which can be adopted by other industries.
> Art Collins and his cohorts didn't invent SSB, but they sure proved it as
> a practical HF application and revolutionized long distance voice
> communications for a generation.
>
> AMSAT and their counterparts didn't invent satellites, but they proved
> the value of low cost LEO technology and a new industry now has
> sprung up based on that amateur "tinkering", and not coincidentally
> we had to fight a mini-battle to keep them from gobbling up the very
> spectrum space we used to prove-in the concept.
>
> We didn't invent packet switching, but we figured out low cost ways
> of transplanting it from copper to RF. Many mobile data services can
> thank us for "proving the concept".
>
> WA4APR and friends didn't invent GPS, but they deduced a cheap
> way to marry that technology with packet radio to come up with APRS.
> That tinkering now founds a new capability in use by public service

> agencies, so the local sheriff need no longer yell "Car 54, where
> are you?, and the copy-cat commercial service "AVL" which helps
> shippers locate their trucks on our vast highway system to within
> a couple of meters.
>
> In those examples lies the seed we need to nurture for our future
> contributions to the state of the radio art, and as an added bonus,
> out of that mass of "tinkerers" will also certainly step a small number
> of bonafide "inventors" and scientists.

And all the ranting the belligerent horses ass can do onrrap only damages his effort.

2903. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 09:48:47 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3Y7A8.1862$6T5.189181@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42122

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CD0B33A.E8C91EB8@earthlink.net...
> K7JEB wrote:
> >
> > Brian:
> > >> Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times.
> > >> Besides, I don't see you asking these types of
> > >> questions of your cronies.
> >
> > Dave, K8MN:
> > > You'd have to establish that Jim has cronies here.
> > > I really don't think you find Jim's questions
> > > tedious. The tedium probably comes from your
> > > inability to deliver a straight answer.
> >
> > I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
> >
> > What was the question, again?
>
> It doesn't really matter, Jim. I think Brian not only believes that Jim
> has cronies, he probably has cohorts too.
>
> Dave K8MN

Possibly even a few mechanics, minions, and lackeys.

2904. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:06:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502060639.13688.00001383@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 42123

In article <JtCz8.54698$Rw2.4380829@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.

Tnx Jim. Hope that makes me a crony of yours.

>What was the question, again?

There are at least two:

"What mode do you use on 30 meters?"

"What is your recent experience in the Novice bands?"

For some reason, certain folks get very upset when asked those questions. I
don't know why.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2905. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:06:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502060639.13688.00001382@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 42124

In article <eLUz8.535$6T5.65479@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Some years ago, Nelson's Needle in Trafalgar Square needed a major
>masonary renewal and the statue needed cleaning badly. Now this had to be
>put up somewhere after the Napoleonic Battle of Trafalgar and all of the
>buildings there now were there then. No one had a clue how the statue was
>put up there to begin with let alone how to get it down so the USAF and a
>big cargo helicopter did the deed coming and going.

omigawsh....

In this same class are the Easter Island monoliths - stone statues as tall as houses, weighing as much as boxcars, that were carved from solid rock and transported miles over rolling terrain, then stood upright on temple platforms. Then a "topknot" of a different kind of stone was brought from a completely different part of the island and placed on top. How was it done? Lots of speculation until the late great Thor Heyerdahl asked some of the locals to show him how and offered to pay for a demo.
>
>It is incredible how much lore has been forgotten over the years not to
>mention dirty tricks and trade secrets.

The first rule of evolution is survival. That means job security.

>A lot of work in the older parts
>of town has uncovered everything from unknown cable car tracks, cisterns
>for horses, and other dross none of which was recorded anywhere and Omaha
>only dates from 1854.

You oughta see what they dig up here in Philly!

One of the locals named Henry Mercer set up a museum around 1900 up in Doylestown. The Mercer Museum is unusual in that he went around and collected ordinary, everyday stuff and info on how it was used and made. He was also a nut for concrete - built the museum and his house out of it.

>If we ever have time travel and really grok the
>Egyptian pyramids which are rather small change by world standards I
>suspect an awful lot of civil engineers will ring out with 'Oh,

[expletive deleted]

>and
>a few labor foremen will wonder what the fuss is about. Remember the
>first time you put brushes in a generator?

Heck yes.

They dug up a complete town virtually in the shadow of the Sphinx that is changing the image of how the whole system worked. PBS special was really good.
>
>One of the more interesting theories on the Pyramids is that it was a
>giant make-work project for people during the Nile floods and the rest of
>the year for the scribes and surveyors needed to determine land allotments
>after the flood ended. Having worked in an entire corporation of scribes
>and surveyors I can testify they get surly when unemployed.
>
More than a grain of truth in that! Also a method of wealth redistribution - best jobs (and money) go to Pharaoh's buddies.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2906. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:10:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502061005.06894.00006199@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42125

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>There's NO indication on WHERE $90K+ is spent. Is it to "congress?"

There is an exact indication of where the $90k is spent, Len. Try reading it again. It goes to the firm that helps ARRL lobby congress.

>More likely it is activities concerned with the FCC, not congress.

Wrong guess. Most of Chris Imlay's work for the League is related to the FCC. About half of mine is.

>It seems unfortunate that details aren't or won't be forthcoming.

They are not forthcoming to those that don't see them, Len. There have been more stories on ARRL's work with the FCC and Congress than I can list.

>The "it's none yer business" sort of answer on
>what the league does is not a good one.

I wonder if you can cite the "none of yer business answer you are claiming you got when you asked ARRL the question. Who gave it to you?

Looks like more Anderson anti-ARRL propaganda to me. :-)

>>>"Details upon request" is written down on several of the 26 pages of
>>>the ARRL FY2000 tax return forms.

>>You can't be seriously suggesting that ARRL's tax returns be considered as a
>>good answer to his question.

>Is this another of those "it's none yer business" answers?

I didn't see a question, Len -- just typical Anderson pontification. If you ask me a question, I will answer it, if I can.

>[Counselor Troi senses pique and aggravation...red alert!]

At least you are willing to admit that you are an aggravation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2907. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:11:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502061146.06894.00006200@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42126

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>It is money well spent, Ryan.
>
>Total revenue, FY2000, Part 1, Line 12 = $11,625,723.
>
>Roughly $68 per member...

In part, a result of the excess revenues over expenses from the sale of ARRL publications.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2908. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:12:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502061238.06894.00006201@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42127

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>I too agree it is well spent. I have no problem with
>ARRL direction (in general). I disagree on one
>specific issue (which is why I became a founding
>member and am on the BOD of No Code Int'l).

Only one issue? I am ahead of you. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2909. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:15:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502061513.06894.00006202@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42128

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> >The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit
>
>What great logic, what style, what class...I gotta
>remember this great debating technique that Dick
>seems to always return to.

And he thinks that ARRL can win its spectrum battles by threating to call the FCC names. I think there is a pattern there somewhere...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2910. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:17:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502061702.06894.00006203@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42129

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>So you'd allow him the right but not me. We see.

In what way have I not allowed you anything here, Dick? Your constant use of profanity and insult to others here demonstrates pretty clearly that no one can control your actions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2911. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:19:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502061903.06894.00006205@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42130

From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>While the majority of hams are content to use modes and methods
>pioneered decades ago, there is a significant (and I think growing)
>minority who are not.

It has always been a minority -- an important minority. In the 50s and 60s, what percentage of US hams led the pioneering to start using SSB in the ham bands?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2912. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:20:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502062026.06894.00006206@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42131

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>While this newsgroup's content is composed mainly of a very tiny
>slice of all licensed radio amateurs, it is nonethess a sampling.

In other posts, you have stated that you don't believe that ARRL's 165,000 members are a representative sample of Amateur Radio. Changing in the wind to suit your purpose?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2913. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 10:23:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502062348.06894.00006207@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42132

From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>Whatever happens, the comments have discredited the shabby ARRL effort to
> present the FCC with a 'concensus'.

I would imagine that most hams' views of how the band segment should be changed are closer to ARRL's view than to yours. It remains to be seen whether most of the comments favor status quo, voice/image only or support the basic premise of ARRL's position.

Concensus is not a synonym for unanimity.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2914. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 12:06:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502080654.20703.00001292@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 42133

In article <20020502061903.06894.00006205@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>
>>While the majority of hams are content to use modes and methods
>>pioneered decades ago, there is a significant (and I think growing)
>>minority who are not.
>
>It has always been a minority -- an important minority. In the 50s and 60s,
>what percentage of US hams led the pioneering to start using SSB in the ham
>bands?

Actually, hams began using "single channel" SSB voice transmission on the HF amateur bands in 1933. The 75 meter LSB transmitter designed and used by Robert Moore, W6DEI was described in R/9 in late 1933 and early 1934. This transmitter was quite sophisticated, generating the SSB signal at 10 kc. and heterodyning it twice (using balanced mixers) to get to 75 meters. There were a handful of west coast amateurs "on the air with single sideband" back in those days.

Dig up QST for 1935 and see what Jim Lamb has to say about SSB, too.

Of course the big push began with articles by W6QYT and others in the late 1940s describing how to build and use SSB exciters.

But the point when SSB gained the upper hand over SSB was in the late 1950s and early 1960s, when the introduction of SSB transceivers and matching transmitter-receiver pairs made SSB easy to use, compact and in many cases much cheaper than AM.

Who manufactured the first amateur "all band HF" (that means 80/40/20/15/10 meters back then, folks) SSB transceiver?

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

2915. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 12:57:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD137D3.2DC2E402@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42134

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Dick, if you want to be a button-pushing copy cat with your head buried in
> > the sands of time, that's your right. But some of us seek to gain knowledge
> > of how and why ham radio works and how we can introduce some progress into
> > the hobby
>
> Why, *of course* you do, Cecil! Carl, too! But I'm sure that most everyone
> else is still wondering about your credibility, given that you both were
> singing the same song some five years ago, at least that's how long I've been
> hearing it since I first landed here on rrap.

So you think Carl and I have learned nothing in the last 5 years? Hams are
supposed to be about experimenting, Dick. Why are you so anti-experimentation?
Haven't you ever experimented with anything, enjoyed doing so, and learned
something from it? I learn something new at least monthly.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2916. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 13:05:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD1397E.367DE3F9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42135

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >Who the hell are you to tell other hams what they should do with their hobby
> > >time? You happen to work in your favorite wallow, so that's what you want to
> > >do. Others are free do to likewise without you haranguing them nonstop. So
> > stuff
> > >it back where it belongs.
> >
> > But you must remain free to tell hams that they must do what YOU like to do
> > with ham radio -- learn and use Morse code, eh?
> >
> > Is this another one of those double-standard things?
> >
> > >The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit who thinks every other ham
> > >MUST be interested and involved in exactly the same thing you are. In other
> > >words, you are pretty stupid.
> >
> > Yes, I guess it is.
>
> So you'd allow him the right but not me. We see.

I think what Ed is suggesting, Dick, is that you follow one the teachings of the
Bible, i.e. Remove the moat from your own eye before complaining about the speck
in someone else's eye.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2917. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 13:07:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD13A06.7D66FB2A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42136

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil and Carl will *never* be happy until the RF signal itself is digital.

Nope, Cecil and Carl will never be happy until all avenues for advancing
the state of the amateur radio art have been explored. Sorry you disagree.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2918. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 15:25:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <5UcA8.1239$Ss1.436@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42137

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CD08768.75FD9D5@townsqr.com...

> "K&#65533;HB" wrote:

> > While the majority of hams are content to use modes and methods
> > pioneered decades ago, there is a significant (and I think growing)
> > minority who are not.
> >
> > While the amateur community may not include hundreds of bona fide
> > *inventors*, we are blessed with hosts of tinkerers and innovators who,
> > seeing some new gimmick or technology say "Aha, I know what practical
> > use I could make of that".
> >
> > I concede we will not be able to base our "technical worth" to society
> > on our bleeding edge inventiveness (and we never have) but rather on
> > our proven ability to reduce new and exotic technologies to practical
> > and cost effective applications which can be adopted by other
industries.
> > Art Collins and his cohorts didn't invent SSB, but they sure proved it
as
> > a practical HF application and revolutionized long distance voice
> > communications for a generation.
> >
> > AMSAT and their counterparts didn't invent satellites, but they proved
> > the value of low cost LEO technology and a new industry now has
> > sprung up based on that amateur "tinkering", and not coincidentally
> > we had to fight a mini-battle to keep them from gobbling up the very
> > spectrum space we used to prove-in the concept.
> >
> > We didn't invent packet switching, but we figured out low cost ways
> > of transplanting it from copper to RF. Many mobile data services can
> > thank us for "proving the concept".
> >
> > WA4APR and friends didn't invent GPS, but they deduced a cheap
> > way to marry that technology with packet radio to come up with APRS.
> > That tinkering now founds a new capability in use by public service
> > agencies, so the local sheriff need no longer yell "Car 54, where
> > are you?, and the copy-cat commercial service "AVL" which helps
> > shippers locate their trucks on our vast highway system to within
> > a couple of meters.
> >
> > In those examples lies the seed we need to nurture for our future
> > contributions to the state of the radio art, and as an added bonus,
> > out of that mass of "tinkerers" will also certainly step a small number

> > of bonafide "inventors" and scientists.

> And all the ranting the belligerent horses ass can do onrrap only damages his
> effort.

If my ideas above are the rant of a horses ass, then what sort of rant are your insults and name calling? My notions are certainly fair game for disagreement, but I don't think they qualify me for the title "horses ass".

The hypothalamus is one of the most important parts of the brain, involved in many kinds of motivation, among other functions. The hypothalamus controls the "Four F's": 1. fighting; 2. fleeing; 3. feeding; and 4. mating.

Please go mate yourself.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2919. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 15:42:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <C7dA8.1262$Ss1.188@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42138

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> Concensus is not a synonym for unanimity.
>

But RM-10413 is a synonym for "shabby ARRL effort".

I count W3KD as a friend, but his persuasive talents and reasoned thought processes are not evident in this petition. In all fairness, I guess he had to work within the confines of his tasking document. A pity.

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: Examine the range of comments on RM-10413 at the FCC site, and see if you can find anything that remotely resembles consensus. Good luck on this one now.

2920. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 16:00:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502120059.14735.00001253@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 42139

In article <qGYz8.2586$nY5.126397@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> >> ...which would not have happened so soon without Collins Radio
>> >> having a development contract for SAC communications equipment.
>
>In the same format, I commented:
>
>> >Which would not have happened so soon, had not CINCSAC been Amateur
>> >Radio operator K0GRL, General Curtis E. LeMay, and a close friend of
>W0CXX,
>> >Art Collins.
>>
>> "CINCSAC?!?" The USAF didn't come out of the USN, mister chief.
>
>Who mentioned the Navy, Old Soldier? General LeMay was in the Air Force,
>and his title was CINCSAC. (But you already knew that!)

That's a pure NAVY acronym, mister chief. "Commanding General,
Strategic Air Command" would be appropriate. There's only one
"Commander IN Chief" in the USAF...or the Army...and that is the
President of the United States.

>> Neither you nor I will know of the possible alternative futures at
>> any given time. Please do not use such a self-defining statement
>> to "prove" any point.
>
>Proves my point just as well as your own statement of the same construct
>*your* point, Old Organ Grinder.

No, it doesn't prove a damn thing, chiefie. You want mythology to
be a FACT when it is only part of the history.

If you look back at the time line (which you have not), you would
have found another corporation got a development contract for
single-channel SSB voice. That was RCA. RCA never made any
"popular" amateur radio equipment that spawned legends and
myths. Collins did...rather pricy equipment at that. The legends
stood Collins Radio good on being able to sell HF SSB goods.
They easily recouped their design and development costs from
the high prices (inflated to make them money).

For all the tales of altruistic do-gooderism supposedly done by
the Collins Radio legends, Collins did well on charging so much

on their ham gear. Hams readily forked over the cash, making
money for Art and company. The legends no doubt helped
all their government contracts later.

Collins Radio hasn't made any amateur radio equipment for years.
It is now a division of Rockwell International.

>Good luck on this one now, and don't grind your organ so fast -- it's hard
>on your heart.

No problem. Arguing with you on any subject doesn't even raise
the beat to 85. About as much effort as picking up some scrap
on the floor and dumping it in the wastebasket.

Since you haven't objected by yet-another lesson in the REAL
history of radio modes, I'll have to conclude you had to concede
and accepted it.

Wear your life jacket when taking out your power boat. You aren't
as young as you think you are.

2921. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 16:39:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD14812.3FBDB61@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42140

W1RFI wrote:
always return to.

>
> And he thinks that ARRL can win its spectrum battles by threating to call the
> FCC names. I think there is a pattern there somewhere...

Is this another case where you say I said what you wanted me to have said? Yes, it is. You can never quote a post where I ever said, or even implied any such thing and you know it.

So much for the honesty of W1RFI.

2922. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 16:39:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD148AE.882BF6B1@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42141

W1RFI wrote:

> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> >While this newsgroup's content is composed mainly of a very tiny
> >slice of all licensed radio amateurs, it is nonethess a sampling.
>
> In other posts, you have stated that you don't believe that ARRL's 165,000
> members are a representative sample of Amateur Radio. Changing in the wind to
> suit your purpose?

He's just doing what you do - shaping the "facts" to fit your Agenda du jour.

2923. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 16:50:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD16E24.B503D69@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42142

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3CD08768.75FD9D5@townsqr.com...
>

>
> > And all the ranting the belligerent horses ass can do onrrap only
> damages his
> > effort.
>
> If my ideas above are the rant of a horses ass, then what sort of rant are
> your insults and name calling?

> My notions are certainly fair game for
> disagreement, but I don't think they qualify me for the title "horses ass".
>

Well, that's novel. I was sure you'd be able to ID Carl as
the belligerent
horses ass, not you.
Maybe I should have been a bit more explicit, again.

> The hypothalamus is one of the most important parts of the brain, involved
> in many kinds of motivation, among other functions. The hypothalamus
> controls the "Four F's": 1. fighting; 2. fleeing; 3. feeding; and 4.
> mating.
>
> Please go mate yourself.

Won't be necessary, thank yew all the same. And the studied
lack of four
letter wording doesn't really change anything, does it? It
only makes it look
"nice". Right.

Phony is phony.

But, shucks, if the shoe seems to fit.....

2924. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 17:11:05 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <JqeA8.1373$Ss1.1063@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42143

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> >> "CINCSAC?!?" The USAF didn't come out of the USN, mister chief.
> >
> >Who mentioned the Navy, Old Soldier? General LeMay was in the Air Force,
> >and his title was CINCSAC. (But you already knew that!)
>
> That's a pure NAVY acronym, mister chief. "Commanding General,
> Strategic Air Command" would be appropriate. There's only one
> "Commander IN Chief" in the USAF...or the Army...and that is the
> President of the United States.
>

Another fine example of how FLAT WRONG the Old Organ Grinder can be when he does shoddy research.

Air Force Gen. Russell E. Dougherty, quoted on an official US Air Force PR site (http://www.af.mil/news/Jul2000/n20000720_001099.html) says "LeMay served as CINCSAC from 1948 to 1957". That sort of makes it seem to be a USAF acronym.

But since SAC has long been replaced by STRATCOM, (CINCSTRATCOM in charge) consider the following current examples of non-USN acronyms in the CINCxxxxx format, to put the lie to your "pure NAVY acronym" claim.

The official online biography of ARMY General Tommy R. Franks at http://www.centcom.mil/who_we_are/bio_cccc.htm says he is "is the Commander in Chief, United States Central Command, MacDill Air Force Base, Fla."

That title is abbreviated "CINCCENT" at http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/doddict/acronym/c/

Other non-USN "CINCxxx" acronyms found at that OFFICIAL DOD site are:

CINCUSAREUR = Commander in Chief, United States Army, Europe
CINCAFLANT = Commander in Chief, Air Forces Atlantic
CINCARLANT = Commander in Chief, Army Forces Atlantic
CINCNORAD = Commander in Chief, North American Aerospace Defense Command

Here are more gleaned from other official US military web sites.

CINCSTRATCOM = Commander in Chief, US Strategic Command, Offutt AFB, NE
CINCEUR = Commander in Chief, US Forces, Europe, Stuttgart-Vaihingen, Germany
CINCSOUTH = Commander in Chief Allied Forces, Southern Europe
CINCSOUTH = Commander in Chief, US Southern Command, Quarry Heights, Panama

CINCUSACOM = Commander in Chief, US Atlantic Command, Norfolk, VA
CINCSOC = Commander in Chief, US Special Operations Command, McDill AFB, FL

Damn, don't you just hate it when someone ruins your perfectly good "facts".

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2925. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 17:37:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502133746.29664.00001053@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 42146

In article <20020502061005.06894.00006199@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>There's NO indication on WHERE $90K+ is spent. Is it to "congress?"
>
>There is an exact indication of where the $90k is spent, Len. Try reading it
>again. It goes to the firm that helps ARRL lobby congress.

That's a literal, word-interpretation statement, not an answer.

In the same mode, you should have corrected "congress" to just
plain "government" in another's posting. You did not. Ergo, you
are being defensive and aggravating.

NO ONE out beyond the ARRL and Chwat and company "knows"
EXACTLY how $90K+ is spent in lobbying efforts/expenses. THAT
was the major point of my comment. Federal tax returns do NOT
have to be detailed down to individual items or to information that
could possibly be prejudicial to any organization's motives. They
only have to be detailed enough to satisfy the IRS.

NO ONE outside the immediate confines of the ARRL knew
anything in terms of dollars spent or efforts directed towards
government lobbying efforts on behalf of amateur radio by the
ARRL...until those "copies of IRS tax forms" were made
available on a website.

["copies..." in quotation marks since there is no guarantee that
those are genuine...one can only suppose so on the basis of
stamp markings on the document copies...and it is unlikely that
they are some elaborate forgery requiring considerable effort to
manufacture]

>>More likely it is activities concerned with the FCC, not congress.
>
>Wrong guess. Most of Chris Imlay's work for the League is related to the
>FCC. About half of mine is.

That is interesting detail information, however phrased in a somewhat
aggravating tone.

NO ONE outside the immediate confines of the ARRL and its
contracted services KNOWS the detail or even knew the detail
and amounts of monies spent until those tax forms surfaced.

>>It seems unfortunate that details aren't or won't be forthcoming.
>
>They are not forthcoming to those that don't see them, Len. There have been
>more stories on ARRL's work with the FCC and Congress than I can list.

Then Ed Hare fails to understand the perception of others who
are outside the ARRL headquarters operations.

The ARRL reports something the ARRL did. The source of this
information is from the ARRL over its own "media" outlet, the
ARRL website and ARRL publications.

There is NO corroboration from a disinterested party as to the
truth of what the ARRL says the ARRL did. Everyone must take
the ARRL's word on nearly everything it does. It is a BELIEF
system.

Pardon us ordinary folks not privy to ARRL insider information,
but the ARRL as an organization is not to be taken as a paragon
of truth and honesty. Since it is partly a political organization
then ordinary folks have to judge its statements as "standard
political phrasing." That is, it has the power to control and bias
its own reporting of what it does and what its aims are...

>>The "it's none yer business" sort of answer on
>>what the league does is not a good one.
>
>I wonder if you can cite the "none of yer business answer you are claiming
>you got when you asked ARRL the question. Who gave it to you?

The ARRL as a group, and as individuals who are insiders in the
ARRL have repeatedly made the inference that the ARRL's
cause, doings, honesty, and nobility are all above reproach.
It's part of the BELIEF system schtick common to all political
organizations. Ed Hare did that, de facto, in the opening of his
aggravated reply to my original message by trying the very
literal interpretation of "where $90K+ monies were spent."

>Looks like more Anderson anti-ARRL propaganda to me. :-)

As an ARRL insider, Ed Hare seems very sensitive to apparent
fault-finding to anyone raising certain points on documents that
have not been made available to the general public. That is
Hare's problem, not mine.

In a free society ALL should have the freedom to bring up
certain observations on documents never before seen by the
public. The journalism media does this on a regular basis
concerning political parties and individuals engaged in politics.
The ARRL is partly a political organization, public in exposure
although private in organization, and declared non-profit (legal
term for tax purposes). They are NOT exempt from criticsm,
positive or negative.

>>Is this another of those "it's none yer business" answers?
>
>I didn't see a question, Len -- just typical Anderson pontification. If you
>ask me a question, I will answer it, if I can.

I wrote a "question" in a direct copy of the Hare "question" mode.

The question mark at the end of a sentence denotes the sentence
as a question. Questions are simply questions. Questions may
be rhetorical (as to be answered later by the questioner) without
any answer necessary or the questions may be ignored. Readers
have that choice.

>>[Counselor Troi senses pique and aggravation...red alert!]
>
>At least you are willing to admit that you are an aggravation.

Aggravation is a subjective thing. Demonstrations of aggravation
are common to those whose cherished belief systems appear to
be threatened by another. "Pique" may be classified as very
low-level aggravation.

A closing wry comment is often used as a humorous "dig" at
others, not myself. It seems blatantly obvious that Hare was
piqued and probably aggravated by my previous comment. No
doubt many others have felt the same, to various degrees.
Judging from an occassional comment by a "non-regular," it is
also obvious that others share the same criticsm of the ARRL.

The ARRL does not share any sacrosanct position, that of
being above reproach. It would do well for its employees to
recognize that fact and not exhibit such pique and/or
aggravation towards critics.

2926. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 17:37:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502133747.29664.00001054@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 42144

In article <3CD1397E.367DE3F9@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> So you'd allow him the right but not me. We see.
>
>I think what Ed is suggesting, Dick, is that you follow one the teachings of
the
>Bible, i.e. Remove the moat from your own eye before complaining about the
speck
>in someone else's eye.

...it's a moat AND drawbridge, plus all the weeds growing on
the edge of the moat... :-)

2927. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 17:37:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502133747.29664.00001055@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 42145

In article <20020502062026.06894.00006206@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>While this newsgroup's content is composed mainly of a very tiny
>>slice of all licensed radio amateurs, it is nonethess a sampling.
>
>In other posts, you have stated that you don't believe that ARRL's 165,000
>members are a representative sample of Amateur Radio. Changing in the wind
>to suit your purpose?

A sampling is just a sampling. There are statistical rules to establish accuracy and efficacy in sampling percentages. I did not enumerate any rules of statistics on my mention of "sampling."

It would do well for Hare to stop demonstrating pique and aggravation on perceived negative criticsm of the ARRL or of certain "regulars" in this newsgroup. All are in the public view. NO ONE is exempt.

Asking rhetorical questions (a standard Hare response) is NOT any sort of answer.

2928. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 18:27:39 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <2F5C539FF7993544.69E9D698CA1474AF.77FCEBA6BB023662@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42147

On 02 May 2002 10:15:13 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>And he thinks that ARRL can win its spectrum battles by threating to call the
>FCC names.

Well, Riley thinks he can clean up the airwaves by threatening to
write violators more nasty letters.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2929. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 18:32:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502143248.09497.00007066@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42148

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/01/02 13:57 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020501135721.21592.00000950@mb-fa.aol.com>

>While this newsgroup's content is composed mainly of a very tiny
>slice of all licensed radio amateurs, it is nonethess a sampling.

Yes, it is. However since no one here, especially YOU, is qualified to determine how the demographics of the NG are dispersed, it's absolutely impossible to make ANY determination as to what, if any, representitive sampling might be accurately made.

>An observation of that sampling indicates a strong propensity to...(SNIP)

Opinion, Lennie...at the MOST you can offer is an opinion. Every day this NG see's new posters, and there is no way anyone can make anything close to an accurate assessment of what anyone's "propensity" is.

>>While the amateur community may not include hundreds of bona fide
>>*inventors*, we are blessed with hosts of tinkerers and innovators who,
>>seeing some new gimmick or technology say "Aha, I know what practical
>>use I could make of that".
>
>Which is unfortunately counterbalanced by a group of self-promoting
>patriots claiming to be members of some sort of mythical "service"
>doing great and valuable things for the country.

Another snide slap, Lennie?

Those whom you just took another swing at are the very people who DO use the technology Hans' made reference to. The ARE providing a service...certainly more service than YOU ever provided the United States, in or out of uniform.

>>AMSAT and their counterparts didn't invent satellites, but they proved
>>the value of low cost LEO technology and a new industry now has
>>sprung up based on that amateur "tinkering", and not coincidentally
>>we had to fight a mini-battle to keep them from gobbling up the very
>>spectrum space we used to prove-in the concept.
>
>That is a gross exaggeration which defiles the entire space
>communications industry

It's no exaggeration and it defiles no one, Your Lyingness. It's right on the money.

>The "mini-battle" for the last Low-Earth Orbit satellite communications
>spectral bandspace was NOT fought entirely by the ARRL and
>AMSAT.

Hans said nothing about the ARRL, and his comment was 100% correct...nor
did he say ANYone did anything "entirely".

>The majority of the commentors on public view at the FCC
>Reading Room are the corporations and services already directly
>involved in space communications that affect more citizens than just
>radio amateurs.

AND....they are using technologies (Little LEO concepts) that were
demonstrated as practical by Radio Amateurs...JUST LIKE HANS SAID.

>>We didn't invent packet switching, but we figured out low cost ways
>>of transplanting it from copper to RF. Many mobile data services can
>>thank us for "proving the concept".
>
>Flag-waving with just a flagpole.

Always quick to find a way to insult...Same old Lennie.

>Time-division multiplexing necessary for packet
>switching systems was already beginning in HF data (teleprinter)
>communications in the 50s. Think ALOHA as having more influence
>on "packet switching" to the industry.

Lennie, why do you find it necessary to try and "prove" something Hans
already stated as fact? To impress us with how timely you are?

>>WA4APR and friends didn't invent GPS, but they deduced a cheap
>>way to marry that technology with packet radio to come up with APRS.
>
>A good innovation but impossible without either GPSS or GLONASS.
>GPSS started with NAVSTAR, a USN program with strong looking-in
>by the USAF and US Army.

Again...trying to "prove" something he already acknowledged. That you
provide more "intimate" details is nice, but only an attempt to wrap yourself
up in your OWN "bunting"..and not very patriotic bunting at that...(You eally
should flush it after you use it, Lennie....)

>As a former member of the Position Location Engineering group at
>RCA Electromagnetic and Aviation Systems, Van Nuys, CA, in
>the 1970s, I have to state that your summation is GROSS
>exaggeration.

I am sure you read a lot of stuff from the trashcans you were emptying
while you were there, Lennie. I am sure the housekeeping staff gets to see a
lot of stuff that way.

>Investigate Terion Corporation and their new grant of HF frequencies
>for reporting vehicle positions...just made possible by the FCC.

Fine reading, I am sure, and in no way diminishes what was said earlier....You just puffed it up along the way.

>Support Your Local Legacy Mode Sheriff!

Who is bound to being doing more for radiocommunication than Lennie Anderson...now or in the past...

2930. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 18:39:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502143944.09497.00007068@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42149

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/01/02 16:38 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020501163855.06459.00001060@mb-mo.aol.com>

>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>> ...which would not have happened so soon without Collins Radio
>>> having a development contract for SAC communications equipment.
>>
>>Which would not have happened so soon, had not CINCSAC not been Amateur
>>Radio operator K0GRL, General Curtis E. LeMay, and a close friend of W0CXX,
>>Art Collins.

>Neither you nor I will know of the possible alternative futures at
>any given time. Please do not use such a self-defining statement
>to "prove" any point. It does NOT prove your point.

Lennie, only a complete and babbling IDIOT such as yourself would try to
make his "newsgroup messaging points" by ignoring documented history...

>Back-room bargaining and buddyism gets one contracts. It does
>absolutely nothing for electrons and EM waves despite the titles
>and ascribed importance of the partners in rooms. Trying to
>equate cronyism, nepotism (of a kind), and under-the-table
>dealings with the government to "advances in amateur radio" is
>not a quality item.

Another cheap shot does not negate what did transpire. SSB
radiocommunication did NOT become widespread or accepted in either Amateur or
USAF RADIO communications until the intervening of Gen LeMay and Art Collins.
This is documented in bot Amateur and USAF histories.

>Good luck on THAT one, mister chief.

You are the one with something to prove, Lennie...PROVE that he was
wrong...

2931. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 18:43:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <NNfA8.1572$Ss1.1243@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42150

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote

>
> Well, Riley thinks he can clean up the airwaves by threatening to
> write violators more nasty letters.
>

Actually Riley's letters are not nasty, but generally polite, businesslike,
and to the point.

And also generally quite effective!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2932. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 18:46:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502144628.09497.00007069@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42201

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 05/02/02 13:11 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <JqeA8.1373$Ss1.1063@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Air Force Gen. Russell E. Dougherty, quoted on an official US Air Force PR
>site (http://www.af.mil/news/Jul2000/n20000720_001099.html) says "LeMay
>served as CINCSAC from 1948 to 1957". That sort of makes it seem to be a
>USAF acronym.

Yep...sure does...but of course anyone with PRACTICAL knowledge of the facts would have known better...Of course Lennie doesn't consider those who had life-long careers in the Armed Forces to know anything more than HE did in his short Korean-era, non-combatant tour.

Stupid Lennie.

Nice job, Hans.

Steve

2933. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 18:52:35 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0205021052.4bff2863@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42202

Gentlemen's Agreements:

Friend of mine says that ham radio has, for as long as he could remember, always been self-policing, developing operating standards, practices and guidelines -- trusting operators to function within the bounds of common sense and shared responsibility. But now we are becoming just like the rest of society -- looking for rules and laws, not so we can obey them but, so we can find the loopholes so we can either get a jump on someone else or find a reason to make new rules and new laws.

I listened to the most amazing interplay last night on 3.865 between two crews of pre-restructured Extras. One bunch had been driven off the frequency by the second bunch grabbing the frequency early in the morning and staying on until late at night. Last night, the first bunch returned to reclaim the frequency with higher power and side-by-side contacts.

None of them were behaving like Amateur Radio Operators. It was like listening to rival groups of 6 year olds arguing over a piece of playground equipment in a public park -- with the language and manners of 18th Century pirates.

I'm afraid that's what I'm hearing in all the discussions about re-farming the Novice/Tech Plus frequencies. If you don't want to do it my way, then you are so wrong you don't belong in this service. I hope these are not the attitudes of the majority of Amateurs. I yearn for a return to consensus rather than up and down votes.

73
KB9RVB
Carl

Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:<3CCF7DD8.27DCE834@worldnet.att.net>...
> Excuse me but I am not sure the poster, in spite of his
> excellent pedigree, has it right. I think Morse CW is
> allowed everywhere on amateur HF freq.s by the regs. It is
> only by gentlemen's agreement that Morse CW does not appear
> much in the phone segments.
>
> I would like to see gentlemen's agreements control what goes
> on in the refarmed novice slivers, not have the FCC get a
> headache trying to rewrite the rules. Unless there is some
> way to keep commission rules for the proposed "experimental
> zones" very simple, I think they will opt for the easy way

> out by extending phone edge down and rtty/data edge up.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX
>
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
>
> > The existing US (Part 97) rules are quite clear:
> >
> > On the HF amateur bands, "RTTY", "data" and "CW" share one part of the
> > bands and "phone" and "image" share the other part. PACTOR III is
> > legal in the 'phone segments of the HF amateur bands ONLY if it's
> > being used for voice or image.
> >
> > To make matters worse, any RTTY or data mode used on the HF amateur
> > bands
> > must not have a symbol rate greater than 300 bauds are not allowed on
> > amateur HF at all.
> >
> > So if you want to run PACTOR III beyond 300 bauds you have to do it in
> > the 'phone bands and you have to use it only for voice or image. Yeah,
> > "bits is bits" but the FCC doesn't see it that way. Yet.
> >
> > This is one of the reasons for the "experimental farm" idea.

2934. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 18:55:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502145546.09497.00007070@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42203

>Subject: I guess I'm not dedicated enough
>From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 05/01/02 22:56 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <eV1A8.309$ce4.32147@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>What a joy to
>cruise down the lake making long graceful S-curves under the stars at
>three-quarter throttle!

Fair Winds And Following Seas....

73

Steve

2935. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 19:14:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502151445.20744.00001169@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 42204

In article <JqeA8.1373$Ss1.1063@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Damn, don't you just hate it when someone ruins your perfectly good "facts".

Not at all. In wasting all that space on the kitschy CINC, you have demonstrated what appears to be a terrible desire for "proper" RANK and TITLE. Isn't that so, mister chief?

What the US military titles its commanding officers is NOT even close to any sort of amateur radio bandspace allocation subject.

Turn down your gain and don't be so sensitive. Try to stay with the program.

2936. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 19:22:15 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <0B641AE5F3A25A07.542F90D08776D29D.C7FA38EF6D9997A6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42205

On Thu, 02 May 2002 18:43:57 GMT, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:

>Actually Riley's letters are not nasty, but generally polite, businesslike,
>and to the point.
>
>And also generally quite effective!

Then why is he constantly having to write more letters to the same
people?

Ignoring "All is well, we'll stop bothering you now" letters, and the
ones going to power companies, look at how many of those letters start
out along the lines of "On ___ we notified you of ___ and you haven't
done a damn thing about it."

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2937. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 19:27:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD19312.45F8AEE8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42206

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > And he thinks that ARRL can win its spectrum battles by threating to call the
> > FCC names. I think there is a pattern there somewhere...
>
> Is this another case where you say I said what you wanted me to have said? Yes,
> it is. You can never quote a post where I ever said, or even implied any such
> thing and you know it.

Dick, you certainly implied such when you said Carl got his way at the FCC
by threatening to call them Luddites - Remember?
--
cheers, CAM. W5DXP

----------== Posted via Newsfeeds.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeeds.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Ulimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2938. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 19:32:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD1945C.AB03F1C2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42207

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I think what Ed is suggesting, Dick, is that you follow one the teachings of the
> >Bible, i.e. Remove the moat from your own eye before complaining about the speck
> >in someone else's eye.
>
> ...it's a moat AND drawbridge, plus all the weeds growing on
> the edge of the moat... :-)

Actually, I just looked it up in my new NIV. "Speck" has been replaced by
"sawdust" and "moat" has been replaced by "plank".
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

----------== Posted via Newsfeeds.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeeds.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Ulimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2939. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 19:46:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <RIgA8.24$RN2.21@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42208

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> >Damn, don't you just hate it when someone ruins your perfectly good
"facts".
>
> Not at all. In wasting all that space on the kitschy CINC, you have
> demonstrated what appears to be a terrible desire for "proper"
> RANK and TITLE. Isn't that so, mister chief?

To the contrary, Old Organ Grinder, it was *you* who initiated the kitsch
with --

"CINCSAC?!?" The USAF didn't come out of the USN, mister
chief."

...and then persisted in your ill-informed challenge with --

"That's a pure NAVY acronym, mister chief. "Commanding
General, Strategic Air Command" would be appropriate. There's
only one "Commander IN Chief" in the USAF...or the Army"

Now that you've been proven hopelessly wrong, you try to beat
a graceful retreat to the tune of "Turn down your gain and don't be
so sensitive."

Most embarrassing to the Old Organ Grinder, I'm sure, but that
doesn't make him a bad person.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2940. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 20:02:16 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205021202.1cedd9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42209

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<9f4bfe89.0205010846.18c150c3@posting.google.com>...
> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
> FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of April 30, 2002:
>
> Novice - 38,584 (decrease of 10,745)
> Tech - 239,555 (increase of 34,161)
> Tech Plus - 80,301 (decrease of 48,559)
> General - 139,022 (increase of 26,345)
> Advanced - 85,691 (decrease of 14,091)
> Extra - 100,244 (increase of 21,494)
> Total - 683,397 (increase of 8,605)
>
> The number of Extras topped 100,000 on April 23, 2002.

Yes, and they will surpass the number of Generals sometime in 2005...
as I predicted last year... isn't there someone who will owe me a
Steak dinner over this?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

It is obvious why many of the defeated and defeatist die-hard ilk want
to "move past the numbers"... they just DON'T LIKE WHAT THEY SEE... or
can't bear to see it.

More telling than the two-year comparison of numbers, is the trend
that has become increasingly clear over the last year... that is, the
overall ARS numbers are dropping(especially as a percent of total US
population). This is clear even from the first degree equation(for
those who can't seem to see trends from 2nd degree equations).

Just as the die-hards who tried to hold the line on 5/13/20 WPM,
created a "rubber-band effect" that eventually caused the Extra

requirement to snap to 5WPM... these same folks are now trying to keep younger people out of the Service, which will eventually cause an alarming drop in the overall numbers(due to the lopsided age demographics), thereby causing another "rubber-band effect" to occur(most likely in 2006 or 2008), leading to the implementation of a resurrected Novice class geared towards the modern digital, and post Morse-Code, era...

Stewart - N0MHS

2941. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 20:07:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502160708.27399.00001182@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 42210

In article <20020430190529.11987.00007016@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "K7JEB" k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net
>
>>I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
>
>As am I.
>
I see I'm in good company.

So, Ed:

What mode do you use on 30 meters?

What's your recent experience in the HF Novice bands?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2942. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 20:07:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502160708.27399.00001181@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 42211

In article <3CCFDC8A.6E08B678@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> New Improved Version - almost ready to send.
>> --
>
> There's basically only one problem I have with all this, aside from
>agreeing
>completely with W3RV's analysis. That is- It concerns me when we ask for
>specific
>spectrum for experimentation that we open ourselves to the unintended
>consequence
>of all other amateur spectrum being thus routinely, over time, becoming
>considered
>as NON experimental.
>
>I Can hear it now-
>
> "Testing, one two three." "Hey, ya lid, take your testing to the
>*experimental*
>band segment!!!".
>
> I wonder if it isn't a mistake to even go there.

I think a worse mistake would be to just turn over the Novice bands to 'phone.

The "300 baud" and "1 kHz FSK" specs in Part 97 make experimentation with new
modes on HF difficult. At the same time, merely dumping all restrictions could
turn the bands into a howling mess. The middle road is to have a bit of space
where folks can try out HBIs (half-baked ideas) and see what happens. The
Novice subbands on 80, 40 and 15 are a good starting place.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2943. Re: PACTOR III

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 20:14:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205021214.27004dfc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42212

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:<Vt0A8.532$vT1.40436@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> Jim, N2EY, posted:
>
> > Yup. But such a ruling would guarantee the band
> > would be full of analog voice signals pretty quick.
> > Such a feature is essentially the same as the ARRL
> > proposal. If there are no restrictions on mode or
> > bandwidth, some folks may have a hankering to try
> > out hi-fi AM or wide-deviation FM. Since such modes
> > are nontraditional in ham radio, they could say
> > they were experimenting.

(expletive deleted)

> I was going to try to be the first guy in
> Arizona to ragchew about lumbago and bowel movements
> in CD-quality stereo using DRM encoding (only 9.6 kHz
> of pure noise - there'd be room for a couple more
> similar QSO's in the 'refarmed' allocations).

DRM encoding doesn't count as "analog voice" so it would be allowed
under the proposal.

I dunno about echo and sound effects
>
> Oh, well!

Go for it!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2944. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 20:24:56 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <sghA8.96$Ng2.48@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42213

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

>... these same folks are now trying to keep
> younger people out of the Service, ...blah, blah, blah.....

Stewart,

Who are "these same folks" and how are they keeping younger people out of Amateur Radio?

Is it the ARRL which is spending a quarter million dollars on the "Big Project" to put Amateur Radio into middle schools? Is it the private and corporate sponsors who are donating those dollars?

Is it scouting program with their "Radio Explorer" posts such as K0BSA, organizing young people around an Amateur Radio theme?

Is it individuals like Valentine Germann of rrap, displaying Amateur Radio in educational facilities?

Is it the Minnesota Youth Amateur Radio Council (http://www.mnyarc.org/) promoting Amateur Radio to youth?

Is it the sponsors of the "Young Ham of the Year" award? (Rules at http://www.arnewsline.org/yhoty/yhoty2002rules.htm -- you can still get your nomination in to them before May 30th)

.... I could go on and on.....

Or is it those folks who wouldn't support your dumbed-down-FRS-like "Pony" license?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2945. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 20:49:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502164950.13743.00007614@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 42214

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/02/02 15:14 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020502151445.20744.00001169@mb-mm.aol.com>

>>Damn, don't you just hate it when someone ruins your perfectly good "facts".
>
>Not at all. In wasting all that space on the kitschy CINC, you have
>demonstrated what appears to be a terrible desire for "proper"
>RANK and TITLE. Isn't that so, mister chief?

Once again caught with his britches down and his ignorance betrayed by his own hand, Leonard H. "Clueless" Anderson tries to spin his way out of having been so self-humiliated.

It didn't work.

>What the US military titles its commanding officers is NOT even close
>to any sort of amateur radio bandspace allocation subject.

YOU initiated it with your reference to "Navy" acronyms.

>Turn down your gain and don't be so sensitive. Try to stay with
>the program

Speaking of programs, WHICH radio service was created for "strictly recreational" purposes, Lennie?

Steve

2946. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 21:00:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020502170014.13743.00007618@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 42215

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
>Date: 05/02/02 15:22 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id:
><0B641AE5F3A25A07.542F90D08776D29D.C7FA38EF6D9997A6@lp.airnews.net>\

>On Thu, 02 May 2002 18:43:57 GMT, "Kï¿½HB"
><KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:
>
>>Actually Riley's letters are not nasty, but generally polite, businesslike,
>>and to the point.
>>
>>And also generally quite effective!
>
>Then why is he constantly having to write more letters to the same
>people?
>
>Ignoring "All is well, we'll stop bothering you now" letters, and the
>ones going to power companies, look at how many of those letters start
>out along the lines of "On ___ we notified you of ___ and you haven't
>done a damn thing about it."

It's called "CYA". If it ever got to the enforcement/litigation stage,
the courts would ask the FCC what was done and how it was documented.

Our courts expect that we will deal with things in the most liberal
fashion, which means expending a great amount of time and effort to "encourage"
the respondent to comply with the law.

It's not enough that they already took a test in which they were supposed
to have demonstrated familiarity with the regulations of the service in which
they sought licensure...In the case of "unlicensed" entities, they are expected
to "remind" them of their responsibilities.

Cheaper, I guess, than tying up funds and personnel in courts.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2947. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 22:55:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <aasg4b$8ml$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42216

Excuse me folks, but isn't ALL of Amateur Radio supposed to be to some
degree experimenters? Why do we need specific band area's just for
experimental modes?

The real problem is getting the FCC to authorize 'experimental modes' before
they become antiques.

Dan/W4NTI

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020502160708.27399.00001181@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3CCFDC8A.6E08B678@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> New Improved Version - almost ready to send.
> >> --
> >
> > There's basically only one problem I have with all this, aside from
> >agreeing
> >completely with W3RV's analysis. That is- It concerns me when we ask for
> >specific
> >spectrum for experimentation that we open ourselves to the unintended
> >consequence
> >of all other amateur spectrum being thus routinely, over time, becoming
> >considered
> >as NON experimental.
> >
> >I Can hear it now-
> >
> > "Testing, one two three." "Hey, ya lid, take your testing to the
> >*experimental*
> >band segment!!!".
> >
> > I wonder if it isn't a mistake to even go there.
>
> I think a worse mistake would be to just turn over the Novice bands to
'phone.
>
> The "300 baud" and "1 kHz FSK" specs in Part 97 make experimentation with
new
> modes on HF difficult. At the same time, merely dumping all restrictions
could

> turn the bands into a howling mess. The middle road is to have a bit of
space
> where folks can try out HBIs (half-baked ideas) and see what happens. The
> Novice subbands on 80, 40 and 15 are a good starting place.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

2948. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 23:13:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD1C816.E40A0D99@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42217

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> Excuse me folks, but isn't ALL of Amateur Radio supposed to be to some
> degree experimenters?

Some hams think the legacy modes are all we'll ever need.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

----------== Posted via Newsfeeds.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeeds.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Ulimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2949. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-02 23:22:44 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205021522.3eb159d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42218

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3CCB0626.4305231A@ix.netcom.com>...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> > Hello, all!
> >
> > But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
> > told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
> > not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
> > FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
> > DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.
>
> "Amateur" here means "no pecuniary interest",
> vs. "professional" meaning "making money at it"
>
> There are no "professional" DXers and such....

Yes... most folks like to get PAID for their time.

The trick is to find something you completely enjoy, while getting paid reasonably well for doing it. I'm lucky enough to work on RF data links for Unmanned Air Vehicle applications.

Nowadays, my main interest in Amateur Radio is to provide Americans (who are interested in RF) a reasonable place to make a entry into the hobby and/or profession. I tend to be inclusive, rather than exclusive - and believe there should be a fairly easy way to become a ham, and strongly feel that we need to quickly replace the archaic and recently-eliminated HF/Morse-oriented Novice entry class, with something more up-to-date.

While most adults will naturally have an aversion to the "Amateur" term, most younger folks won't... and this is where we should be concentrating our enlistment efforts - at the Junior High/High School/University age groups.

2950. Re: Trollin' down the river.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 00:07:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020502200719.07832.00002774@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 42219

In article <aanp0k$qt3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>But what did the French judge say?
>
>Cheers, :-)
>
>Bill K2UNK

Whatever the French Olympic Trolling Association told her to say!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2951. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 00:39:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CD1DC25.D96C08F0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42220

Well, you could go maritime mobile....
Work some DX while you're bass fishin'.

2952. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 00:51:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CD1DF1E.C2D129CA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42221

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <qGYz8.2586$nY5.126397@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> >> ...which would not have happened so soon without Collins Radio
> >> >> having a development contract for SAC communications equipment.
> >
> >In the same format, I commented:
> >
> >> >Which would not have happened so soon, had not CINCSAC been Amateur
> >> >Radio operator K0GRL, General Curtis E. LeMay, and a close friend of
> >W0CXX,
> >> >Art Collins.
> >>
> >> "CINCSAC?!?" The USAF didn't come out of the USN, mister chief.
> >
> >Who mentioned the Navy, Old Soldier? General LeMay was in the Air Force,
> >and his title was CINCSAC. (But you already knew that!)
>
> That's a pure NAVY acronym, mister chief. "Commanding General,
> Strategic Air Command" would be appropriate. There's only one
> "Commander IN Chief" in the USAF...or the Army...and that is the
> President of the United States.

You know about as much of the military as you do of amateur
radio--little. I suppose CINCEUR is an old salt too.

>
> >> Neither you nor I will know of the possible alternative futures at
> >> any given time. Please do not use such a self-defining statement
> >> to "prove" any point.
> >
> >Proves my point just as well as your own statement of the same construct
> >*your* point, Old Organ Grinder.
>
> No, it doesn't prove a damn thing, chiefie. You want mythology to
> be a FACT when it is only part of the history.
>
> If you look back at the time line (which you have not), you would
> have found another corporation got a development contract for
> single-channel SSB voice. That was RCA. RCA never made any
> "popular" amateur radio equipment that spawned legends and

> myths. Collins did...rather pricy equipment at that. The legends
> stood Collins Radio good on being able to sell HF SSB goods.
> They easily recouped their design and development costs from
> the high prices (inflated to make them money).
>
> For all the tales of altruistic do-gooderism supposedly done by
> the Collins Radio legends, Collins did well on charging so much
> on their ham gear. Hams readily forked over the cash, making
> money for Art and company. The legends no doubt helped
> all their government contracts later.

All of the transmitters and receivers and many of the antennas at the old 2nd AF, 8th AF, 16th AF and SAC HQ (installed in 1959) were manufactured by Collins. The two types of transmitter in use ran 10kw and 45kw PEP. The 618T's used on KC-135's and B-52's were manufactured by Collins. All of the HF equipment I used in Vietnam was manufactured by Collins. It looks as if you've stepped in the bucket once again.

Dave K8MN

2953. Re: Trollin' down the river.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 01:02:11 UTC
From: eccraigjr@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020502210211.17981.00006524@mb-fk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 42222

>>But what did the French judge say?
>>
>>Cheers, :-)
>>
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>Whatever the French Olympic Trolling Association told her to say!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Now that was funny. :-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2954. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 01:03:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <%lIA8.138$jy3.88@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42223

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> Work some DX while you're bass fishin'.

BASS?!?!?! Green carp!

73, Hans, K0HB

2955. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 01:32:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <aaspa6jsg1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42224

How do you get that from my post CAM? I didn't say anything of the sort.

Dan/W4NTI

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD1C816.E40A0D99@IEEE.org...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > Excuse me folks, but isn't ALL of Amateur Radio supposed to be to some
> > degree experimenters?
>
> Some hams think the legacy modes are all we'll ever need.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>
> ------------== Posted via Newsfeeds.Com - Uncensored Usenet News
==----------
> http://www.newsfeeds.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Ulimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers
=-----

2956. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 02:05:52 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <4gmA8.218635$CH1.144454@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 42225

>
> If my ideas above are the rant of a horses ass, then what sort of rant are
> your insults and name calling? My notions are certainly fair game for
> disagreement, but I don't think they qualify me for the title "horses
ass".
>
> The hypothalamus is one of the most important parts of the brain, involved
> in many kinds of motivation, among other functions. The hypothalamus
> controls the "Four F's": 1. fighting; 2. fleeing; 3. feeding; and 4.
> mating.
>
> Please go mate yourself.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Oh no Hans man !!!!!! You know what the result of that would be ....
73 Tom KI3R

2957. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 02:20:52 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CD1F3E3.8E3FE4DF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42226

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>

> I think that I will let your words speak for your views and let it go at that.
> I don't think that ARRL needs any rationale for its lobbying efforts with
> congress.
>
>
>
> I think my answer was a bit more useful to him than yours.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I think that "ARRL", whoever you are referring to, owes
someone an explanation, since the "ARRL" constitution and
bylaws prohibit "lobbying" efforts. Otherwise, it appears
that the Newington crowd and/or the BoD just flipped the
rank and file a bird and are going to do whatever d**n they
feel like with the membership's money.

73,
Clay N4AOX

2958. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 03:12:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD20004.554AD7CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42227

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> How do you get that from my post CAM? I didn't say anything of the sort.

You're not one of the "some hams" I was talking about.

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Some hams think the legacy modes are all we'll ever need.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2959. ___NO CODE=NO HAM.___

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 04:07:05 UTC
From: stevebg <sbgood@njnet.com>
Message-ID: <3CD20C99.604688C6@njnet.com>
Source record: 42228

NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.

Suck it up, CBers. Suuuuuuuuuck it up.

2960. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 04:35:26 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aatted4238f@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42235

Why not mount a mobile rig in the boat? Maritime mobile? I am sure that would get some interesting responses!

:)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> Amateur radio .... fugetabowdit till winter.
>
> K0HB
> --
> "If people concentrated on the really important
> things of life, there'd be a shortage of fishing rods."
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2961. This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 04:38:04 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <MuoA8.652$jy3.484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42229

http://www.non-sequitur.com/comics/2002/april/0414.jpg

(&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;) 73, de Hans, K0HB

2962. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 11:53:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205030353.5bbcfa8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42230

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0205021202.1cedd9b@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<9f4bfe89.0205010846.18c150c3@posting.google.com>...
> > Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
> > FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >
> > As of May 14, 2000:
> >
> > Novice - 49,329
> > Tech - 205,394
> > Tech Plus - 128,860
> > General - 112,677
> > Advanced - 99,782
> > Extra - 78,750
> > Total - 674,792
> >
> >
> > As of April 30, 2002:
> >
> > Novice - 38,584 (decrease of 10,745)
> > Tech - 239,555 (increase of 34,161)
> > Tech Plus - 80,301 (decrease of 48,559)
> > General - 139,022 (increase of 26,345)
> > Advanced - 85,691 (decrease of 14,091)
> > Extra - 100,244 (increase of 21,494)
> > Total - 683,397 (increase of 8,605)
> >
> > The number of Extras topped 100,000 on April 23, 2002.
>
> Yes, and they will surpass the number of Generals sometime in 2005...
> as I predicted last year...

Probably sooner. Percentage-wise, the fastest-growing class is the
Extra.

> isn't there someone who will owe me a Steak dinner over this?

I dunno. Show up in Philly when W1RFI does and we'll figure it out.

(Hey Ed - that's a hint...)
>
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> It is obvious why many of the defeated and defeatist die-hard ilk want

> to "move past the numbers"... they just DON'T LIKE WHAT THEY SEE... or
> can't bear to see it.

One of the reasons I keep posting these totals every half-month is so
there will be a record in Usenet archives.
>
> More telling than the two-year comparison of numbers, is the trend
> that has become increasingly clear over the last year... that is, the
> overall ARS numbers are dropping(especially as a percent of total US
> population). This is clear even from the first degree equation(for
> those who can't seem to see trends from 2nd degree equations).

The numbers were GROWING from September 1998 to March 2001, when US
ARS numbers peaked. Since March 2001 the total has bounced around 683
kilohams.
>
> Just as the die-hards who tried to hold the line on 5/13/20 WPM,
> created a "rubber-band effect" that eventually caused the Extra
> requirement to snap to 5WPM...

Huh? What does that mean?

FCC has been deemphasizing code testing since 1975, when they first
tried to implement a nocodetest license. Then came the end of sending
tests, multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank options, and medical
waivers.

The R&O for 98-143 made it perfectly clear that FCC sees "no
regulatory purpose" in code testing EXCEPT meeting the requirements of
S25.5. Despite majority of comments opposing it, FCC reduced code
testing to the bare minimum they considered adequate to meet S25.5.
The next step is blatantly obvious: If/when S25.5 goes, so does code
testing in the USA. (And most of the rest of the world).

> these same folks are now trying to keep
> younger people out of the Service,

WHO?? HOW??

There are preschoolers with ham licenses and elementary schoolers with
Extras. The ARRL "Big Project" is aimed squarely at young people. K0HB
has listed a whole series of efforts aimed at young people. Locally,
there is a serious and long-term BSA-ARS connection.

> which will eventually cause an
> alarming drop in the overall numbers(due to the lopsided age
> demographics),

Been doing that for decades. I'm 48 - how old are you?

> thereby causing another "rubber-band effect" to
> occur(most likely in 2006 or 2008),

The Tech license now consists of 35 multiple choice questions from a published Q%A pool. While full understanding of everything in the test is a bit of work, merely passing it is not beyond the capabilities of most elementary school kids who are interested in the material.

There have been substantive discussions here about what the license structure and requirements should be in a post-S25.5 era. I can dig them up if you want a real discussion.

> leading to the implementation of a
> resurrected Novice class geared towards the modern digital, and post
> Morse-Code, era...

You comment on the refarming petition yet?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2963. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 11:59:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020503075958.06869.00006008@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42233

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>I think that "ARRL", whoever you are referring to, owes
>someone an explanation, since the "ARRL" constitution and
>bylaws prohibit "lobbying" efforts.

Perhaps you should ask them for the explanation.

>Otherwise, it appears
>that the Newington crowd and/or the BoD just flipped the
>rank and file a bird and are going to do whatever d**n they
>feel like with the membership's money.

I suspect that you may be the only rank and file to think that ARRL's work with Congress to promote Amateur Radio is flipping the members a bird.

What an odd view you must have of the world.

73,Ed Hare, W1RFI

2964. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 12:01:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020503080149.06869.00006009@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42231

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>Wrong guess. Most of Chris Imlay's work for the League is related to the
>>FCC. About half of mine is.

>That is interesting detail information, however phrased in a somewhat
>aggravating tone.

If you found that aggravating, perhaps it would be best if you and I picked
this up again when you are feeling better.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2965. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 12:04:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020503080408.06869.00006010@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42234

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>What mode do you use on 30 meters?

Morse encoded OOK CW, the few times I have operated 30 meters.

>What's your recent experience in the HF Novice bands?

None.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2966. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 12:06:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020503080615.06869.00006011@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42236

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> He's just doing what you do - shaping the "facts" to fit your Agenda du
>jour.

I have seen your interpretation of some of my facts, Dick. Although I don't always choose the best words, I think we all know where the problem is...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2967. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 12:07:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020503080756.06869.00006012@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42237

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>It would do well for Hare to stop demonstrating pique and aggravation
>on perceived negative criticsm of the ARRL or of certain "regulars" in
>this newsgroup. All are in the public view. NO ONE is exempt.

It would do well for Anderson to keep in mind that he has absolutely no control over what anyone says in this newsgroup but himself. It is a bit disturbing that he would like to.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2968. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 12:09:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020503080923.06869.00006013@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42238

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Is this another case where you say I said what you wanted me to have said?
>Yes,
>it is. You can never quote a post where I ever said, or even implied any
>such
>thing and you know it.

I think we will let people's memory of what you said speak for itself, Dick.

> So much for the honesty of W1RFI.

I think I will people's memory of my posts speak for itself, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2969. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 12:12:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020503081230.06869.00006015@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 42232

From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net

>Well, Riley thinks he can clean up the airwaves by threatening to
>write violators more nasty letters.

For most of the violators, that has worked quite well. For those that choose to ignore them, from what I have seen, most of the cases have gone to NALs.

The FCC can issue a lot more warning letters than it can issue NALs. I don't think that enforcement would be well served if the FCC issued only NALs.

In an ideal world, ever rules violator would be instantly fined. I think that what can be done in practice is a reasonable second-best alternative.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2970. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 13:16:18 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <C4wA8.2687$vT1.248559@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42239

>>> I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.

>> It doesn't really matter, Jim. I think Brian not
>> only believes that Jim has cronies, he probably
>> has cohorts too.

> Possibly even a few mechanics, minions, and lackeys.

Not to mention the sycophants and stooges.

And then there are opportunities for leadership in the positions of lead crony, stooge supervisor, consulting sycophant, mechanic vice president, etc. One has to work one's way up the hierarchy, though, by starting out as lackey associate.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2971. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 13:46:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD215C2.965BC6CE@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42240

N2EY wrote:

> > I wonder if it isn't a mistake to even go there.
>
> I think a worse mistake would be to just turn over the Novice bands to 'phone.
>

Certainly agree with that.

> The "300 baud" and "1 kHz FSK" specs in Part 97 make experimentation with new
> modes on HF difficult. At the same time, merely dumping all restrictions could
> turn the bands into a howling mess.

Yes indeed..

> The middle road is to have a bit of space
> where folks can try out HBIs (half-baked ideas) and see what happens. The
> Novice subbands on 80, 40 and 15 are a good starting place.
>
>

Not the best solution but maybe the best we will ge - if we can get it. I think
I'm becoming convinced.

2972. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 13:46:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD2175E.4D9B9091@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42241

CAM wrote:

> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > Excuse me folks, but isn't ALL of Amateur Radio supposed to be to some
> > degree experimenters?
>
> Some hams think the legacy modes are all we'll ever need.

And who might they be? So far we haven't had any of them turn up here on rrap.
How do you know they think that?

Surely a "genius" of your caliber wouldn't confuse anyone who believe that even
loder modes which have long-proven communications value are worth keeping in
ham radio believe that. You *couldn't* be that dumb ..... Could you?

2973. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 13:46:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD21932.3717B18A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42242

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> How do you get that from my post CAM? I didn't say anything of the sort.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CD1C816.E40A0D99@IEEE.org...
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > > Excuse me folks, but isn't ALL of Amateur Radio supposed to be to some
> > > > degree experimenters?
> > >
> > > Some hams think the legacy modes are all we'll ever need.
> > >

CAM and Ed Hare read the posts of others to fit their own specifications so
that the poster said what they wanted him to say. Makes it much easier to
criticise him for it.

2974. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 13:59:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ZIwA8.1276$jy3.1124@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42243

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote

> Why not mount a mobile rig in the boat?

You must not be a fisherman, or wouldn't ask that question!!!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"If people concentrated on the really important
things of life, there'd be a shortage of fishing rods."

2975. Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 14:10:40 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ATwA8.1298$jy3.663@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42244

The following came from K3KO -- direct contact info is included if interested.

(Incidentally, looks like they've found a way to make good use of 27MHz freqs down there -- they've turned them into ham freqs! FCC, are you listening?)

Guys,

I have been in contact several times with H44A (Sam).

In conjunction with their National Disaster Office in the Solomon's, Sam is trying to get the locals licensed.

There are many obstacles. The people of the Solomon's exist in a mostly non-cash environment. The personal purchase of anything like radio gear is out of the question.

Sam is in need to donations of ham and CB gear. In H44, nine of the CB channels have been allocated to amateur radio. CB gear is quite useable for them.

He will also welcome with "open arms" any ham from any country who wants to help out teaching (+ equipment work). Stays for weeks to months would be greatly appreciated.

This might be a great opportunity for those interested in performing international good will via amateur radio.

Sam and the director can be reached via E-mail:

lotiyates@yahoo.com

Sam is H44A and the director is Mr. Loti Yates.

UNCLE SAM wants you!

73 de Brian/K3KO

2976. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 14:16:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD29BCF.A9EE5D93@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42245

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Some hams think the legacy modes are all we'll ever need.
>
> And who might they be? So far we haven't had any of them turn up here on rrap.
> How do you know they think that?

Because they badmouth hams experimenting with digital modes every
chance they get. Your postings are clearly anti-digital, Dick. Doesn't
the FCC desiring that members of the ARS upgrade to the 21st century
indicate to you that the handwriting is on the wall?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

----------== Posted via Newsfeeds.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeeds.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Ulimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2977. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 14:18:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD29C21.381CB40@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42246

Dick Carroll wrote:
> CAM and Ed Hare read the posts of others to fit their own specifications so
> that the poster said what they wanted him to say. Makes it much easier to
> criticise him for it.

We are reading the words that you post, Dick. Perhaps you need some
English lessons?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

----------== Posted via Newsfeeds.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeeds.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Ulimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2978. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 14:40:32 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <AjxA8.2781$vT1.255272@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42247

Ed, W1RFI, wrote:

> The FCC can issue a lot more warning letters than it
> can issue NALs. I don't think that enforcement would
> be well served if the FCC issued only NALs.
>
> In an ideal world, every rules violator would be instantly
> fined. I think that what can be done in practice is a
> reasonable second-best alternative.

You will recall that I, as Founder of No Test International (NTI), proposed that the only qualification for an amateur radio license be a valid credit card number. Under that system, you'd know you screwed up when you got your monthly statement and found an instant payment to the FCC in response to an electronic NAL.

;-) Have a Nice Day.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2979. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 14:40:33 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <BjxA8.2782$vT1.255412@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42248

Jim, N2EY, asked:

> Who manufactured the first amateur "all band HF"
> (that means 80/40/20/15/10 meters back then, folks)
> SSB transceiver?

Cosmophone??

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2980. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 14:40:34 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <CjxA8.2783$vT1.255491@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42249

>>> It is money well spent, Ryan.

>>Total revenue, FY2000, Part 1, Line 12 = $11,625,723.

>>Roughly $68 per member...

> In part, a result of the excess revenues over expenses
> from the sale of ARRL publications.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Sure as hell outperformed all my so-called "investments"
over the past couple of years. No complaints at all.
Just wish I had scraped together enough for a Life
Membership back in '62.

Dayumn! I've been licensed 40 years? Whut hoppened?

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2981. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 14:55:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD2A4DC.C3052194@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42250

K7JEB wrote:
> Dayumn! I've been licensed 40 years? Whut hoppened?

Wow Jim, you're eligible for membership in the Old Old
Timer's Club. How time flies when you're having fun.

----------== Posted via Newsfeeds.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeeds.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Ulimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2982. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 15:34:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020503113408.07469.00006220@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42251

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 05/03/02 08:07 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020503080756.06869.00006012@mb-mf.aol.com>

>It would do well for Anderson to keep in mind that he has absolutely no
>control
>over what anyone says in this newsgroup but himself. It is a bit disturbing
>that he would like to.

Come, come Ed....You KNOW Lennie's favorite rant is "Do As I Say, Not Do As
I Do."

73

Steve, K4YZ

2983. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 18:14:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CD2D384.77D92396@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42252

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote
>
> > Why not mount a mobile rig in the boat?
>
> You must not be a fisherman, or wouldn't ask that question!!!
>

CQ CQ TROUT, CQ CQ TROUT. Oh, wait, trout are
river/stream fish, yes? I'm not a fisherman.......

2984. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 20:42:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205031242.7acc7114@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42253

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<3CD215C2.965BC6CE@townsqr.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > > I wonder if it isn't a mistake to even go there.
> > >
> > I think a worse mistake would be to just turn over the Novice bands to 'phone.

> Certainly agree with that.

Then we gotta at least let FCC know.

> > The "300 baud" and "1 kHz FSK" specs in Part 97 make experimentation with
> > new modes on HF difficult. At the same time, merely dumping all
> > restrictions could turn the bands into a howling mess.
>
> Yes indeed..

> > The middle road is to have a bit of space
> > where folks can try out HBIs (half-baked ideas) and see what happens. The
> > Novice subbands on 80, 40 and 15 are a good starting place.

> Not the best solution but maybe the best we will ge - if we can get it.

The "best" theoretical solution is worthless if we can't get it.

> > I think I'm becoming convinced.

There are currently 90 comments on view at the FCC website, and the
most
recent is a few days old.

Here's what I submitted. Feel free to copy or use as a starting point:

--

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's)
RM-10413 Amateur Service Rules Governing)
Operating Privileges)
)

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF JAMES MICCOLIS, N2EY

OVERVIEW

These comments are in response to the ARRL proposal for "refarming" the
existing HF "Novice sub-bands" on the 80, 40 and 15 meter bands.

I. Discussion:

The ARRL petition does not address the implementation of new technologies by radio amateurs as repeatedly requested by the Commission in WT Docket 98-143. The ARRL petition simply proposes the elimination of the Novice subbands and their reallocation to existing popular modes, primarily analog voice and image. The ARRL polling method did not address any spectrum allocation alternatives other than possible changes to the existing subband structure.

I propose that the Commission take this opportunity to provide the Amateur Radio Service with a new incentive to try out new modes on the amateur HF bands by permitting and encouraging the use of new, experimental and nontraditional modes in the Novice subbands without the need for a Special Temporary Authority (STA).

Advances in technology, changes in the license structure and test requirements have eliminated the need for special HF subbands for Novice and Technician Plus licensees. The "Novice subbands" have outlived their regulatory purpose, so I propose they be reallocated to enhance the ability of the Amateur Radio service "to contribute to the advancement of the radio art".

II Proposal:

A. To "de-populate" the current Novice segments, I propose that all Novice
(and Technician with code credit) licensees be authorized to use Morse
code(CW) in all of the MF/HF spectrum now authorized for General class
licensees, using the current power output level restriction of 200 watts.

B. I propose that the current Novice sub-bands be reallocated for non-traditional and experimental modes such as digitized voice, digitized
image, high speed data, and other forward looking communications methods. Modes currently allowed in these segments would continue to
be allowed without restriction.

C. I propose that Commission grant broad discretion to amateurs in the technical aspects of mode use in these subbands as to modulation and
coding schemes, non-traditional technologies, and data/symbol rates.
Specifically, the current limitations on occupied bandwidth and data/symbol rate limitations would not apply in these subbands, provided the occupied bandwidth of a signal is entirely within the

experimental subband. The encoding and modulations used would be
required to be documented according to current Commission rules.
This
broad discretion would only apply within the experimental subbands,
in order to minimize interference. “Analog” voice modes
such as SSB
and AM would not be allowed in these subbands.

III. Conclusion

I have held an amateur license since 1967 and been an ARRL member
since 1968. I responded to the ARRL poll but was frustrated by the
limited options offered by the poll. In most cases I agree with the
ARRL position, but this proposal lacks vision for the future of
amateur radio. “Refarming” the Novice subbands to
experimental use will facilitate and encourage experimentation by
radio amateurs without the need for extensive rule changes or extra
paperwork, and will avoid most interference issues between users of
existing modes and experimental modes.

Respectfully submitted,

James Miccolis, N2EY
136 Morningside Circle
Wayne, PA 19087

--

Anybody else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2985. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-03 21:09:09 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <aauu9l$10rl$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 42254

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>"K�HB" wrote:
>
>> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote
>>
>> > Why not mount a mobile rig in the boat?
>>
>> You must not be a fisherman, or wouldn't ask that question!!!
>>
>
>CQ CQ TROUT, CQ CQ TROUT. Oh, wait, trout are
>river/stream fish, yes? I'm not a fisherman.....

No, trout are found in lakes as well. Where I grew up the small
lakes were either pickerel lakes or trout lakes (almost never both
in the same lake for some reason). Big rivers usually had pickerel
as the best eating fish. Note that "pickerel" is the same fish they
often call "walleye" south of the great lakes.

I like to eat trout the best. Caught early in the morning, so there's
enough time for the seasoning to take before they're cooked for an
on-shore lunch. I have a piece of property on a small, very cold
spring-fed trout lake tucked up between some hills which has the best
tasting trout on the entire planet (along with the world's worst black
flies in running-water season). When I retire I plan to spend as much
time there as my wife will allow (though not in the spring). Not that
this makes me a fisherman either, I like to eat the fish but find what
you have to do to catch them not particularly interesting. Real
fishermen seem to derive such pleasure from the act to make it a close
second to sex, whether the fish are biting or not, and are hence horrified
that I sometimes listen to a walkman while doing it (the act of fishing,
not the other one).

Dennis Ferguson

2986. Re: ___NO CODE=NO HAM.___

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 01:06:43 UTC
From: eccraigjr@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020503210643.01697.00003872@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 42255

```
>NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
>
>Suck it up, CBers. Suuuuuuuuuck it up.

====================
||||||||||||||||||||
0 1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
====================
Digital Troll-O-Meter

73 de Bert
WA2SI
```

2987. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 01:08:25 UTC
From: eccraigjr@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020503210825.01697.00003873@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 42256

>http://www.non-sequitur.com/comics/2002/april/0414.jpg
>
>(ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

LOL! Nice, Hans.
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2988. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 01:26:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020503212658.01774.00002575@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42257

In article <eV1A8.309$ce4.32147@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Amateur radio .... fugetabowdit till winter.

Hansl:

Wassamatta .... you don't do Field Day?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2989. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 01:33:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <uTGA8.7$Jb.2637@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42258

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> Hansl:
>
> Wassamatta .... you don't do Field Day?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

0400-1000 shift in the CW tent. Look for "W0EF 2A MN QRQ PSE"

2990. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 03:05:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020503230516.01774.00002587@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42259

In article <3CD1F3E3.8E3FE4DF@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
<wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>I think that "ARRL", whoever you are referring to, owes
>someone an explanation, since the "ARRL" constitution and
>bylaws prohibit "lobbying" efforts. Otherwise, it appears
>that the Newington crowd and/or the BoD just flipped the
>rank and file a bird and are going to do whatever d**n they
>feel like with the membership's money.
>
>73,
>Clay N4AOX

Clay:

Are you saying that you don't want the ARRL to lobby on behalf
of the ARS in Washington? If I had my way, we'd slash K1ZZ's
six-figure paycheck in half and spend the other half on the lobbying
efforts! If Sumner was really worth that kind of dough, the ARRL
would never have any financial woes, and the ARS would not be
on the verge of extinction!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2991. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 03:05:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020503230516.01774.00002588@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42260

In article <MuoA8.652$jy3.484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>http://www.non-sequitur.com/comics/2002/april/0414.jpg
>
>(ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

While I agree that the Non-sequitur comic strip did seem to quite
accurately capture the essential character of Usenet, it did so in
it's usually heavy-handed, politically-correct manner. This makes
me wonder -- is it possible for *anyone* to be truly acceptable to
the so-called "liberals" today? How would a politically-oriented
but conservative comic strip fare in today's media? Can anyone
point to such a comic strip? Why does the conservative point-of-
view go virtually unrepresented in our mass media? The closest
thing I can think of as a conservative, family-oriented, comic strip
is the Family Circus, but it is so saccharine as to be annoying to
anyone with a remotely realistic worldview.

What DO the liberals want? What IS their agenda? What could
possibly appease them, other than the one thing they really
want to impose upon us, which is global socialism? Keep in
mind, in a socialist world, things like Usenet, and comic strips
like Non-Sequitur, would not exist! After all, the ruling class of
liberal elites would no longer believe that they served any useful
purpose, since THEY would now be in power!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2992. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 05:08:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD29674.F0C0F101@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42261

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > He's just doing what you do - shaping the "facts" to fit your Agenda du
> >jour.
>
> I have seen your interpretation of some of my facts, Dick. Although I don't
> always choose the best words, I think we all know where the problem is...

> I think we do, too. You always change what I say into something I DIDN'T say
> in order for it to correspond with your version of something you can easily
> criticise. I could criticise it too, it YOU said it.

Yes I think we do, too. You always want to change what I say into something I *didn't* say, in order to make it codrespond with your version of something you can easily criticize. I would criticize it too, if you said it!

If you truly believe that me saying that a government employee in Cross' would be sensitive to a joker like Carl yelling "Luddite!" at everyone who disagrees with his worldview of radio, is the same as saying that "the ARRL can get anything they want by threatening FCC officials" is the same, your understanding of the English language is primitive indeed. To say nothing of your understanding of the workings of government and politics.

2993. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 05:08:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD3511E.8ACA296A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42262

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Some hams think the legacy modes are all we'll ever need.
> >
> > And who might they be? So far we haven't had any of them turn up here on rrap.
> > How do you know they think that?
>
> Because they badmouth hams experimenting with digital modes every
> chance they get.

Who on RRAP *are* you referring to now, Old Sot? Carl? I thought he badmouthed everything BUT digital. It couldn't be me, all I badmouth is Carl, you, and Ed occasionally when he gets a kink in his tail which clearly has negative effects on his reading comprehension.

As for who is actually DOING digital, as opposed to yakking about forcing all others to do it, It sure isn't you and Carl. You have the yakking market cornered.

> Your postings are clearly anti-digital, Dick.

Yeah, RIGHT. You spring near a kilobuck for a STS-for PACTOR instead of just building your own, as you insist that all us lesser mortals must do, while I busily work the soundcard digital modes SEVERAL of them, and you make such a statement SOLELY because I support the use and testing of CW in ham radio. And you still act like I'm the goat here. But the readers know, old sot. They know.

> Doesn't
> the FCC desiring that members of the ARS upgrade to the 21st century
> indicate to you that the handwriting is on the wall?

The FCC really couldn't care less what hams do. One or two *individual employee*/hams have made noises on their own. The Commission couldn't care less about what modes we use. If you believe the modes we use will save our frequencies when the right $$$$$ comes asking, you're a dreaming fool.

>
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeeds.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
> http://www.newsfeeds.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Ulimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2994. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 05:08:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD35186.A8928839@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42263

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > CAM and Ed Hare read the posts of others to fit their own specifications so
> > that the poster said what they wanted him to say. Makes it much easier to
> > criticise him for it.
>
> We are reading the words that you post, Dick. Perhaps you need some
> English lessons?

It sure is curious that you, Ed and Carl are the trio that seems to have problems with understanding my posts while no one else in the whole wide world seems to have any problem at all. Of course we all know why.

2995. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 05:08:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD35200.C1A143D0@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42264

K7JEB wrote:

> Jim, N2EY, asked:
>
> > Who manufactured the first amateur "all band HF"
> > (that means 80/40/20/15/10 meters back then, folks)
> > SSB transceiver?
>
> Cosmophone??

That's the way I remember the ads in QST. Much too pricey
for any but the most elite of the elite. There was a Babcock
rig out about that time,too, IIRC.

2996. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 13:18:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD3DF90.89694C49@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42265

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Your postings are clearly anti-digital, Dick.
>
> Yeah, RIGHT. You spring near a kilobuck for a STS-for PACTOR instead of just building
> your own, as you insist that all us lesser mortals must do, while I busily work the
> soundcard digital modes SEVERAL of them, and you make such a statement SOLELY because
> I support the use and testing of CW in ham radio. And you still act like I'm the goat
> here. But the readers know, old sot. They know.

All I have done is suggest that digital software and DSP programming is a good
way for amateurs to experiment nowadays. You responded that we don't need any
digital experimentation and that the modes we have are good enough for the
foreseeable future. Your postings are clearly anti-digital, anti-experimentation,
and anti-progress. What are you afraid of, Dick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2997. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 13:20:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD3E005.C0CC562E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42266

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > We are reading the words that you post, Dick. Perhaps you need some
> > English lessons?
>
> It sure is curious that you, Ed and Carl are the trio that seems to have problems
> with understanding my posts while no one else in the whole wide world seems to
> have any problem at all.

The rest of the world has written you off, Dick. We three are still trying to
understand why you say something and then in the next posting deny saying it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2998. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 13:27:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD3E1C5.8976AED9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42267

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > I think we do, too. You always change what I say into something I DIDN'T say
> > in order for it to correspond with your version of something you can easily
> > criticise. I could criticise it too, it YOU said it.
>
> Yes I think we do, too. You always want to change what I say into something I
> *didn't* say, in order to make it codrespond with your version of something you
> can easily criticize. I would criticize it too, if you said it!

Dick, the above W1RFI quote wasn't in the posting to which you replied. Where
did it come from? I can't find it on Google.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2999. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 13:49:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CD3E6F9.3ABD4A31@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42268

Larry, was that rant a response to the cartoon, or was it your
impression of the kid in the cartoon? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <MuoA8.652$jy3.484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >http://www.non-sequitur.com/comics/2002/april/0414.jpg
> >
> >(ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> While I agree that the Non-sequitur comic strip did seem to quite
> accurately capture the essential character of Usenet, it did so in
> it's usually heavy-handed, politically-correct manner. This makes
> me wonder -- is it possible for *anyone* to be truly acceptable to
> the so-called "liberals" today? <some snippage>

3000. Re: ___NO CODE=NO HAM.___

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 13:51:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CD3E779.D4581545@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42269

Gee, I dunno about the Troll-O-Meter. This old troll is repeated every
couple months and getting pretty stale.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
> >
> >Suck it up, CBers. Suuuuuuuuuck it up.
>
> ====================
> ||||||||||||||||||||
> 0 1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
> ====================
> Digital Troll-O-Meter
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

3001. Re: ___NO CODE=NO HAM.___

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 16:36:27 UTC
From: sir.oblivion@public.com
Message-ID: <3cd4a8e6$1_8@nopics.sjc>
Source record: 42297

"stevebg" <sbgood@njnet.com> wrote in message
news:3CD20C99.604688C6@njnet.com...
> NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
>
> Suck it up, CBers. Suuuuuuuuuck it up.
>

Considering the average age of amateurs is constantly rising and the cost of HF equipment is beyond the average new users reach; code and for that matter amateur service as we know it will be long gone within a decade +/-.

3002. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 16:38:51 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <v8UA8.5260$vT1.410945@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42270

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD3DF90.89694C49@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Your postings are clearly anti-digital, Dick.
> >
> > Yeah, RIGHT. You spring near a kilobuck for a STS-for PACTOR instead
of just building
> > your own, as you insist that all us lesser mortals must do, while I
busily work the
> > soundcard digital modes SEVERAL of them, and you make such a statement
SOLELY because
> > I support the use and testing of CW in ham radio. And you still act
like I'm the goat
> > here. But the readers know, old sot. They know.
>
> All I have done is suggest that digital software and DSP programming is
a good
> way for amateurs to experiment nowadays. You responded that we don't
need any
> digital experimentation and that the modes we have are good enough for
the
> foreseeable future. Your postings are clearly anti-digital,
anti-experimentation,
> and anti-progress. What are you afraid of, Dick?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Cecil, the biggest breakthru in digital technology is the DSP side of the house where a receiver and to a lesser extent transmitter can be dialed up more or less on cue. It has come a long way but has a long way to go as I am sure you will admit. This is intriguing, just as the Collins mechanical filter was intriguing about 50 years ago. And a DSP rig will do an ace job on CW and SSB.

And while we are at it, we can apply software to synchronous detection and realize the promise made about 50 years ago that DSB signals with or without pilot carriers can be spaced at 2 kHz and by ignoring things not identical on both sides do so without noticeable interference. The FCC would thank us firmly because it would finally put an end to FM for communications and free up gazillions of Public Safety and commercial channels without having them hop all over creation.

Try attacking a commercial FM channel as a digital signal; why not, Heathkit did it about 40 years ago and it had far better fidelity than anything Armstrong ever envisioned.

But no, you digifreaks gots to go out and attack the simplest (and cheapest, wetware is really cheap) communication method known to man because it gives you a manhood problem. BFD. Sure SSB is getting very long in tooth but its major failing is that the receiver is pretty much on its own; it is harder to process concentrated communication because it does not supply a Rosetta Stone to do much translation or auto-adjustment with. Even NTSC television envisioned that with VIR and FM used the identical sideband thing to do AFC with TV taking a few years to use the same method.

No one is really defending the status quo except the ogres that exist in the minds of some digifreaks who seem to be able to drive themselves to neurosis with no help from me or anyone else. These things are evolutionary and always have been but there seems to be a cadre of yoyos who feel called upon to build the New Jerusalem upon the ruins of the old one; and they are far better at creating the ruins than much else.

For what it is worth, I like the idea of an 'futz-mode' band in the middle of the regular bands for the same reason it made sense to put Novices there. Kept them out of trouble.

Dick N BK

3003. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 17:18:12 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205040918.57276344@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42271

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020503230516.01774.00002588@mb-cg.aol.com>...
> What DO the liberals want? What IS their agenda? What could
> possibly appease them, other than the one thing they really
> want to impose upon us, which is global socialism? Keep in
> mind, in a socialist world, things like Usenet, and comic strips
> like Non-Sequitur, would not exist! After all, the ruling class of
> liberal elites would no longer believe that they served any useful
> purpose, since THEY would now be in power!

...and what do conservatives want, Larry? When capitalism is allowed
to run its course unchecked, eventually ALL of the power will be
concentrated in one individual... Yes, unchecked capitalism leads to
Monarchy(a form of Dictatorship). And, just like with a totalitarian
communist state, a totalitarian Monarchy wouldn't allow comic stips
with opposing points of view.

What we need Larry is a little more TOLERANCE of others and of other's
viewpoints. Any kind of government that is INTOLERANT of opposing
viewpoints is bad.

3004. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 17:41:40 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205040941.49f8ad0e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42272

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<9f4bfe89.0205030353.5bbcfa8f@posting.google.com>...

> One of the reasons I keep posting these totals every half-month is so
there will be a record in Usenet archives.

A noble goal, I suppose. I'm not trying to discourage you or
anything, but there is a very strong possibility that freely available
Usenet records WON'T be maintained very much longer. Hopefully, they
can be maintained for quite a few more years with a small amount of
advertising.

> You comment on the refarming petition yet?

Why? How will changing around a few HF frequency allocations help
promote the Service? I think it just shows how ridiculously petty and
out-of-touch ham radio is with the modern world.

What we need is a truly revolutionary way to allow young people to
enter the Service... a replacement for the old Novice class, if you
will. A faily simple 25 question exam which provides these folks with
a non-renewable 5 year license to operate on 1.25cm.

3005. New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 18:01:54 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205041001.1f748ec2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42273

****
Proposal to FCC to reinstate the Novice license class in the Amateur Radio Service - REV B

Due to the elimination of the Novice Class license, and improving communications technologies, the Technician Class license no longer serves well as an introductory license class; especially in terms of drawing young members into the Service. As a result of license restructuring, it is now actually harder for young people to obtain an Amateur license than it was before restructuring.

In this critical era of global competition, especially in the wireless communications arena, it is essential that we provide a means for properly educating our young people in RF communications operation and theory.

Today, technologies like the Family Radio Service, Multi-Use Radio Service, high-speed telephone & cable modems, the Internet, and inexpensive cellular telephones, have overshadowed the privileges of the Amateur Radio Service, and made the requirements for young beginners to obtain a Technician Class license out of date. Additionally, the Technician Class license has now evolved into a beginning and ending point for most Amateurs now entering the service, who are mostly interested in VHF/UHF communications, rather than HF communications. Incentive licensing has virtually been eliminated.

The need for a Service dedicated to the goal of teaching young radio users proper radio operation techniques and etiquette can clearly be seen in the disarray present on the Citizen's Band Service frequencies. The fact is, the Citizen's Band has become the defacto introductory service for young people just beginning to learn to experiment with radio; yet the Citizen's Band is a very poor environment for young people to be learning in.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Novice Class license reinstated in the Amateur Radio Service, with minor modifications to requirements and privileges to reflect the today's changing dynamics in radio technology and usage; and to expressly encourage young individuals to enter the Amateur Radio Service to improve their understanding of RF communications theory and operations, provide a healthy learning environment, and encourage radio experimentation.

On VHF and UHF frequencies, the privileges and restrictions will be the same as exists for the current grandfathered Novice Class license.

New Novice Class license holders would not have any privileges on HF frequencies.

Consistent with the implementation of the No Code Technician License, in which the existing Technician Class license holders were placed in a new class known as Technician Plus, existing Novice Class license holders would be placed in a new class known as Novice Plus. Novice Plus license holders would hold all the VHF/UHF privileges of the new Novice Class license, plus their existing HF privileges. Consistent with the manner in with Technician Class license holders may upgrade to Technician Plus by passing a 5wpm Morse Code examination, new Novice class licensees will also be allowed to upgrade to Novice Plus by passing a 5wpm Morse Code examination.

The new license class would have the following goals:

1) Encourage more young people to enter the Amateur Radio Service, by providing an entry-level ARS license class that includes privileges allowing reliable short-range voice and data communications.

2) Not significantly impact existing users of the affected Amateur Radio Service frequency bands.

3) Encourage basic knowledge of radio, electronics, operating principles and etiquette among a wider segment of the general population.

The Novice license exam would consist of 25 elementary questions. Emphasis would be put on understanding the operational, technical, safety, etiquette and emergency questions that relate specifically to the new Novice Class license privileges. All questions containing calculations would contain small integer(whole-number) input values and have relatively small integer results. Novice licensees would be required to have a general understanding of Ohm's Law and Power relations. They should be required to have a general understanding of how antenna length relates to wavelength; and have a knowledge of transmitter power, antenna gain, transmission line loss, and the ability to perform a simple ERP calculation would be required. General knowledge of simple resistive circuits, and their power dissipation, would be required. New Novice Class licensees will need to have a basic understanding of digital communication methods. Consistent with the final form of the old Novice Class license examination, knowledge of capacitors and inductors would not be required.

Stewart Teaze - N0MHS

3006. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 18:50:55 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <8EF89379B87930C3.CE6E867431630BBE.9AEC8E7DF54BA638@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42274

On 4 May 2002 11:01:54 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>The fact is, the Citizen's Band has become the defacto
>introductory service for young people just beginning to learn to
>experiment with radio; yet the Citizen's Band is a very poor
>environment for young people to be learning in.

Why? They have the chance to get all of the yelling obscenities and
making fart noises out of their systems before they get to the hame
bands.

>On VHF and UHF frequencies, the privileges and restrictions will be
>the same as exists for the current grandfathered Novice Class license.

Well, it *might* revive 220.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3007. ARNewsline 1290 - May 3 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 19:26:20 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020504152620.19405.00006217@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 42276

I corrected the date. Newsline said it was Friday May 1. Friday is May 3.

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1290 - May 3 2002

**

SPECIAL NOTICE TO THOSE WHO ONLY READ THE PRINT VERSION OF THIS NEWSCAST

ARNewsline™ 1290 coverage of the flight of Mark Shuttleworth, ZS-RSA, is very audio intensive. This historic meaning of this story really cannot be appreciated in a print version. We strongly urge you this week to visit www.arnewsline.org, click on the newscast number, download the MP3 file and listen to a moment in history that was made possible by Amateur Radio. Thank you.

**

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1290 with a release date of Friday, May 3rd 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Mark Shuttleworth comes on the air from the I-S-S and South Africa cheers. This story is first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1290 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SECOND SPACE VISITOR OPERATES HAM RADIO FROM THE ISS

South African amateur researcher Mark Shuttleworth has made his way to the International Space Station and to ham radio. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Roy Neal, K6DUE, has been following the mission and brings us up to date:

--

(STUDENTS CHEER)

MORE THAN 200 STUDENTS, IN SOUTH AFRICA, CHEERED THEIR NEW HERO, MARK SHUTTLEWORTH. THEY TALKED TO HIM VIA AMATEUR RADIO. NICE DX. ON THE FIRST CALL, THESE ARE STUDENTS IN CAPE TOWN, TALKING TO THE PASSENGER IN SPACE BY WAY OF HAM STATION VK5ZAI, IN AUSTRALIA.

(STUDENT QUESTION AND SHUTTLEWORTH RESPONSE)

MARK SHUTTLEWORTH HAS BECOME A HERO IN SOUTH AFRICA. TO QUOTE THE HEADLINES: “HE’S THE FIRST AFRICAN IN SPACE” AND HAM RADIO HAS ENHANCED THAT IMAGE.

USING ARISS -- THE AMATEUR RADIO ON THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION -- WITH SPECIAL PERMISSION AND AN HONORARY LICENSE -- SHUTTLEWORTH LINED UP CONTACTS WITH HUNDREDS OF SCHOOL KIDS -- SCHOOL LEARNERS THEY'RE CALLED IN SOUTH AFRICA. HE ALSO MADE SOME GENERAL CONTACTS WITH HAM RADIO OPERATORS.

ON FOUR DIFFERENT DAYS, STUDENTS GATHERED AT FOUR SPECIAL SCHOOLS, STARTING WITH SHUTTLEWORTH'S ALMA MATER, BISHOPS IN CAPE TOWN. ALL TOLD, ABOUT A THOUSAND SOUTH AFRICAN STUDENT LEARNERS SHARED THE EXPERIENCE OF DIRECT CONTACT.

ON THE SECOND DAY SOME 300 STUDENTS GATHERED AT THE HAVENSIDE COMMUNITY CENTER IN DURBAN WERE TREATED TO SOME REAL TIME EXCITEMENT. SHUTTLEWORTH WAS NOT ON THE AIR AT THE APPOINTED HOUR! HE WAS BUSY COMPLETING A MEDICAL EXPERIMENT.

AN EMERGENCY TEAM WENT TO WORK. THEY CALLED RUSSIAN MISSION CONTROL, IN MOSCOW, NASA MISSION CONTROL IN HOUSTON, MARK SHUTTLEWORTH ABOARD THE SPACE STATION…AND THEY AWAKENED TONY HUTCHISON, VK5ZAI, IN AUSTRALIA BEFORE DAWN.

AT ONE POINT THE SOUTH AFRICAN COORDINATOR, RICHARD MILLS, WAS ON THREE PHONES AT THE SAME TIME. SOMEHOW IT WORKED AND LESS THAN HALF AN HOUR AFTER THE FIRST ATTEMPT THEY MADE CONTACT AND THE HAPPY STUDENTS CHATTED BRIEFLY WITH THEIR HERO IN SPACE.

ARISS PROVIDED TOP NOTCH GROUND STATIONS IN AUSTRALIA, SOUTH AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES TO MAKE THE CONTACTS. ON THE AIR, MARK USED ONE OF THE ISS INTERNATIONAL CALLS, NA1SS. THE COMMUNICATIONS WERE FED AROUND THE WORLD AS A DONATION FROM WORLDCOM, THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

MOST SOUTH AFRICAN RADIO AND TELEVISION STATIONS AND NETWORKS CARRIED THE REPORTS LIVE AND REPEATED THEM ON TAPE. NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES GAVE THEM HEADLINES GALORE. IN THE UNITED STATES, CABLE NETWORK MSNBC CARRIED THE CONTACTS.

--
(STUDENT QUESTION AND SHUTTLEWORTH RESPONSE)
--

BEFORE TAKING OFF ON HIS SPACE FLIGHT, FOR WHICH HE PAID RUSSIA AN ESTIMATED $20 MILLION, SHUTTLEWORTH TOLD REPORTERS THAT HIS LIVE COMMUNICATION REPRESENTS A MAJOR TURNING POINT FOR THE IMAGE OF SOUTH AFRICAN EDUCATION. THEN MARK SHUTTLEWORTH ADDED "THIS PUTS A GROUP OF OUR SCHOOL LEARNERS UNIQUELY INTO THE GLOBAL SPOTLIGHT OF SPACE EXPLORATION."

AND THAT'S JUST WHAT HE DID, HOLDING CONVERSATIONS WITH STUDENTS WHO WON THE RIGHT TO ASK THEIR QUESTIONS IN A NATIONAL COMPETITION.
--
(STUDENT QUESTION AND SHUTTLEWORTH RESPONSE)
--
SPACE TRAVEL HAS BEEN A LIFELONG DREAM FOR MARK SHUTTLEWORTH. HE HAS SHARED IT WITH A VERY GRATEFUL SOUTH AFRICA AND IN THE PROCESS HAS GIVEN AMATEUR RADIO A MAGNIFICENT SHOWCASE TO THE WORLD.

FOR THE AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE, RN, K6DUE.

--

The crew's primary mission was to deliver a fresh Soyuz spacecraft to the I-S-S. This spacecraft remains available as an emergency escape lifeboat. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SHUTTLEWORTH MAKES RANDOM CONTACTS

Mark Shuttlesworth was active on voice over North America from the International Space Station making random contacts. He used the standard space communications F-M channel pair 145.800 to transmit while listening on 144.490 MHz. One of those he spoke to was AMSAT North America's Frank Bauer, KA3HDO. Mark's audio was captured by Bruce Paige, KK5DO and posted to his website. Take a listen:

--
Shuttleworth: "Kilo-Alpha-3-Hotel-Delta-Oscar this is NA1SS. Do you copy us?"
(Response)
Shuttleworth: "Thaks very much for your help with the station on the ISS."
--

Shuttleworth was only been heard using NA1SS. That's a call assigned to the ISS. He's not used his honorary South African ZS-RSA callsign. According to Miles Mann, WF1F, Shuttleworth worked many stations as he flew across the United States. This included school amateur radio club KB3BRT in Knoxville Pennsylvania. More next week. (ARNewsline(tm) with audio provided by KK5DO)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SHUTTLEWORTHS SPECIAL CALL

Before his flight, Mark Shuttleworth was granted a temporary honorary ham radio call to operate from the International Space Station. And while everyone who is assigned to the ISS has some form of ham radio certification, the call, ZS RSA, is a one of a kind. Amateur Radio Newsline's Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, tells us why:

--

According to Deon Erwin, ZR1DQ, space visitor Mark Shuttleworth received all the information in Russia's Star City, from the South African Radio League, to study for his ham radio license and he was trying to fit these studies into his busy training schedule. However, there was doubt whether Shuttleworth would actually have the time to complete his ham radio exam due to the eight months it took to learn Russian and simultaneously completing his astronaut training.

So the Oakdale Amateur Radio Club near Cape Town, South Africa, negotiated with the South African licensing authority to grant Shuttleworth an Amateur Radio license in light of the tight schedule before the launch and in anticipation of him writing the test. The authorities agreed and awarded the temporary, honorary and very unique callsign ZS RSA. ZS is the prefix for South Africa' and R S A represents the nations name -- the Republic of South Africa.

Shuttleworth’s callsign is only valid for three months. The licensing authorities did not assign a number to the callsign, as the numerals represent South Africa’s provinces and geographic locations. And in the South African licensing system no separate callsign allocation exists for space communications.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ

--

The Oakdale Amateur Radio Club is located in Durbanville, a village which is about 30 kilometers North East of Cape Town. Durbanville is Shuttleworth’s home town and where his family still lives. (ARNewsline with information from SAREX remailer)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the
Woodchuck Amateur Radio Club repeater serving Cleveland Ohio.

(5 sec pause here)

**
REPEATER LINKING: IRLP SURPASSES 400

Nate Duehr, WY0X, reports that the Internet Radio Linking Project or I-R-L-P has now exceeded 400 nodes. The latest list shows the number stands at 403 installed.

The Internet Radio Linking Project permits repeaters around the world to interconnect with one another using a Linux based computer and a simple computer to repeater interface. The system is secure against non hams penetrating it because of its propriority hardware and software made available only to licensed radio amateurs. In fact, it is the only Internet ham radio linking system permitted by the Australian government.

More information is on the world wide web at www.irlp.net. Be sure to look at http://status.irlp.net and http://maps.irlp.net to see if there is an I-R-L-P node near you (WY0X)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT-NA ANNOUNCES NEW SATELLITE PROJECT

AMSAT North America has started construction of a new low-earth-orbit communications satellite. According to the groups president Robin Haighton, VE3FRH, the satellite will be similar in size to the original AMSAT Microsat design, but will incorporate all new leading edge electronics and RF technology

The new satellite will be code named AMSAT OSCAR E or Echo until launch. It will contain both analog and digital VHF and UHF FM transponders similar to those carried on the UOSAT-OSCAR 14 and AMRAD-OSCAR 27 ham-sats that are

currently in orbit. In addition, the new satellite will have the capability to host one or two other experimental payloads.

Haighton discussed the new bird at the organization's Board of Directors meeting held in Washington, DC, on April 20th and 21st. The spacecraft is now slated to be ready for launch in late 2003. AMSAT says that a number of affordable launch opportunities are being actively explored. (ANS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: KOLIBRI 2000 TO DE-ORBIT

The Kolibri-2000 Russian and Australian School Scientific Research Microsatellite is headed toward a fiery grave. Kolibri-2000, later named RS-21 was launched on March 19th at 22:00 UTC from the International Space Station and has been in orbit for the past 6 weeks. During that time Kolibri's has been sending back telemetry and digital voice recordings.

The low cost RS-21 satellite was designed for this type of short duration mission. Part of its job included analyzing particles using a very sophisticated a flux-gate magnetometer and sending that data back to Earth. But all of this will soon end as Kolibri-2000 will reenter the Earths atmosphere and burn up sometime between May 3rd to the 4th UTC time.

Since the RS-21 has solar panels to recharge it batteries, it should be able to continue to transmit data until re-entry occurs. To hear its last transmissions, keep your radio set to the satellites primary downlink on 435.335 MHz and secondary downlink on 145.825 MHz. Both frequencies operate CW and FSK and you might want to keep a tape recorder running to catch a bit of ham radio space history as the mission of Kolibri-2000 comes to an end. (WF1F, ARNewsline(tm))

**

ENFORCEMENT: OWNERS OF BROOKLYN REPEATER DON’T RESPOND TO FCC

The owner operators of a repeater in the New York City area have not yet responded to a letter of inquiry from the FCC and the agency wants to know why. So it has once again written to one of the pair of hams to demand an answer. The person posing the questions is Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH:

--
Hollingsworth: “We warned Thomas Batista, an operator of the KC2DDD and the N2IFU repeater -- the repeater alternately known by both of those call signs -- in Corona New York -- that we had nor gotten a response from him to our letter of February 15th. That letter concerned interference and allegations of no coordination.”
--

In earlier letters to Batista and Gerardo Arias regarding the same repeater, the FCC asked for an explanation of why the system input is on 143.020 MHz. This is a frequency not allocated for use by hams. (FCC)

**

RADIO RULES: XM & SIRIUS CONCERNED ABOUT OUT-OF-BAND EMISSIONS

The nation's two satellite digital audio radio service providers, XM and Sirius, are concerned that out-of-band signals from a variety of wireless devices. The CGC Communicator reports that the two worry that these services will eventually cause widespread interference to their program services.

Singled out as potential culprits are license-free Part 15 and 18 devices such as ISM, Bluetooth, IEEE 802.11b, home RF wireless devices, RF lighting, ultra-wideband devices and even Family Radio Service transmitters. The fifth harmonics from Channels FRS channels 8 to 14 fall within XM's passband but not Sirius's. More information is found at the FCC website under ET Docket 01-278, RM-9375 and RM-10051. (CGC Communicator)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for todays radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

**

SUPPORT FUND REPORT WITH ANDY JAREMA N6TCQ

Its time once again to hear from our support fund administrator. Here’s N6TCQ.

--

In the month of February we heard from The Montgomery ARC of Gaithersburg, MD; The Kanawha ARC of Charleston, WV; Michael Leahan, N9PQK of Sun Prairie, WI; Jay Underdown, W0PS of St. Charles, MO; The DuPage, IL ARC; Russell Lamb and the South Texas Amateur Repeater Society of Harlingen, TX, WH8H; The Steamboat Springs, CO Amateur Radio Association; regular contributor William Walters, WA2IBM of San Jose, CA.; The Kings ARC of Armona, CA; David Estrada, KD6HDX and the INLANDARS repeater system of Chino Hills, CA and the Xerox Amateur Radio Club in El Segundo, WD6CZH.

Thanks to everybody for their support. A reminder that Newsline is a 501c 3 and a California non-profit corporation; all contributions are tax-deductible.

The address for the Newsline Support fund is PO Box 660937, Arcadia, CA 91066. If you missed it, it will be given again at the end of this week's newscast.

I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Also, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2002 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year award closes May 30th. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our website at www.arnewsline.org. (ARNewsline(tm) Support Fund)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: AUTOMATING NEWSLINE

Fred Vobbe of the National Radio Club D-X Audio Service says that he is now playing Amateur Radio Newsline automatically on his repeater. Fred says that he uses Echo Station software to automatically play this newscast every Saturday and Monday night at 7 P-M over his W8HDU repeater.

Fred’s machine operates 443.625 and is located in Allen County Ohio. More on Echo Station automation software is on the word wide web at www dot westmountainradio.com and click the link on the right side of the page that says Amateur Radio soundcard software presentation. (W8HDU)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: CALL 511 IN UTAH FOR TRAFFIC INFO

Travelers in Utah have a new way to get updates on traffic, and they can do it without having to watch television or listen to the radio. Instead, using a cellular phone, they can dial the nation's first voice-activated 511 travel service line.

Called Tellme, this is one of several free, voice-activated services known as voice portals.' Voice portals use speach recognition software to retrieve and translate information from the Internet. Taking their cues from spoken words, the services can dispense stock quotes, horoscopes, driving directions, sports scores and other widely sought information over any telephone.

Utah was one of six states selected to launch a 511 service after the Federal Communications Commission officially designated 511 as a nationwide number for travel information back in July 2000. Like the emergency number 911, the 511 systems are a public service and free. (Road Routes)

**

INTERNATIONAL: UK ANNOUNCES INTERMEDIATE LICENSE CLASS PLANS

The United Kingdom’s Radiocommunications Agency has announced details of the qualifications and examinations for the revised licensing structure for that nations Amateur Radio service.

A press release from the Radiocommunications Agency says that a new program of study for the U-K Intermediate license will be introduced early in 2003. This will be based on the current Novice syllabus but will exclude those topics covered in the Foundation License. The Radiocommunications Agency says that it plans to announce the course outline at least three months ahead of its introduction. It will be run initially as a pilot format similar to the Foundation pilot. Once the new syllabus is in force, a pass at Foundation level will be a pre-requisite to sitting the Intermediate Class U-K exam.

The new licensing structure was announced in September 2001. It’s first phase was the introduction of the Foundation License last January. This new ticket has been deemed to be a major success with over 1500 M 3 prefix Foundation Licenses having been issued. (RSGB)

**

DX

In D-X, what is believed to be the first 2-meter random meteor scatter contact has been made between Australia and New Zealand. Rex Moncur, VK7MO, in Hobart and Bob McQuarrie, ZL3TY, in Greymouth, on the west coast of the south island of New Zealand, made the contact on April 13th over a distance of 1950 kilometres using the W-S-J-T software. (Q-News, RSGB)

A bit lower in frequency, HC8N reports that the new QSL Route to him is Randy Becnel, W5UE, at Post Office Box 170, Kiln, MS 39556-0170 in the United States. Bechnel replaces Derek Wills AA5BT who is stepping down after 10 years of service and 50,000 QSL requests answered. (Various DX publications)

Also, Dennis Hanley, G3YVY, says that he has been informed that his callsign is being used on 20 meters. At present Dennis has no High Frequency equipment and says that has no immediate plans to become active on the H-F bands. (RSGB)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: USA ARDF CHAMPIONSHIP WINNERS ANNOUNCED

And finally, who's the best in the country at finding hidden transmitters? Here's Newsline's Joe Moell, K0OV, with the results of a contest to find the answer, and an opportunity for your club to get in on the fun.

--

USA has just completed its second national championships of on-foot hidden transmitter hunting, also called radio-orienteering and ARDF. The event took place near Pine Mountain, Georgia, hosted by hams in the Georgia Orienteering club. Primary organizers were Laurie Searle KG4FDM and Sam Smith N4MAP. About two dozen of our country's best fox-finders went into the deep woods of Franklin D. Roosevelt State Park, trying to be first to find up to five transmitters and then navigate their way to the finish line. Their rewards: the possibility of a medal and a place on our country's team going to the ARDF World Championships in Slovakia this coming September.

The championships included two complete courses on consecutive days, the first on two meters and the second on 80 meters. Best performance overall was by Gyuri Nagi KF6YKN, who averaged 19 minutes per fox on two meters and an amazing 15 minutes per fox on 80 meters. Gyuri, whose other call is HA3PA, is a part-time US resident who learned the sport in his native Hungary. He competed in M21, the prime age division, requiring him to find five foxes on a six kilometer forest course. Gold medal winning hams in other age and gender divisions were Jerry Boyd WB8WFK, Valerie Meyer KG4QWE, John Munsey KB3GK, Debbie Pendley KD5LOK, Charlie Siler KO4NO, and Jack Stump KD5OEO.

Hidden transmitter hunting is a fast-growing activity in the USA, whether on foot like these championships, or in cars full of direction finding gear and computers. It's time for your club to give it a try. The perfect opportunity is coming May 11 and 12, which will be the fifth annual National Foxhunting Weekend, sponsored by CQ magazine. The May issue of CQ has all the details. On the Web, you can find lots of information on both the National Fox Hunting W and the just-completed national Championships at www.homingin.com. That's

homingin -- one word -- homingin.com

From southern California, where every weekend is a transmitter hunting weekend, this is Joe Moell K-zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

The next stop for the winners? Hopefully Slovakia and the world championships this fall. (ARNewsline(tm). K0OV)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us, support us or nominate someone for the Young Ham of the Year Award at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Damron, N8TMW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

(End Newscast)

RAIN PROMO: “This week on the Radio Amateur Information Network Hap Holly presents part 2 of his interview with Nicholas Leggett, N3NL. Leggett wants the FCC to mandate field repairable ham gear. Here more at www.rainreport.com or on the phone at 847-827-7246.”

3008. ARNewsline 1290 - May 3 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 19:27:25 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020504152725.19405.00006218@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 42275

I corrected the date. Newsline said it was Friday May 1. Friday is May 3.

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1290 - May 3 2002

**

SPECIAL NOTICE TO THOSE WHO ONLY READ THE PRINT VERSION OF THIS NEWSCAST

ARNewsline™ 1290 coverage of the flight of Mark Shuttleworth, ZS-RSA, is very audio intensive. This historic meaning of this story really cannot be appreciated in a print version. We strongly urge you this week to visit www.arnewsline.org, click on the newscast number, download the MP3 file and listen to a moment in history that was made possible by Amateur Radio. Thank you.

**

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1290 with a release date of Friday, May 3rd 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Mark Shuttleworth comes on the air from the I-S-S and South Africa cheers. This story is first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1290 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SECOND SPACE VISITOR OPERATES HAM RADIO FROM THE ISS

South African amateur researcher Mark Shuttleworth has made his way to the International Space Station and to ham radio. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Roy Neal, K6DUE, has been following the mission and brings us up to date:

--

(STUDENTS CHEER)

MORE THAN 200 STUDENTS, IN SOUTH AFRICA, CHEERED THEIR NEW HERO, MARK SHUTTLEWORTH. THEY TALKED TO HIM VIA AMATEUR RADIO. NICE DX. ON THE FIRST CALL, THESE ARE STUDENTS IN CAPE TOWN, TALKING TO THE PASSENGER IN SPACE BY WAY OF HAM STATION VK5ZAI, IN AUSTRALIA.

(STUDENT QUESTION AND SHUTTLEWORTH RESPONSE)

MARK SHUTTLEWORTH HAS BECOME A HERO IN SOUTH AFRICA. TO QUOTE THE HEADLINES: “HE’S THE FIRST AFRICAN IN SPACE” AND HAM RADIO HAS ENHANCED THAT IMAGE.

USING ARISS -- THE AMATEUR RADIO ON THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION -- WITH SPECIAL PERMISSION AND AN HONORARY LICENSE -- SHUTTLEWORTH LINED UP CONTACTS WITH HUNDREDS OF SCHOOL KIDS -- SCHOOL LEARNERS THEY'RE CALLED IN SOUTH AFRICA. HE ALSO MADE SOME GENERAL CONTACTS WITH HAM RADIO OPERATORS.

ON FOUR DIFFERENT DAYS, STUDENTS GATHERED AT FOUR SPECIAL SCHOOLS, STARTING WITH SHUTTLEWORTH'S ALMA MATER, BISHOPS IN CAPE TOWN. ALL TOLD, ABOUT A THOUSAND SOUTH AFRICAN STUDENT LEARNERS SHARED THE EXPERIENCE OF DIRECT CONTACT.

ON THE SECOND DAY SOME 300 STUDENTS GATHERED AT THE HAVENSIDE COMMUNITY CENTER IN DURBAN WERE TREATED TO SOME REAL TIME EXCITEMENT. SHUTTLEWORTH WAS NOT ON THE AIR AT THE APPOINTED HOUR! HE WAS BUSY COMPLETING A MEDICAL EXPERIMENT.

AN EMERGENCY TEAM WENT TO WORK. THEY CALLED RUSSIAN MISSION CONTROL, IN MOSCOW, NASA MISSION CONTROL IN HOUSTON, MARK SHUTTLEWORTH ABOARD THE SPACE STATION…AND THEY AWAKENED TONY HUTCHISON, VK5ZAI, IN AUSTRALIA BEFORE DAWN.

AT ONE POINT THE SOUTH AFRICAN COORDINATOR, RICHARD MILLS, WAS ON THREE PHONES AT THE SAME TIME. SOMEHOW IT WORKED AND LESS THAN HALF AN HOUR AFTER THE FIRST ATTEMPT THEY MADE CONTACT AND THE HAPPY STUDENTS CHATTED BRIEFLY WITH THEIR HERO IN SPACE.

ARISS PROVIDED TOP NOTCH GROUND STATIONS IN AUSTRALIA, SOUTH AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES TO MAKE THE CONTACTS. ON THE AIR, MARK USED ONE OF THE ISS INTERNATIONAL CALLS, NA1SS. THE COMMUNICATIONS WERE FED AROUND THE WORLD AS A DONATION FROM WORLDCOM, THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

MOST SOUTH AFRICAN RADIO AND TELEVISION STATIONS AND NETWORKS CARRIED THE REPORTS LIVE AND REPEATED THEM ON TAPE. NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES GAVE THEM HEADLINES GALORE. IN THE UNITED STATES, CABLE NETWORK MSNBC CARRIED THE CONTACTS.

--
(STUDENT QUESTION AND SHUTTLEWORTH RESPONSE)
--

BEFORE TAKING OFF ON HIS SPACE FLIGHT, FOR WHICH HE PAID RUSSIA AN ESTIMATED $20 MILLION, SHUTTLEWORTH TOLD REPORTERS THAT HIS LIVE COMMUNICATION REPRESENTS A MAJOR TURNING POINT FOR THE IMAGE OF SOUTH AFRICAN EDUCATION. THEN MARK SHUTTLEWORTH ADDED "THIS PUTS A GROUP OF OUR SCHOOL LEARNERS UNIQUELY INTO THE GLOBAL SPOTLIGHT OF SPACE EXPLORATION."

AND THAT'S JUST WHAT HE DID, HOLDING CONVERSATIONS WITH STUDENTS WHO WON THE RIGHT TO ASK THEIR QUESTIONS IN A NATIONAL COMPETITION.
--
(STUDENT QUESTION AND SHUTTLEWORTH RESPONSE)
--
SPACE TRAVEL HAS BEEN A LIFELONG DREAM FOR MARK SHUTTLEWORTH. HE HAS SHARED IT WITH A VERY GRATEFUL SOUTH AFRICA AND IN THE PROCESS HAS GIVEN AMATEUR RADIO A MAGNIFICENT SHOWCASE TO THE WORLD.

FOR THE AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE, RN, K6DUE.

--

The crew's primary mission was to deliver a fresh Soyuz spacecraft to the I-S-S. This spacecraft remains available as an emergency escape lifeboat. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SHUTTLEWORTH MAKES RANDOM CONTACTS

Mark Shuttlesworth was active on voice over North America from the International Space Station making random contacts. He used the standard space communications F-M channel pair 145.800 to transmit while listening on 144.490 MHz. One of those he spoke to was AMSAT North America's Frank Bauer, KA3HDO. Mark's audio was captured by Bruce Paige, KK5DO and posted to his website. Take a listen:

--
Shuttleworth: "Kilo-Alpha-3-Hotel-Delta-Oscar this is NA1SS. Do you copy us?"
(Response)
Shuttleworth: "Thaks very much for your help with the station on the ISS."
--

Shuttleworth was only been heard using NA1SS. That's a call assigned to the ISS. He's not used his honorary South African ZS-RSA callsign. According to Miles Mann, WF1F, Shuttleworth worked many stations as he flew across the United States. This included school amateur radio club KB3BRT in Knoxville Pennsylvania. More next week. (ARNewsline(tm) with audio provided by KK5DO)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SHUTTLEWORTHS SPECIAL CALL

Before his flight, Mark Shuttleworth was granted a temporary honorary ham radio call to operate from the International Space Station. And while everyone who is assigned to the ISS has some form of ham radio certification, the call, ZS RSA, is a one of a kind. Amateur Radio Newsline's Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, tells us why:

--

According to Deon Erwin, ZR1DQ, space visitor Mark Shuttleworth received all the information in Russia's Star City, from the South African Radio League, to study for his ham radio license and he was trying to fit these studies into his busy training schedule. However, there was doubt whether Shuttleworth would actually have the time to complete his ham radio exam due to the eight months it took to learn Russian and simultaneously completing his astronaut training.

So the Oakdale Amateur Radio Club near Cape Town, South Africa, negotiated with the South African licensing authority to grant Shuttleworth an Amateur Radio license in light of the tight schedule before the launch and in anticipation of him writing the test. The authorities agreed and awarded the temporary, honorary and very unique callsign ZS RSA. ZS is the prefix for South Africa' and R S A represents the nations name -- the Republic of South Africa.

Shuttleworth’s callsign is only valid for three months. The licensing authorities did not assign a number to the callsign, as the numerals represent South Africa’s provinces and geographic locations. And in the South African licensing system no separate callsign allocation exists for space communications.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ

--

The Oakdale Amateur Radio Club is located in Durbanville, a village which is about 30 kilometers North East of Cape Town. Durbanville is Shuttleworth’s home town and where his family still lives. (ARNewsline with information from SAREX remailer)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the
Woodchuck Amateur Radio Club repeater serving Cleveland Ohio.

(5 sec pause here)

**
REPEATER LINKING: IRLP SURPASSES 400

Nate Duehr, WY0X, reports that the Internet Radio Linking Project or I-R-L-P has now exceeded 400 nodes. The latest list shows the number stands at 403 installed.

The Internet Radio Linking Project permits repeaters around the world to interconnect with one another using a Linux based computer and a simple computer to repeater interface. The system is secure against non hams penetrating it because of its propriority hardware and software made available only to licensed radio amateurs. In fact, it is the only Internet ham radio linking system permitted by the Australian government.

More information is on the world wide web at www.irlp.net. Be sure to look at http://status.irlp.net and http://maps.irlp.net to see if there is an I-R-L-P node near you (WY0X)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT-NA ANNOUNCES NEW SATELLITE PROJECT

AMSAT North America has started construction of a new low-earth-orbit communications satellite. According to the groups president Robin Haighton, VE3FRH, the satellite will be similar in size to the original AMSAT Microsat design, but will incorporate all new leading edge electronics and RF technology

The new satellite will be code named AMSAT OSCAR E or Echo until launch. It will contain both analog and digital VHF and UHF FM transponders similar to those carried on the UOSAT-OSCAR 14 and AMRAD-OSCAR 27 ham-sats that are

currently in orbit. In addition, the new satellite will have the capability to host one or two other experimental payloads.

Haighton discussed the new bird at the organization's Board of Directors meeting held in Washington, DC, on April 20th and 21st. The spacecraft is now slated to be ready for launch in late 2003. AMSAT says that a number of affordable launch opportunities are being actively explored. (ANS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: KOLIBRI 2000 TO DE-ORBIT

The Kolibri-2000 Russian and Australian School Scientific Research Microsatellite is headed toward a fiery grave. Kolibri-2000, later named RS-21 was launched on March 19th at 22:00 UTC from the International Space Station and has been in orbit for the past 6 weeks. During that time Kolibri's has been sending back telemetry and digital voice recordings.

The low cost RS-21 satellite was designed for this type of short duration mission. Part of its job included analyzing particles using a very sophisticated a flux-gate magnetometer and sending that data back to Earth. But all of this will soon end as Kolibri-2000 will reenter the Earths atmosphere and burn up sometime between May 3rd to the 4th UTC time.

Since the RS-21 has solar panels to recharge it batteries, it should be able to continue to transmit data until re-entry occurs. To hear its last transmissions, keep your radio set to the satellites primary downlink on 435.335 MHz and secondary downlink on 145.825 MHz. Both frequencies operate CW and FSK and you might want to keep a tape recorder running to catch a bit of ham radio space history as the mission of Kolibri-2000 comes to an end. (WF1F, ARNewsline(tm))

**

ENFORCEMENT: OWNERS OF BROOKLYN REPEATER DON’T RESPOND TO FCC

The owner operators of a repeater in the New York City area have not yet responded to a letter of inquiry from the FCC and the agency wants to know why. So it has once again written to one of the pair of hams to demand an answer. The person posing the questions is Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH:

--
Hollingsworth: “We warned Thomas Batista, an operator of the KC2DDD and the N2IFU repeater -- the repeater alternately known by both of those call signs -- in Corona New York -- that we had nor gotten a response from him to our letter of February 15th. That letter concerned interference and allegations of no coordination.”
--

In earlier letters to Batista and Gerardo Arias regarding the same repeater, the FCC asked for an explanation of why the system input is on 143.020 MHz. This is a frequency not allocated for use by hams. (FCC)

**

RADIO RULES: XM & SIRIUS CONCERNED ABOUT OUT-OF-BAND EMISSIONS

The nation's two satellite digital audio radio service providers, XM and Sirius, are concerned that out-of-band signals from a variety of wireless devices. The CGC Communicator reports that the two worry that these services will eventually cause widespread interference to their program services.

Singled out as potential culprits are license-free Part 15 and 18 devices such as ISM, Bluetooth, IEEE 802.11b, home RF wireless devices, RF lighting, ultra-wideband devices and even Family Radio Service transmitters. The fifth harmonics from Channels FRS channels 8 to 14 fall within XM's passband but not Sirius's. More information is found at the FCC website under ET Docket 01-278, RM-9375 and RM-10051. (CGC Communicator)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for todays radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

**

SUPPORT FUND REPORT WITH ANDY JAREMA N6TCQ

Its time once again to hear from our support fund administrator. Here’s N6TCQ.

--

In the month of February we heard from The Montgomery ARC of Gaithersburg, MD; The Kanawha ARC of Charleston, WV; Michael Leahan, N9PQK of Sun Prairie, WI; Jay Underdown, W0PS of St. Charles, MO; The DuPage, IL ARC; Russell Lamb and the South Texas Amateur Repeater Society of Harlingen, TX, WH8H; The Steamboat Springs, CO Amateur Radio Association; regular contributor William Walters, WA2IBM of San Jose, CA.; The Kings ARC of Armona, CA; David Estrada, KD6HDX and the INLANDARS repeater system of Chino Hills, CA and the Xerox Amateur Radio Club in El Segundo, WD6CZH.

Thanks to everybody for their support. A reminder that Newsline is a 501c 3 and a California non-profit corporation; all contributions are tax-deductible.

The address for the Newsline Support fund is PO Box 660937, Arcadia, CA 91066. If you missed it, it will be given again at the end of this week's newscast.

I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Also, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2002 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year award closes May 30th. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our website at www.arnewsline.org. (ARNewsline(tm) Support Fund)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: AUTOMATING NEWSLINE

Fred Vobbe of the National Radio Club D-X Audio Service says that he is now playing Amateur Radio Newsline automatically on his repeater. Fred says that he uses Echo Station software to automatically play this newscast every Saturday and Monday night at 7 P-M over his W8HDU repeater.

Fred’s machine operates 443.625 and is located in Allen County Ohio. More on Echo Station automation software is on the word wide web at www dot westmountainradio.com and click the link on the right side of the page that says Amateur Radio soundcard software presentation. (W8HDU)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: CALL 511 IN UTAH FOR TRAFFIC INFO

Travelers in Utah have a new way to get updates on traffic, and they can do it without having to watch television or listen to the radio. Instead, using a cellular phone, they can dial the nation's first voice-activated 511 travel service line.

Called Tellme, this is one of several free, voice-activated services known as voice portals.' Voice portals use speach recognition software to retrieve and translate information from the Internet. Taking their cues from spoken words, the services can dispense stock quotes, horoscopes, driving directions, sports scores and other widely sought information over any telephone.

Utah was one of six states selected to launch a 511 service after the Federal Communications Commission officially designated 511 as a nationwide number for travel information back in July 2000. Like the emergency number 911, the 511 systems are a public service and free. (Road Routes)

**

INTERNATIONAL: UK ANNOUNCES INTERMEDIATE LICENSE CLASS PLANS

The United Kingdom’s Radiocommunications Agency has announced details of the qualifications and examinations for the revised licensing structure for that nations Amateur Radio service.

A press release from the Radiocommunications Agency says that a new program of study for the U-K Intermediate license will be introduced early in 2003. This will be based on the current Novice syllabus but will exclude those topics covered in the Foundation License. The Radiocommunications Agency says that it plans to announce the course outline at least three months ahead of its introduction. It will be run initially as a pilot format similar to the Foundation pilot. Once the new syllabus is in force, a pass at Foundation level will be a pre-requisite to sitting the Intermediate Class U-K exam.

The new licensing structure was announced in September 2001. It’s first phase was the introduction of the Foundation License last January. This new ticket has been deemed to be a major success with over 1500 M 3 prefix Foundation Licenses having been issued. (RSGB)

**

DX

In D-X, what is believed to be the first 2-meter random meteor scatter contact has been made between Australia and New Zealand. Rex Moncur, VK7MO, in Hobart and Bob McQuarrie, ZL3TY, in Greymouth, on the west coast of the south island of New Zealand, made the contact on April 13th over a distance of 1950 kilometres using the W-S-J-T software. (Q-News, RSGB)

A bit lower in frequency, HC8N reports that the new QSL Route to him is Randy Becnel, W5UE, at Post Office Box 170, Kiln, MS 39556-0170 in the United States. Bechnel replaces Derek Wills AA5BT who is stepping down after 10 years of service and 50,000 QSL requests answered. (Various DX publications)

Also, Dennis Hanley, G3YVY, says that he has been informed that his callsign is being used on 20 meters. At present Dennis has no High Frequency equipment and says that has no immediate plans to become active on the H-F bands. (RSGB)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: USA ARDF CHAMPIONSHIP WINNERS ANNOUNCED

And finally, who's the best in the country at finding hidden transmitters? Here's Newsline's Joe Moell, K0OV, with the results of a contest to find the answer, and an opportunity for your club to get in on the fun.

--

USA has just completed its second national championships of on-foot hidden transmitter hunting, also called radio-orienteering and ARDF. The event took place near Pine Mountain, Georgia, hosted by hams in the Georgia Orienteering club. Primary organizers were Laurie Searle KG4FDM and Sam Smith N4MAP. About two dozen of our country's best fox-finders went into the deep woods of Franklin D. Roosevelt State Park, trying to be first to find up to five transmitters and then navigate their way to the finish line. Their rewards: the possibility of a medal and a place on our country's team going to the ARDF World Championships in Slovakia this coming September.

The championships included two complete courses on consecutive days, the first on two meters and the second on 80 meters. Best performance overall was by Gyuri Nagi KF6YKN, who averaged 19 minutes per fox on two meters and an amazing 15 minutes per fox on 80 meters. Gyuri, whose other call is HA3PA, is a part-time US resident who learned the sport in his native Hungary. He competed in M21, the prime age division, requiring him to find five foxes on a six kilometer forest course. Gold medal winning hams in other age and gender divisions were Jerry Boyd WB8WFK, Valerie Meyer KG4QWE, John Munsey KB3GK, Debbie Pendley KD5LOK, Charlie Siler KO4NO, and Jack Stump KD5OEO.

Hidden transmitter hunting is a fast-growing activity in the USA, whether on foot like these championships, or in cars full of direction finding gear and computers. It's time for your club to give it a try. The perfect opportunity is coming May 11 and 12, which will be the fifth annual National Foxhunting Weekend, sponsored by CQ magazine. The May issue of CQ has all the details. On the Web, you can find lots of information on both the National Fox Hunting W and the just-completed national Championships at www.homingin.com. That's

homingin -- one word -- homingin.com

From southern California, where every weekend is a transmitter hunting weekend, this is Joe Moell K-zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

The next stop for the winners? Hopefully Slovakia and the world championships this fall. (ARNewsline(tm). K0OV)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us, support us or nominate someone for the Young Ham of the Year Award at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Damron, N8TMW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

(End Newscast)

RAIN PROMO: “This week on the Radio Amateur Information Network Hap Holly presents part 2 of his interview with Nicholas Leggett, N3NL. Leggett wants the FCC to mandate field repairable ham gear. Here more at www.rainreport.com or on the phone at 847-827-7246.”

3009. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 19:35:16 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <63b80ffaa0ff2033fd2b7a5c9e029f83.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42277

I'm not sure; however, in our state (NY, land of the taxes), the
conservatives have cut the income tax, but not lowered spending. Where
does the money come from? Our local sales tax is 8%, now, needing even
MORE money, they have upped the taxes on NURSING homes! Nice job.

Frankly, I do NOT trust either the ultra liberals nor the reactionaries.
Both groups are fed by special interests; however, the conservatives are
much better funded - big oil, you name it. I had to laugh. For a good
while (perhaps even now), Wall Street was impressed by how few employees
generated how much money. Of course, now industry manufactures in
China,
Mexico, and many other countries. Interesting headline in this
morning's
paper - UNEMPLOYMENT HITS 6% ! Why are folks surprised? The
liberal answer would be to extend unemployment to help people
unemployed.
The conservative answer would be to shorten unemployment to 4 weeks. In
a month or so those unemployment figures would go down and everyone
would be happy! Well, almost everyone.

About the only thing REALLY protecting us, IMHO, is freedom of the
press.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020503230516.01774.00002588@mb-cg.aol.com

> In article <MuoA8.652$jy3.484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >http://www.non-sequitur.com/comics/2002/april/0414.jpg
> >
> >(ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

(snip)
>
> What DO the liberals want? What IS their agenda? What could
> possibly appease them, other than the one thing they really
> want to impose upon us, which is global socialism? Keep in
> mind, in a socialist world, things like Usenet, and comic strips
> like Non-Sequitur, would not exist! After all, the ruling class of
> liberal elites would no longer believe that they served any useful
> purpose, since THEY would now be in power!
>

> 73 de Larry, K3LT

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3010. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 19:43:33 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <24497f5c86b6cf501d2140c4cad7fa92.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42278

Cute, Hans. Good for a chuckle, but, IMHO, the kid may be headed for
RRCB or, even more likely, RRAM!

73 from Rochester, NY (& tnx fer the laugh)
Jim AA2QA

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3011. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 21:00:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ab1ibv$eg4$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42279

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD3E005.C0CC562E@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > We are reading the words that you post, Dick. Perhaps you need some
> > > English lessons?
> >
> > It sure is curious that you, Ed and Carl are the trio that seems to
have problems
> > with understanding my posts while no one else in the whole wide world
seems to
> > have any problem at all.
>
> The rest of the world has written you off, Dick. We three are still trying
to
> understand why you say something and then in the next posting deny saying
it.
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Make that "we 4" since I'm also find
many of Dick's post far from being examples of
clear and understandable use of English.

Cheers,
Bill

3012. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 21:07:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ab1ip1$4n9$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42280

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205040918.57276344@posting.google.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020503230516.01774.00002588@mb-cg.aol.com>...
> > What DO the liberals want? What IS their agenda? What could
> > possibly appease them, other than the one thing they really
> > want to impose upon us, which is global socialism? Keep in
> > mind, in a socialist world, things like Usenet, and comic strips
> > like Non-Sequitur, would not exist! After all, the ruling class of
> > liberal elites would no longer believe that they served any useful
> > purpose, since THEY would now be in power!
>
> ...and what do conservatives want, Larry? When capitalism is allowed
> to run its course unchecked, eventually ALL of the power will be
> concentrated in one individual...

Since that has failed to happen after 200+ years of a capatalistic
American society, I find your statement wholly without merit.
Indeed, there aren't even good examples on a single industry basis.

> Yes, unchecked capitalism leads to
> Monarchy(a form of Dictatorship).

Per chance you meant monopoly?

> And, just like with a totalitarian
> communist state, a totalitarian Monarchy wouldn't allow comic stips
> with opposing points of view.

Come back when you get your definitions straight.

> What we need Larry is a little more TOLERANCE of others and of other's
> viewpoints. Any kind of government that is INTOLERANT of opposing
> viewpoints is bad.

Conservatives allow far more toleramce than the liberals seem to.

Liberals don't even want discussion/debate on their ideas.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3013. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 22:05:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD45B3D.9670C20@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42281

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Cecil, the biggest breakthru in digital technology is the DSP side of the
> house where a receiver and to a lesser extent transmitter can be dialed up
> more or less on cue. It has come a long way but has a long way to go as I
> am sure you will admit.

That's my point. There's no reason that hams can't do that kind of development.
But to hear Dick tell it, to even suggest DSP software development by hams is
heresy. You'd think I had suggested slaying the Sacred Cow.

> But no, you digifreaks gots to go out and attack the simplest (and
> cheapest, wetware is really cheap) communication method known to man
> because it gives you a manhood problem. BFD.

Being for progress doesn't mean being against the legacy modes. I believe
that most present mode functions will be folded into a super digital mode
sooner or later. For instance, digital cellphones handle data as well as
voice. It's all 'ones' and 'zeros'. The electronics don't know the difference.
Incidentally, the high fidelity music stored on CDs is (heaven forbid) digital.

What is wrong with a little digital DSP experimentation by hams?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3014. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 22:06:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020504180645.26630.00000214@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 42282

In article <5f4fe4c2.0205040941.49f8ad0e@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<9f4bfe89.0205030353.5bbcfa8f@posting.google.com>...
>
>> One of the reasons I keep posting these totals every half-month is so
>there will be a record in Usenet archives.
>
>A noble goal, I suppose. I'm not trying to discourage you or
>anything, but there is a very strong possibility that freely available
>Usenet records WON'T be maintained very much longer. Hopefully, they
>can be maintained for quite a few more years with a small amount of
>advertising.

We'll see. The old deja archives only went back to 1995, but now google goes
back to 1981.

>> You comment on the refarming petition yet?
>
>Why? How will changing around a few HF frequency allocations help
>promote the Service?

The rules today make experimanting with new modes on HF somewhat difficult. For
example, all RTTY and data signals on HF must be confined to the non-phone
bands and must not exceed 300 bauds - regardless of occupied bandwidth. OTOH,
digitized voice and image signals must be confined to the 'phone subbands -
again regardless of occupied bandwidth.

Of course one can go for an STA, but that requires paperwork and time.

One way to attract newcomers is the experimental side of things. But the
present rules are not very conducive to many types of experimentation.

>I think it just shows how ridiculously petty and
>out-of-touch ham radio is with the modern world.

How?

>What we need is a truly revolutionary way to allow young people to
>enter the Service... a replacement for the old Novice class, if you
>will. A faily simple 25 question exam which provides these folks with
>a non-renewable 5 year license to operate on 1.25cm.

Your heart's in the right place, but your head misses the important points:

1) FCC wants simpler rules, not more complex ones. Selling them on a 4th
license class after they decided 3 is enough is a losing battle. Tacking on

stuff like age limits, no renewability and band restrictions (no 2 meters?) makes it even worse.

2) FCC got rid of the old Novice because there were very few of them issued for many years. For more than 15 years the Tech has been the first license of most new hams. This was going on even before the Tech lost its code test in 1991. Back then, most newcomers looked at the requirements for Tech vs. Novice, compared them to the privileges, and went straight to Tech.

3) To make any license attractive, the privileges granted must be worth the "investment". In most areas, 2 meters and 440 are where the local action is. HF is where the DX is.

4) It's pretty clear that Element 1 will probably disappear in late 2003 or early 2004, depending on when S25.5 disappears. What FCC will want from us hams is ideas on how to structure licenses in a nocodetest ham radio, not warmed-over
old stuff. Heck, there are elementary schoolers with Extras - how much easier do you want the tests to be?

How about this (assuming the code test is gone):

Replace the existing Tech with a new "Basic" license. Allows a wide selection of modes and bands - say about half the spectrum allowed to Generals, plus the most-popular modes (CW, SSB, FM, PSK31, a few others). Power limit is low to avoid lots of RF exposure questions on the test. Basics couldn't be VEs or repeater control ops - again to keep the test simple. End result is a 25-35 question test on "the basics" and the Basic ham gets lots of mode and band choices.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3015. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 22:14:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <z3ZA8.3180$U11.142941@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42283

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

> The Novice license exam would consist of 25 elementary questions.
> Emphasis would be put on understanding the operational, technical,
> safety, etiquette and emergency questions that relate specifically to
> the new Novice Class license privileges. All questions containing
> calculations would contain small integer(whole-number) input values
> and have relatively small integer results. Novice licensees would be
> required to have a general understanding of Ohm's Law and Power
> relations. They should be required to have a general understanding of
> how antenna length relates to wavelength; and have a knowledge of
> transmitter power, antenna gain, transmission line loss, and the
> ability to perform a simple ERP calculation would be required. General
> knowledge of simple resistive circuits, and their power dissipation,
> would be required. New Novice Class licensees will need to have a
> basic understanding of digital communication methods. Consistent with
> the final form of the old Novice Class license examination, knowledge
> of capacitors and inductors would not be required.

First, what you describe above is almost indistinguishable from the current
Technician examination.

Second, elementary school children are passing the current Extra exam with
ease, so your "dumbed-down-because-they're-babies" notion (which you've
floated here under various other names before) simply isn't needed.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3016. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 22:55:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205041455.8fb32c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42284

"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<MuoA8.652$jy3.484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> http://www.non-sequitur.com/comics/2002/april/0414.jpg
>
> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

I'll bet Plourde posed for the cartoonist.
>
>
w3rv

3017. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-04 23:51:35 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <bu_A8.6646$6T5.564838@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42285

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD45B3D.9670C20@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Cecil, the biggest breakthru in digital technology is the DSP side of
the
> > house where a receiver and to a lesser extent transmitter can be
dialed up
> > more or less on cue. It has come a long way but has a long way to go
as I
> > am sure you will admit.
>
> That's my point. There's no reason that hams can't do that kind of
development.
> But to hear Dick tell it, to even suggest DSP software development by
hams is
> heresy. You'd think I had suggested slaying the Sacred Cow.
>
> > But no, you digifreaks gots to go out and attack the simplest (and
> > cheapest, wetware is really cheap) communication method known to man
> > because it gives you a manhood problem. BFD.
>
> Being for progress doesn't mean being against the legacy modes. I
believe
> that most present mode functions will be folded into a super digital
mode
> sooner or later. For instance, digital cellphones handle data as well as
> voice. It's all 'ones' and 'zeros'. The electronics don't know the
difference.
> Incidentally, the high fidelity music stored on CDs is (heaven forbid)
digital.
>
> What is wrong with a little digital DSP experimentation by hams?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Not a damned thing if that was all that it entailed but the jolly boys at TenTec have done more for it accidentally than you guys have managed on purpose. And I think we all know that the A/D conversion is the weak spot at the moment and I would not have a clue, tho I am quite willing to concede that you might, how to engineer around that.

My real question is why all the emphasis on mode? Who gives a hoot? Things get their feet in the door by osmosis and because they work at a price. Buying a gizwidgit to plug into the mike and speaker jack to run

to a compooter at a price equal to either one is patently ridiculous. For that matter, the quest to decode morse on a compooter is right up there in the stupidity department as well.

As you point out, it is all binary anyway once you figure out how do do A/D conversion. And as you point out the CD jocks figured out how to make a speaker rattle years ago. The size of the CD was set to handle Beethoven's Third, the Eroica. So if there are hardware limitations, and doing a 21 MHz signal directly is not to my knowlege possible today, then why have we not seen more audio/i.f. DSP beyond filters for RTTY etc. I put digital detection in there for a reason, several of them in fact. The problem is quite solvable: if you can digitize a piece of spectrum you can decode it digitally even if it is analog in origin; FSK should be trivial and to top it all off, you should be able to look at a wider bit of spectrum, recognize two channels that are mutually inclusive and exclusive, narrow down the spectrum cut to maximize reception and decode the signal digitally without worrying about tuning to the right boop and beep. FM is not that hard if Heathkit could do it with vacuum tubes.

You guys are demanding the mode be set first and in fact seem to be hung up on mode. Now the two examples I gave have their decoding methods implicit in them, FSK because one or the other is on all the time and FM because, sub carriers aside, both sides of center are equal. It seems a little silly to be decoding the digital third subcarrier from the output of some variation on an Armstrong Discriminator so I can be sure I am tuned to KWWW, the Turnip Grinder now playing Elvis singing Don Giovanni or Tex Ritter doing La Donna e Mobile'. I keep hearing about software, so let us see some in the present environment. If nothing else you could decode the second subcarrier as well and make a monumental contribution to talking books for the blind.

I am not just being pissy, I am trying to show how we get from Analog Point A to Digital Point B in a market with an installed base that actually works pretty well. It is done by infiltration and performing certain tasks better than the present approach can do. At some point the issue with mode becomes moot, we go with one that fits the existing digital capability whatever they may be at the time. One does not destroy SSB, he co-opts it.

Above all, he buries the 'legacy' schtick as deep as he can digitally dig the hole. This term bothers me probably more than it should because I have seen more IT phonies try to buffalo people with it than I ever want to see again. At least to me the term 'legacy' anything makes me believe I am dealing with a gold-plated turkey. To be frank, I have never seen its use in this context convince me it isn't worse in radio.

I admit, as should be obvious, that I like approaches where the key is in the transmitted signal and where intelligence can be applied to tune and decode it to the virtual exclusion of all else. It is the only real weakness of SSB and one good reason to eat the elephant one bite at a time. The first step is to apply some intelligence period and sweat mode later.

Dick N&#65533;BK

3018. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 00:16:14 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <a5efd1b7e5e93c431f3809d4d87fccad.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42286

Hans, I always thought my idea would be good, but I found a flaw.
The test would consist of two questions:

1) What is your full name?
2) What is your address?

Each question would be worth 50 points. Partial credit could be
extended if some of the spelling were incorrect, so long as the FCC
could figure it out and actually contact the person. A passing grade
would be 50% (I've seen folks suggesting that 50% should be the passing
grade, so who am I to complain?)

I even considered letting folks make their X so someone who is literate
could fill in the blanks for them, but then some enterprising soul
would license his dog or cat. Then again, wasn't there quite a bit
of call-letter hoarding folks who were licensing a ton of repeaters?
Maybe my idea is making it too tough for them. Unfair!

The flaw is this: companies couldn't make money selling Q&A manuals.
Of course, maybe someone COULD figure out a way to sell a Q&A manual
for this test. Of course, some folks would complain that the test
was too hard ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:z3ZA8.3180$U11.142941@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net
>
>
> First, what you describe above is almost indistinguishable from the current
> Technician examination.
>
> Second, elementary school children are passing the current Extra exam with
> ease, so your "dumbed-down-because-they're-babies" notion (which you've
> floated here under various other names before) simply isn't needed.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3019. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 00:31:56 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CD47D7C.5329E428@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42287

Jim Hampton wrote:

> Hans, I always thought my idea would be good, but I found a flaw.
> The test would consist of two questions:
>
> 1) What is your full name?
> 2) What is your address?
>

CB used to be like this. I was once KAAR5167
Then got my old tech, which morphed into tech plus.
Upgraded to extra on restructuring day.

3020. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 01:18:20 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205050114170.31848-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42288

On Sat, 4 May 2002, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:
>On 4 May 2002 11:01:54 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>>The fact is, the Citizen's Band has become the defacto
>>introductory service for young people just beginning to learn to
>>experiment with radio; yet the Citizen's Band is a very poor
>>environment for young people to be learning in.
>
>Why? They have the chance to get all of the yelling obscenities and
>making fart noises out of their systems before they get to the hame
>bands.

Actually, a petition to compel enforcement of the CB "service" rules has a better chance of succeeding than bringing back the Novice amateur license as an "actively issued" class (i.e. not renewals only) - and that's still "a snowball's chance in hell...."

>>On VHF and UHF frequencies, the privileges and restrictions will be
>>the same as exists for the current grandfathered Novice Class license.
>
>Well, it *might* revive 220.

220 is dead? Maybe in your area, but not in Southern California - at least not in the places I'm at.

I'm surprised that S.T. didn't suggest that other "service" he's been attempting to promote (and spam this group with) as the new "entry level" learning area.....

3021. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 01:26:15 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205050121290.31848-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42289

On Sun, 5 May 2002, Jim Hampton wrote:
>Hans, I always thought my idea would be good, but I found a flaw.
>The test would consist of two questions:
>
>1) What is your full name?
>2) What is your address?
>
>Each question would be worth 50 points. Partial credit could be
>extended if some of the spelling were incorrect, so long as the FCC
>could figure it out and actually contact the person. A passing grade
>would be 50% (I've seen folks suggesting that 50% should be the passing
>grade, so who am I to complain?)
>
>I even considered letting folks make their X so someone who is literate

Don't you mean illiterate?

>could fill in the blanks for them, but then some enterprising soul
>would license his dog or cat. Then again, wasn't there quite a bit
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^ ^^^
Ask Gordon West about that. He managed to get a license for his cat some
years ago.

My rabbit wants a license, but due to fur, he doesn't make a distinguishing paw
print for a signature. Any suggestions for accomodation on the signature?
Perhaps he should sue the FCC for not meeting the "[entities] with disabilities
act" - after all, he THINKS he should have been a person and is therefore DNA
disadvantaged! [And yes, I am in California; the land of plentiful attorneys!]

>of call-letter hoarding folks who were licensing a ton of repeaters?
>Maybe my idea is making it too tough for them. Unfair!
>
>The flaw is this: companies couldn't make money selling Q&A manuals.
>Of course, maybe someone COULD figure out a way to sell a Q&A manual
>for this test. Of course, some folks would complain that the test
>was too hard ...

3022. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 02:07:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020504220702.29940.00000898@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 42290

In article <20020503080408.06869.00006010@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>What mode do you use on 30 meters?
>
>Morse encoded OOK CW, the few times I have operated 30 meters.
>
>>What's your recent experience in the HF Novice bands?
>
>None.
>

OK. Simple, direct answers to simple, direct questions. I wonder why Kim and Brian have such a hard time with those questions?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3023. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 02:07:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020504220702.29940.00000897@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 42291

In article <CjxA8.2783$vT1.255491@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>Sure as hell outperformed all my so-called "investments"
>over the past couple of years. No complaints at all.
>Just wish I had scraped together enough for a Life
>Membership back in '62.

I don;t think they had life memberships back then. As I recall, they came out about 1969 or so. And yeah, I wish I'd gotten one then!

I wonder how ARRL membership has kept up with inflation?

>Dayumn! I've been licensed 40 years? Whut hoppened?
>
Hopefully, lots of fun things!

I'm just 5 years behind ya. Almost OOTC material.

Consider this: Back then, there were maybe 250,000 US hams. Today there are about 683,000.

If we assume that just 2% of those 250,000 mid-1960s hams dropped out each year, only about 125,000 remain. Less than 20% of the total.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3024. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 02:07:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020504220703.29940.00000899@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 42292

In article <3CD35200.C1A143D0@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>K7JEB wrote:
>
>> Jim, N2EY, asked:
>>
>> > Who manufactured the first amateur "all band HF"
>> > (that means 80/40/20/15/10 meters back then, folks)
>> > SSB transceiver?
>>
>> Cosmophone??

You are correct, sir!!

The Cosmophone 35 appeared in early 1958, more than a year before the Collins
KWM-2. The KWM-1 preceded the '35, but the KWM-1 only covered 20, 15 and 10
meters.

The 75S-1 and 32S-1 appeared in early 1959, and were the first amateur
transceive-capable transmitter-receiver pair.
>
> That's the way I remember the ads in QST. Much too pricey
>for any but the most elite of the elite.

1958 prices:

Cosmophone 35: $799.50
Power supply: $139.50

Expensive, but actually cheaper than many other popular SSB rigs of the day,
like the Hallicrafters SX-101/HT-32 pair. Also less expensive than the KWM-2,
and the Cosmophone had more features (like dual VFOs).

> There was a Babcock
>rig out about that time,too, IIRC.

Not an SSB transceiver, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3025. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 02:54:19 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205041854.79010c85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42293

"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<z3ZA8.3180$U11.142941@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>
> First, what you describe above is almost indistinguishable from the current
> Technician examination.
>
> Second, elementary school children are passing the current Extra exam with
> ease, so your "dumbed-down-because-they're-babies" notion (which you've
> floated here under various other names before) simply isn't needed.

Like a fine wine, it get's better with age.

Now - tell us the truth, Hans; if you had your way, we would have
NEVER had a NoCode Tech license, would we? In fact, we wouldn't have
had a NOVICE or a TECHNICIAN class license.

Yes, indeed - if Hans had his way since 1958, the ONLY way to get into
the Amateur Radio Service would have been(and would still be) to pass
a 13wpm Morse Code examination, and the General Class written
examination. Fortunately, the FCC(and even the ARRL) at times have
seen fit to ignore this ridiculous line of thought, and do the right
thing over the years.

Mark my words, when the Amateur numbers start to slide again(and they
will), the ARRL will be forced to back some kind of REAL measure to
stop the decline. Why do you think the ARRL backed 5WPM restructuring
- to stop the ongoing contraction which was obviously occuring at that
time. But, 5WPM restructuring has only provided a little short-term
relief - eventually REAL reform will be necessary.

3026. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 03:11:54 UTC
From: RadioClaire <freeradc50502@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <_p1B8.3942$Jb.232822@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42294

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020502061005.06894.00006199@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

> >>You can't be seriously suggesting that ARRL's tax returns be considered as a
> >>good answer to his question.

They are really much more interesting than
the "highly sanitized" Board Meeting Minutes
and Pubicly Released Annual Financial Report.

What I would like to see is the COMPREHENSIVE
ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT for the ARRL !

This Document [..known in the Industry as the CAFI]
lists where every penny went to, and often to whom.
If you want to know what's really going on, don't bother
with the Budgetary Report, get the CAFR instead !!

There's been alot of exposure, and many red faces, on
the part of Local and County Governments when "Ordinary
Citizens" have gotten ahold of a copy of their State, County and Local CAFI

To SEE what I mean...go here---> http://www.cafrman.com/

Again, I would LOVE to see the ARRL's un-redacted CAFR
on somebody's website in the near future!

3027. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 03:16:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD4A411.21BF7124@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42295

Richard McCollum wrote:
> My real question is why all the emphasis on mode?

The emphasis is on experimentation, not on mode. It's just natural to
experiment with new modes.

> You guys are demanding the mode be set first and in fact seem to be hung
> up on mode.

Not true. We are suggesting that hams experiment more. The legacy modes
have been experimented with for the better part of a century so they are
in the area of diminishing returns. It's only logical to experiment in
areas that have not been saturated with experimentation already.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3028. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 03:18:40 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <ab287u$7sd$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 42303

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020503230516.01774.00002588@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <MuoA8.652$jy3.484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K&#65533;HB"
> <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >http://www.non-sequitur.com/comics/2002/april/0414.jpg
> >
> >(&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> While I agree that the Non-sequitur comic strip did seem to quite
> accurately capture the essential character of Usenet, it did so in
> it's usually heavy-handed, politically-correct manner. This makes
> me wonder -- is it possible for *anyone* to be truly acceptable to
> the so-called "liberals" today? How would a politically-oriented
> but conservative comic strip fare in today's media? Can anyone
> point to such a comic strip? Why does the conservative point-of-
> view go virtually unrepresented in our mass media? The closest
> thing I can think of as a conservative, family-oriented, comic strip
> is the Family Circus, but it is so saccharine as to be annoying to
> anyone with a remotely realistic worldview.
>
> What DO the liberals want? What IS their agenda? What could
> possibly appease them, other than the one thing they really
> want to impose upon us, which is global socialism? Keep in
> mind, in a socialist world, things like Usenet, and comic strips
> like Non-Sequitur, would not exist! After all, the ruling class of
> liberal elites would no longer believe that they served any useful
> purpose, since THEY would now be in power!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry check out Mallard Fillmore at
http://www.kingfeatures.com/features/comics/mallard/about.htm
This is a cut and paste off the website:
"Tinsley created Mallard for what he saw as the conservative underdog.

The strip is for "the average person out there: the forgotten American
taxpayer who's sick of the liberal media and cultural establishments that
act like he or she doesn't exist," he says.

Mallard's targets include President Clinton, the National Endowment for the
Arts and champions of political correctness. "

I think all you conservatives will like this one.
--

'73' From KB9TMP
The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing.
if you can fake that, you've got it made.
-Groucho Marx

3029. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 03:19:19 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205041919.1de9ada9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42296

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20020504180645.26630.00000214@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> 1) FCC wants simpler rules, not more complex ones. Selling them on a 4th
> license class after they decided 3 is enough is a losing battle. Tacking on
> stuff like age limits, no renewability and band restrictions (no 2 meters?)
> makes it even worse.

I tend to agree with this, that's why I've dropped the age requirement
and renewability issues, and left the privileges the same as they were
before. Even the old Novice question pool could be reused(by simply
eliminating all the non-applicable questions).

3030. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 03:35:59 UTC
From: mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net
Message-ID: <3cd4a2b3.1274886039@news.newsville.com>
Source record: 42298

On 4 May 2002 19:54:19 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<z3ZA8.3180$U11.142941@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>>
>> First, what you describe above is almost indistinguishable from the current
>> Technician examination.
>>
>> Second, elementary school children are passing the current Extra exam with
>> ease, so your "dumbed-down-because-they're-babies" notion (which you've
>> floated here under various other names before) simply isn't needed.
>
>Like a fine wine, it get's better with age.
>
>Now - tell us the truth, Hans; if you had your way, we would have
>NEVER had a NoCode Tech license, would we? In fact, we wouldn't have
>had a NOVICE or a TECHNICIAN class license.
>
>Yes, indeed - if Hans had his way since 1958, the ONLY way to get into
>the Amateur Radio Service would have been(and would still be) to pass
>a 13wpm Morse Code examination, and the General Class written
>examination. Fortunately, the FCC(and even the ARRL) at times have
>seen fit to ignore this ridiculous line of thought, and do the right
>thing over the years.
>
>Mark my words, when the Amateur numbers start to slide again(and they
>will), the ARRL will be forced to back some kind of REAL measure to
>stop the decline. Why do you think the ARRL backed 5WPM restructuring
>- to stop the ongoing contraction which was obviously occuring at that
>time. But, 5WPM restructuring has only provided a little short-term
>relief - eventually REAL reform will be necessary.

Funny - nothing I've read on this board, and particularly nothing I
read in this thread seems to match the reality of what I hear on the
HAM Bands.

I've been an active SWL'r for 3 years and am taking the tech license
test at Dayton on the 19th.

I'm working on my code and will likely upgrade to General before the
year is out.

HF:

Filled with idiots (on voice). like the people on 3.865, 3.875, and
others up and down the frequencies. Some of these yahoo's and

good-ol-boys are listed on QRZ - and they're EXTRA CLASS!!!

I sure as hell wouldn't want children who might be interested or in whom interest might be cultivated listening to these guys. I believe the proper term for most of these folks is "lid", if I'm not mistaken. They're almost as bad as the QRMers although most are not intentionally annoying other operators.

One reason for holding off so long in getting my license was that I didn't think I'd have any real interest in VHF/UHF.

But - I knew I had to start at the beginning. I bought my 2M rig and have been listening and learning (and NOT transmitting) while I await my test and practice my code.

At least in my neck the woods, 2 Meters is *heaven*. Courteous operators, following the rules who seem to be doing the bulk of public service work.

I'm quickly losing interest in using Phone on HF - most of what I've heard is crap.

Using "CWGet", the code I listen to and try to learn from is much more like what my impression of Amateur Radio is supposed to be at its best.

My point is this: The No-Code Techs on 2M (I look up their licenses on QRZ) more fit my definition of HAMS than MOST Generals and Extra's I hear on HF SSB. In short - I pray they stay where the hell they are and never come up and infect 2M or 440.

Your proposal is yet another way of forcing code on folks who frankly appear to share my opinion and want nothing to do with HF and the plethora of cranks, freaks, and goof-offs that use phone there.

My incentive for learning code is to be able to use it for low power DX on HF. I sure as hell wouldn't waste my time with most of the so-called "real" HAMS on HF phone. Perhaps I should say I wouldn't waste my time with most domestic traffic.

Your proposal does nothing to address QRMers who buy rigs and swarm the frequencies, and does nothing to address "real" HAMS who incessantly argue with them, use foul language, and waste bandwidth.

So my plea to most Generals and Extras is, kindly stay on HF where you belong and if you code, you have my respect and I genuinely hope I have the pleasure and privilage of speaking with you soon. But please stay the hell away from VHF/UHF - from the comments on this board and the things I hear discussed on HF - many of you don't think highly of the space above 50 anyway.

And remember - YOU and YOUR practices formed my opinions in the past 3 years.

Forcing Code on good HAMS who don't want it or need it does NOTHING to
improve HAM radio - NOTHING.

3031. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 03:45:23 UTC
From: KØHB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <nV1B8.25$Mb6.8963@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42299

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

> Now - tell us the truth, Hans; if you had your way, we would have
> NEVER had a NoCode Tech license, would we?

Of course we would have. Did you read my recommendation to FCC which called for two classes of license, neither of which would have required Morse code? (Reproduced below.)

> Yes, indeed - if Hans had his way since 1958, the ONLY way to get into
> the Amateur Radio Service would have been(and would still be) to pass
> a 13wpm Morse Code examination, and the General Class written
> examination.

Stewart obviously has me confused with some other person.

Please produce a SINGLE posting in which I defend Morse testing (at any speed) as a requirement for entry to the Amateur Radio service. Good luck on this one now!

Meanwhile you advance a warmed over copy of something that FCC has already dismissed (their word, not mine) previously.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of) WT Docket No. 98-143
)
1998 Biennial Regulatory Review --) RM-9148
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-9150
Amateur Service Rules.) RM-9196
)
)

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments contain proposals on reducing the number of amateur radio operator license classes, and suggestions regarding Morse testing.

I. Discussion:

The NPRM proposes reducing the number of operator classes from six to four. This reduction would be accomplished by phasing out Novice and Technician Plus classes, leaving the remaining four classes in

place. It is worthy of note that this plan would preserve the heart of the so-called "incentive licensing" plan which was implemented in 1968.

I believe that the effects originally expected of the incentive licensing scheme have not been realized in practice. There is little evidence that this scheme, now 30 years old, has produced any notable increase in the skills, operating excellence, advanced electronic techniques, or other tangible valuable difference between the operators in the various "non-entry-level" classes of licensee.

As a non-scientific but pragmatic experiment, tune a receiver to 14.350MHz. Close your eyes and slowly tune the receiver down across the 20M amateur radio band. Try to detect the "class boundaries" based on a difference in signal quality, better operating practices, or more advanced technical conversations. I think you will find no detectable difference as you transit across the frequencies which mark the boundary between General, Advanced, and Amateur Extra sub-bands. Thus it can be assumed that the expectations of the incentive licensing program (greater levels of technical and operating skill at higher license classes) have not been realized, and the incentive licensing plan can be safely abandoned as providing no significant benefit to the public interest, necessity, or convenience (PICON).

II Proposal:

A. License Classes:

If the interest of the FCC is (as stated in the NPRM) streamlining of the licensing structure, then I propose that the license classes be reduced to two classes, namely "Basic" and "Advanced".

The "Basic" license would have an entry-level test (basic regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC electronics). Without CW endorsement this class would have full frequency and mode privileges above 30MHz, power limited to 50W output.

The "Advanced" license test would be of a difficulty level similar to the current Advanced class test, and would have full privileges above 30MHz at power levels up to 1500W.

B. Morse required for operation below 30MHz

Either license class could gain access to all MF/HF amateur radio frequency allocations (at 50W and 1500W respectively) upon passing a Morse test of 5WPM and gaining a "CW endorsement" for their operator license.

The Morse test should be "fill in the blank" or "1 minute of solid copy". Multiple-choice test formats should not be allowed.

C. Status of current licensees.

Current licensees should be redistributed as follows:

Current class	Converts to
Novice:	Basic CW Endorsed
Technician:	Basic
Technician+:	Basic CW Endorsed (Note 1)
General:	Advanced CW Endorsed
Advanced:	Advanced CW Endorsed (Note 2)
Extra:	Advanced CW Endorsed (Note 2)

Notes:
1) "Old" Technicians (who took same written test as General and 5WPM) would be "Advanced" CW endorsed.
2) Current Extra licensees could continue to have that class printed on their license in recognition of their previous status.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Hans Brakob, K0HB

3032. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 03:49:46 UTC
From: mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net
Message-ID: <3cd4ab6b.1277118098@news.newsville.com>
Source record: 42300

On 4 May 2002 19:54:19 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<z3ZA8.3180$U11.142941@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>>
>> First, what you describe above is almost indistinguishable from the current
>> Technician examination.
>>
>> Second, elementary school children are passing the current Extra exam with
>> ease, so your "dumbed-down-because-they're-babies" notion (which you've
>> floated here under various other names before) simply isn't needed.
>
>Like a fine wine, it get's better with age.
>
>Now - tell us the truth, Hans; if you had your way, we would have
>NEVER had a NoCode Tech license, would we? In fact, we wouldn't have
>had a NOVICE or a TECHNICIAN class license.
>
>Yes, indeed - if Hans had his way since 1958, the ONLY way to get into
>the Amateur Radio Service would have been(and would still be) to pass
>a 13wpm Morse Code examination, and the General Class written
>examination. Fortunately, the FCC(and even the ARRL) at times have
>seen fit to ignore this ridiculous line of thought, and do the right
>thing over the years.
>
>Mark my words, when the Amateur numbers start to slide again(and they
>will), the ARRL will be forced to back some kind of REAL measure to
>stop the decline. Why do you think the ARRL backed 5WPM restructuring
>- to stop the ongoing contraction which was obviously occuring at that
>time. But, 5WPM restructuring has only provided a little short-term
>relief - eventually REAL reform will be necessary.

Funny - nothing I've read on this board, and particularly nothing I
read in this thread seems to match the reality of what I hear on the
HAM Bands.

I've been an active SWL'r for 3 years and am taking the tech license
test at Dayton on the 19th.

I'm working on my code and will likely upgrade to General before the
year is out.

HF:

Filled with idiots (on voice). like the people on 3.865, 3.875, and
others up and down the frequencies. Some of these yahoo's and

good-ol-boys are listed on QRZ - and they're EXTRA CLASS!!!

I sure as hell wouldn't want children who might be interested or in whom interest might be cultivated listening to these guys. I believe the proper term for most of these folks is "lid", if I'm not mistaken. They're almost as bad as the QRMers although most are not intentionally annoying other operators.

One reason for holding off so long in getting my license was that I didn't think I'd have any real interest in VHF/UHF.

But - I knew I had to start at the beginning. I bought my 2M rig and have been listening and learning (and NOT transmitting) while I await my test and practice my code.

At least in my neck the woods, 2 Meters is *heaven*. Courteous operators, following the rules who seem to be doing the bulk of public service work.

I'm quickly losing interest in using Phone on HF - most of what I've heard is crap.

Using "CWGet", the code I listen to and try to learn from is much more like what my impression of Amateur Radio is supposed to be at its best.

My point is this: The No-Code Techs on 2M (I look up their licenses on QRZ) more fit my definition of HAMS than MOST Generals and Extra's I hear on HF SSB. In short - I pray they stay where the hell they are and never come up and infect 2M or 440.

Your proposal is yet another way of forcing code on folks who frankly appear to share my opinion and want nothing to do with HF and the plethora of cranks, freaks, and goof-offs that use phone there.

My incentive for learning code is to be able to use it for low power DX on HF. I sure as hell wouldn't waste my time with most of the so-called "real" HAMS on HF phone. Perhaps I should say I wouldn't waste my time with most domestic traffic.

Your proposal does nothing to address QRMers who buy rigs and swarm the frequencies, and does nothing to address "real" HAMS who incessantly argue with them, use foul language, and waste bandwidth.

So my plea to most Generals and Extras is, kindly stay on HF where you belong and if you code, you have my respect and I genuinely hope I have the pleasure and privilage of speaking with you soon. But please stay the hell away from VHF/UHF - from the comments on this board and the things I hear discussed on HF - many of you don't think highly of the space above 50 anyway.

And remember - YOU and YOUR practices formed my opinions in the past 3 years.

Forcing Code on good HAMS who don't want it or need it does NOTHING to improve HAM radio - NOTHING.

And because someone will likely respond with, "no license - no opinion", let me give a pre-emptive and friendly, "PFFFFFFT".

Thank you.

3033. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 03:51:43 UTC
From: mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net
Message-ID: <3cd4ac30.1277314881@news.newsville.com>
Source record: 42301

On Sun, 05 May 2002 03:49:46 GMT, mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net (You Betcha (Mike H.)) wrote:

I hate my Usenet provider...sheesh.

3034. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 04:00:49 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <R72B8.37$Mb6.12805@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42302

"You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote

>
> So my plea to most Generals and Extras is, kindly stay on HF where you
> belong and if you code, you have my respect and I genuinely hope I
> have the pleasure and privilage of speaking with you soon. But please
> stay the hell away from VHF/UHF - from the comments on this board and
> the things I hear discussed on HF - many of you don't think highly of
> the space above 50 anyway.
>

I'm not sure why you think I should stay away from any allocated
frequencies. The "space above 50" is no less the domain of Extras,
Advanced, or Generals, than it is for Technicians.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3035. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 04:09:31 UTC
From: mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net
Message-ID: <3cd4aeba.1277965316@news.newsville.com>
Source record: 42304

On Sun, 05 May 2002 04:00:49 GMT, "K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:

>
>"You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote
>
>>
>> So my plea to most Generals and Extras is, kindly stay on HF where you
>> belong and if you code, you have my respect and I genuinely hope I
>> have the pleasure and privilage of speaking with you soon. But please
>> stay the hell away from VHF/UHF - from the comments on this board and
>> the things I hear discussed on HF - many of you don't think highly of
>> the space above 50 anyway.
>>
>
>I'm not sure why you think I should stay away from any allocated
>frequencies. The "space above 50" is no less the domain of Extras,
>Advanced, or Generals, than it is for Technicians.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>

The reason I would like *many* of you to stay away is clearly indicated in the rest of the message.

As I've said, I've been actively monitoring SSB Phone for 3 years and there's way too many dolts and "lids" using phone on HF.

I've never heard *anything* on 2M or 440 that I wouldn't want a youngster to hear. I sure as hell can't say the same thing for HF and I'd prefer those HAMS (so-called "real" HAMS who passed the code test) not bring their bad practices and foul language up to VHF/UHF.

Some of what I said was intended to be a bit facetious and cutting - to drive home a particular point. But ONLY some of it.

The "point' being - don't force code on good HAMS who don't need it to be good HAMS.

>
>
>

3036. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 04:18:40 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Ao2B8.22$7x6.6457@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42305

"You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote

>
> The "point' being - don't force code on good HAMS who don't need it to
> be good HAMS.
>

I don't propose to force code on anyone, but how does your "point" support your request for me to get off the frequencies above 50?

You just aren't making a very persuasive case for kicking me off those frequencies.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3037. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 04:20:22 UTC
From: mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net
Message-ID: <3cd4b29a.1278956662@news.newsville.com>
Source record: 42306

On Sun, 05 May 2002 04:09:31 GMT, mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net (You Betcha (Mike H.)) wrote:

>On Sun, 05 May 2002 04:00:49 GMT, "K&#65533;HB"
><KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:
>
>>
>>"You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote
>>
>>>
>>> So my plea to most Generals and Extras is, kindly stay on HF where you
>>> belong and if you code, you have my respect and I genuinely hope I
>>> have the pleasure and privilage of speaking with you soon. But please
>>> stay the hell away from VHF/UHF - from the comments on this board and
>>> the things I hear discussed on HF - many of you don't think highly of
>>> the space above 50 anyway.
>>>
>>
>>I'm not sure why you think I should stay away from any allocated
>>frequencies. The "space above 50" is no less the domain of Extras,
>>Advanced, or Generals, than it is for Technicians.
>>
>>With all kind wishes,
>>
>>de Hans, K0HB
>>
>>
>>
>
>The reason I would like *many* of you to stay away is clearly
>indicated in the rest of the message.
>
>As I've said, I've been actively monitoring SSB Phone for 3 years and
>there's way too many dolts and "lids" using phone on HF.
>
>I've never heard *anything* on 2M or 440 that I wouldn't want a
>youngster to hear. I sure as hell can't say the same thing for HF and
>I'd prefer those HAMS (so-called "real" HAMS who passed the code test)
>not bring their bad practices and foul language up to VHF/UHF.
>
>Some of what I said was intended to be a bit facetious and cutting -
>to drive home a particular point. But ONLY some of it.
>

>The "point' being - don't force code on good HAMS who don't need it to
>be good HAMS.
>
>>
>>
>>
>

I should also add that I'm perfectly well aware that VHF/UHF is used
by General's/Extra's, etc., every day and in perhaps greater numbers
than Tech or Tech Plus HAMS.

At least they know how to behave. :)

3038. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 04:32:39 UTC
From: mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net
Message-ID: <3cd4b4d7.1279530307@news.newsville.com>
Source record: 42307

On Sun, 05 May 2002 04:18:40 GMT, "K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:

>
>"You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote
>
>>
>> The "point' being - don't force code on good HAMS who don't need it to
>> be good HAMS.
>>
>
>I don't propose to force code on anyone, but how does your "point" support
>your request for me to get off the frequencies above 50?
>
>You just aren't making a very persuasive case for kicking me off those
>frequencies.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB
>
>

Ah...argument for sake of argument.

Fer Cryin' out loud, Hans

I'M NOT PROPOSING TO KICK YOU OFF ANYTHING.

I'm simply "requesting" that HAMS (who had to pass code) to get on HF
and who employ bad practices, foul language, etc., etc. to stay on HF
and not infect VHF/UHF with those practices.

I'm sure you're a lovely HAM, Hans and you're perfectly welcome on any
frequency you are authorized to transmit on.

If you use foul language and are a creep - I'd simply prefer you stay
away from 2M/400.

Jeez...is this clear enough?

I was addressing Stewart's proposal - not you personally.

hzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzz.

3039. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 05:58:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505015822.27478.00007011@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 42308

>Subject: Re: This kid is headed to rrap!
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/04/02 13:18 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205040918.57276344@posting.google.com>

>Yes, unchecked capitalism leads to
>Monarchy(a form of Dictatorship)

Stew...just WHICH capitalist entity has ever become a Monarchy due to
capitalism?

>What we need Larry is a little more TOLERANCE of others and of other's
>viewpoints.

Tolerance is fine as long as you agree with me. (Refer back to Hans'
cartoon, and now you understand the gist of it...)

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

3040. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 06:26:30 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <E6D2A16C1FFD0B3D.53F07A5048655A75.EDEC8E7B8A7D96DC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42309

On Sun, 05 May 2002 04:00:49 GMT, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:

>"You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote

>> So my plea to most Generals and Extras is, kindly stay on HF where you
>> belong and if you code, you have my respect and I genuinely hope I
>> have the pleasure and privilage of speaking with you soon. But please
>> stay the hell away from VHF/UHF - from the comments on this board and
>> the things I hear discussed on HF - many of you don't think highly of
>> the space above 50 anyway.

>I'm not sure why you think I should stay away from any allocated
>frequencies. The "space above 50" is no less the domain of Extras,
>Advanced, or Generals, than it is for Technicians.

Hmmm...maybe I can talk him into sending me a nice HF rig to get me
off 2m for a while...

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3041. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 06:46:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505024659.20814.00006727@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 42310

>Subject: New Novice Class Proposal
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/04/02 14:01 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205041001.1f748ec2@posting.google.com>

Geezus Freakin' Holidays, Stewart......

>Proposal to FCC to reinstate the Novice license class in the Amateur
>Radio Service - REV B

"Revision A" was stupid enough. This is even less thought-out.

>Due to the elimination of the Novice Class license, and improving
>communications technologies, the Technician Class license no longer
>serves well as an introductory license class;...(SNIP)

Spoken from a position of true ignorance.

>...especially in terms of
>drawing young members into the Service.

Even more ignorance, considering the popularity of Amateur Radio as
classroom projects.

>As a result of license
>restructuring, it is now actually harder for young people to obtain an
>Amateur license than it was before restructuring.

Now going from true ignorance to COMPLETE ignorance.

>In this critical era of global competition...

Snipped...Lotsa syllables...I am sure someone felt vindicated in thier
expenditure of tax dollars for your public education. Now if we can help you
develop some common sense to go with it, you MIGHT be able to do something with
it....

>Today, technologies like the Family Radio Service, Multi-Use Radio
>Service, ...

WHOINTHEHELL are you trying to kid, Stew? 14 channels of 1/2 watt uhf FM
and five channels of 2 watts of VHF- FM "overshadow" the Amateur Technician
class..?!?!

Let's see.....A weekend's worth of studying, maybe make it a week if you
want to really stretch it out, then I can use all allocations above 50mHz, up
to 1500 W of power, a plethora of modes, satellites and other operating
options, vs your 19 CHANNELS...???

Why don't you just sit outside of the FCC offices with a dunce cap on, thumb and index finger in an "L" on your forehead, and an old copy of "S9" magazine in your lap?

>high-speed telephone & cable modems, the Internet, and
>inexpensive cellular telephones, have overshadowed the privileges of
>the Amateur Radio Service...(SNIP)

Apples/Oranges. Really stupid, Stew.

>Additionally, the Technician Class license has now evolved into a
>beginning and ending point for most Amateurs now entering the service,
>who are mostly interested in VHF/UHF communications, rather than HF
>communications.

Then if that's all they want to do with it, Stew, it doesn't matter how many classes of license you would have the FCC create. If V/UHF is all they want, then what's another class of license going to do?

For those who WANT HF priviledges, they will do what's necessary. The incentive is still there. It's up to the individual to make it happen.

>The need for a Service dedicated to the goal of teaching young radio
>users proper radio operation techniques and etiquette can clearly be
>seen in the disarray present on the Citizen's Band Service
>frequencies.

"The service" itself is not going to teach anyone anything, Stew. Part 97 exisits, in part, to provide the >opportunity< for interested parties to have the resource available. It's what indivduals make of it that will make it a learning tool.

>On VHF and UHF frequencies, the privileges and restrictions will be
>the same as exists for the current grandfathered Novice Class license.

PRESENT DAY Novices let it lay fallow for a decade, Stew. It was so confining that practically no one used it.

>New Novice Class license holders would not have any privileges on HF
>frequencies.

WTF for?

>Consistent with the implementation of the No Code Technician License,
>in which the existing Technician Class license holders were placed in
>a new class known as Technician Plus, existing Novice Class license
>holders would be placed in a new class known as Novice Plus.

Great, Stew...One MORE class of license to keep up with...With your "proposal" you now have us bck up to five.

You weren't paying attention when the FCC said they want to STREAMLINE the licensing structure, were you?

>The new license class would have the following goals:
>

>1) Encourage more young people to enter the Amateur Radio Service, by
>providing an entry-level ARS license class that includes privileges
>allowing reliable short-range voice and data communications.

Absolutely contrainidcated in a class of licnese that YOU propose for
"training" . Why do you "propose" a new class of license and then throw all
sorts of restricitions on it, Stew?

>The Novice license exam would consist of 25....

The Technician class already consists of 25 questions and grants ALL
Amateur priviledges above 50mHz.

>Consistent with
>the final form of the old Novice Class license examination, knowledge
>of capacitors and inductors would not be required.

Yeah...Let's try to hoodwink the FCC into creating a new license to
allegedly "train" kids in radio electronics, then NOT require they learn about
some of the very most basic of RF theory.

Stewart, are you just doing this to get your name into the Federal
Register?

Steve

3042. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 10:08:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505060857.27399.00001233@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 42311

In article <5f4fe4c2.0205041919.1de9ada9@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20020504180645.26630.00000214@mb-cs.aol.com>...
>> 1) FCC wants simpler rules, not more complex ones. Selling them on a 4th
>> license class after they decided 3 is enough is a losing battle. Tacking on
>> stuff like age limits, no renewability and band restrictions (no 2 meters?)
>> makes it even worse.
>
>I tend to agree with this, that's why I've dropped the age requirement
>and renewability issues, and left the privileges the same as they were
>before.

I recall this proposal being for "a 5 year nonrenewable license". I assumed age limits, which is just plain dumb of me, but the shorter license term and nonrenewability are both nonstarters.

Leaving the requirements as they were will result in the same problem as before: very few new hams starting out with Novice licenses. The difference between Novice and Tech requirements is simply too small, and the difference in privileges too great. No 2 meters and no 440? Forget it!

>Even the old Novice question pool could be reused(by simply
>eliminating all the non-applicable questions).

The current Tech is 35 questions, mostly on regs and operating practices. Do you think new hams would rather take 2 tests totaling 60 questions, or one test totalling 35 questions, in order to get all ham privileges above 30 MHz? Most will simply bypass the Novice and go straight to Tech.

And your idea does not look forward to what will happen if/when S25.5 disappears in a year or two. That's where the real action is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3043. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 12:45:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD52919.35CE8193@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42312

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Your postings are clearly anti-digital, Dick.
> >
> > Yeah, RIGHT. You spring near a kilobuck for a STS-for PACTOR instead of just building
> > your own, as you insist that all us lesser mortals must do, while I busily work the
> > soundcard digital modes SEVERAL of them, and you make such a statement SOLELY because
> > I support the use and testing of CW in ham radio. And you still act like I'm the goat
> > here. But the readers know, old sot. They know.
>
> All I have done is suggest that digital software and DSP programming is a good
> way for amateurs to experiment nowadays. You responded that we don't need any
> digital experimentation and that the modes we have are good enough for the
> foreseeable future.

So you lie even more. Nowhere have I even suggested that digital experimentation isn't a good thing, and you can't show where I did. I said it isn't the do-all and be-all that you and Candid Carl insist it has to be for all hams. Yep, that's been your thrust.

> Your postings are clearly anti-digital, anti-experimentation,
> and anti-progress.

Your (and Carl's and Ed Hare's) mischaracterizations of my posts are so dishonest that I'm quite certain the readers see through it all very clearly. How does it feel to be proven a outright liar?

> What are you afraid of, Dick?

It sure as hell isn't you, Carl nor Ed. The damage you do to the ARS is one possibility.

3044. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 13:32:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD53461.DCDB18BE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42313

"You Betcha (Mike H.)" wrote:
> I should also add that I'm perfectly well aware that VHF/UHF is used
> by General's/Extra's, etc., every day and in perhaps greater numbers
> than Tech or Tech Plus HAMS.
>
> At least they know how to behave. :)

Except in Los Angeles, hams don't usually pi$$ in their local sandbox.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3045. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 13:38:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD535CA.76F75562@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42314

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
> >Yes, unchecked capitalism leads to Monarchy(a form of Dictatorship)
>
> Stew...just WHICH capitalist entity has ever become a Monarchy due to
> capitalism?

Stewart seems to be confusing economic systems with political systems.
Capitalism is NOT a political system. Capitalism is an economic system
that allows the ownership and control of the means of production to
reside in the hands of the citizens rather than in the hands of a
socialist/fascist government.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3046. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 13:48:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ab3dql$i77$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42315

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in
message news:bu_A8.6646$6T5.564838@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
....
> My real question is why all the emphasis on mode? Who gives a hoot?

I think the issue is doing whatever (transport of voice or data content)
in a more efficient manner such that spectrum use can be expanded
over contemporary modes (legacy modes as some folks call them).

> Things get their feet in the door by osmosis and because they work at a
> price. Buying a gizwidgit to plug into the mike and speaker jack to run
> to a compooter at a price equal to either one is patently ridiculous.

That depends on the price of the computer and the derived benefit
of the gizwidget.

> For
> that matter, the quest to decode morse on a compooter is
> right up there in the stupidity department as well.

But who's to fault those that want to. It's a free country
and I could care less what others do to enjoy amateur
radio pursuits.

> As you point out, it is all binary anyway once you figure out how
> to do A/D conversion.

It's been going on for 4 decades in telephony.

> And as you point out the CD jocks figured out how to make
> a speaker rattle years ago. The size of the CD was set to handle
> Beethoven's Third, the Eroica. So if there are hardware limitations, and
> doing a 21 MHz signal directly is not to my knowlege possible today, then
> why have we not seen more audio/i.f. DSP beyond filters for RTTY etc.
> I put digital detection in there for a reason, several of them in fact.
The
> problem is quite solvable: if you can digitize a piece of spectrum you can
> decode it digitally even if it is analog in origin; FSK should be trivial
> and to top it all off, you should be able to look at a wider bit of
> spectrum, recognize two channels that are mutually inclusive and
> exclusive, narrow down the spectrum cut to maximize reception and decode
> the signal digitally without worrying about tuning to the right boop and
> beep. FM is not that hard if Heathkit could do it with vacuum tubes.

But all that is primarily high end audio quality today. Nice if we'd
want to transport Dolby multichannel audio, but I think the primary
goal is traditional voice akin to a telephone voice call.

> You guys are demanding the mode be set first and in fact seem to be hung
> up on mode. Now the two examples I gave have their decoding methods
> implicit in them, FSK because one or the other is on all the time and FM
> because, sub carriers aside, both sides of center are equal. It seems a
> little silly to be decoding the digital third subcarrier from the output
> of some variation on an Armstrong Discriminator so I can be sure I am
> tuned to KWWW, the Turnip Grinder now playing Elvis singing Don Giovanni
> or Tex Ritter doing La Donna e Mobile'. I keep hearing about software, so
> let us see some in the present environment. If nothing else you could
> decode the second subcarrier as well and make a monumental contribution to
> talking books for the blind.
>
> I am not just being pissy, I am trying to show how we get from Analog
> Point A to Digital Point B in a market with an installed base that
> actually works pretty well.

In most cases, it is really getting from A to D and back to A. I don't
know anyone that listens to digital. The end result is always A for
voice. Telephony uses a 64Kb channel for traditional telephone
connections. Contemporary compression techniques have lowered that
to 8Kb... and the result is still a "near toll quality" audio.

> It is done by infiltration and performing
> certain tasks better than the present approach can do. At some point the
> issue with mode becomes moot, we go with one that fits the existing
> digital capability whatever they may be at the time. One does not destroy
> SSB, he co-opts it.

Agreed...which is what SSB did to AM.

> Above all, he buries the 'legacy' schtick as deep as he can digitally dig
> the hole. This term bothers me probably more than it should because I
> have seen more IT phonies try to buffalo people with it than I ever want
> to see again. At least to me the term 'legacy' anything makes me believe
> I am dealing with a gold-plated turkey. To be frank, I have never seen
> its use in this context convince me it isn't worse in radio.

I tend to agree. The "legacy" term seems to always apply to
equipment and systems that hang on beyond their useful life.
Some of that is driven by the marketplace in commercial
areas....it is more often driven by a staunch advocate base
in the non-commercial space.

> I admit, as should be obvious, that I like approaches where the key is in
> the transmitted signal and where intelligence can be applied to tune and
> decode it to the virtual exclusion of all else. It is the only real
> weakness of SSB and one good reason to eat the elephant one bite at a
> time. The first step is to apply some intelligence period and sweat mode
> later.

Agree also.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3047. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 14:00:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD52C59.C51EDF31@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42316

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CD3DF90.89694C49@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Your postings are clearly anti-digital, Dick.
> > >
> > > Yeah, RIGHT. You spring near a kilobuck for a STS-for PACTOR instead
> of just building
> > > your own, as you insist that all us lesser mortals must do, while I
> busily work the
> > > soundcard digital modes SEVERAL of them, and you make such a statement
> SOLELY because
> > > I support the use and testing of CW in ham radio. And you still act
> like I'm the goat
> > > here. But the readers know, old sot. They know.
> > >
> > All I have done is suggest that digital software and DSP programming is
> a good
> > way for amateurs to experiment nowadays. You responded that we don't
> need any
> > digital experimentation and that the modes we have are good enough for
> the
> > foreseeable future. Your postings are clearly anti-digital,
> anti-experimentation,
> > and anti-progress. What are you afraid of, Dick?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
>
> Cecil, the biggest breakthru in digital technology is the DSP side of the
> house where a receiver and to a lesser extent transmitter can be dialed up
> more or less on cue. It has come a long way but has a long way to go as I
> am sure you will admit. This is intriguing, just as the Collins
> mechanical filter was intriguing about 50 years ago. And a DSP rig will
> do an ace job on CW and SSB.
>
> And while we are at it, we can apply software to synchronous detection and
> realize the promise made about 50 years ago that DSB signals with or
> without pilot carriers can be spaced at 2 kHz and by ignoring things not
> identical on both sides do so without noticeable interference. The FCC
> would thank us firmly because it would finally put an end to FM for

> communications and free up gazillions of Public Safety and commercial
> channels without having them hop all over creation.
>
> Try attacking a commercial FM channel as a digital signal; why not,
> Heathkit did it about 40 years ago and it had far better fidelity than
> anything Armstrong ever envisioned.
>
> But no, you digifreaks gots to go out and attack the simplest (and
> cheapest, wetware is really cheap) communication method known to man
> because it gives you a manhood problem. BFD. Sure SSB is getting very
> long in tooth but its major failing is that the receiver is pretty much on
> its own; it is harder to process concentrated communication because it
> does not supply a Rosetta Stone to do much translation or auto-adjustment
> with. Even NTSC television envisioned that with VIR and FM used the
> identical sideband thing to do AFC with TV taking a few years to use the
> same method.
>
> No one is really defending the status quo except the ogres that exist in
> the minds of some digifreaks who seem to be able to drive themselves to
> neurosis with no help from me or anyone else. These things are
> evolutionary and always have been but there seems to be a cadre of yoyos
> who feel called upon to build the New Jerusalem upon the ruins of the old
> one; and they are far better at creating the ruins than much else.
>
> For what it is worth, I like the idea of an 'futz-mode' band in the middle
> of the regular bands for the same reason it made sense to put Novices
> there. Kept them out of trouble.
>
> Dick Nï¿½BK

Cecil, Carl and Ed Hazer just *think* they're smart. This guy N0BK is where
the brains actually are.

3048. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 14:00:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CD53A75.DCF6FAC5@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42317

Richard McCollum wrote:

>
> No one is really defending the status quo except the ogres that exist in
> the minds of some digifreaks who seem to be able to drive themselves to
> neurosis with no help from me or anyone else. These things are
> evolutionary and always have been but there seems to be a cadre of yoyos
> who feel called upon to build the New Jerusalem upon the ruins of the old
> one; and they are far better at creating the ruins than much else.
>

Precisely the situation, and it all reverts back to the fact that said individuals were never able to gain the sense of accomplishment in amateur radio they gained in their comical careers.
What that mostly means is they didn't want to do it enough to practice the code. Somehow they feel compelled to translate all their frustrations into and onto other hams who just did it. Of course, newcomers know nothing of all this, so the frustrated ones grasp the opportunity to make it all look like a "class warfare" situation when nothing of the sort is involved. How many of us old-timer Extras would have participated for years in the VET program if we didn't want any newcomers particularly Nicole Etches, to enter the hobby? I've always encouraged every new ham to go wherever they wanted in ham radio, and it was never an issue where that may have been, from remaining Nicole tech to the full load and I have friends at every level. But to further their Agenda, these louts fervently insist that we code supporters hate knockers. What we actually hate is the very destructive attitude of these very persons. It does more to destroy harmony and trust among hams than any other factor.

In Worldradio Magazine last month was a first person article by a newer ham in which she stated ".. I wound up with my Extra. (a friend) urged me to get on HF, and suddenly I realized I didn't know HOW to get on HF.."

That's where we have wound up, and it's the only real problem I ever had with the late restructuring. The practical effect was to destroy the Extra class license by making it possible to obtain with Novice knowledge and skill.

3049. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 14:07:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD53CB6.77B69D39@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42318

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> Nowhere have I even suggested that digital experimentation isn't a
> good thing, and you can't show where I did.

I said that digital experimentation would be a good thing and you argued
loud and long against it. Everyone who follows your postings will agree.

> > Your postings are clearly anti-digital, anti-experimentation,
> > and anti-progress.
>
> Your (and Carl's and Ed Hare's) mischaracterizations of my posts are so dishonest that
I'm
> quite certain the readers see through it all very clearly. How does it feel to be proven
a
> outright liar?

Would you like to retract the multiple slams and rants that you have made against
digital experimentation for all the world to read?

> > What are you afraid of, Dick?
>
> It sure as hell isn't you, Carl nor Ed. The damage you do to the ARS is one possibility.

Your own words are what you should be afraid of. Maybe we could agree on some
statements.

1. OOK/Morse is a digital mode. Coherent CW is hard for any mode to beat.

2. Writing software is a relatively straight forward design and development path
as there is very little hardware design needed.

3. Slowly but surely, the RF world is going digital. It would be nice if
hams participated in the design and development of some of the new systems
that are sure to come.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3050. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 14:11:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ab3eol$1m$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42319

"You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote in
message news:3cd4aeba.1277965316@news.newsville.com...
> On Sun, 05 May 2002 04:00:49 GMT, "K&#65533;HB"
> <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:
>
> >"You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote
> >> So my plea to most Generals and Extras is, kindly stay on HF where you
> >> belong and if you code, you have my respect and I genuinely hope I
> >> have the pleasure and privilage of speaking with you soon. But please
> >> stay the hell away from VHF/UHF - from the comments on this board and
> >> the things I hear discussed on HF - many of you don't think highly of
> >> the space above 50 anyway.
> >
> >I'm not sure why you think I should stay away from any allocated
> >frequencies. The "space above 50" is no less the domain of
> >Extras, Advanced, or Generals, than it is for Technicians.
> >de Hans, K0HB
>
> The reason I would like *many* of you to stay away is clearly
> indicated in the rest of the message.
>
> As I've said, I've been actively monitoring SSB Phone for 3 years
> and there's way too many dolts and "lids" using phone on HF.

The problem manifests itself on HF because HF allows
a small group of hams that represent the worst aspects of
humanity to get together over large distances. Hence we get
the racist bilge from a handful of "lids" who would have
no other means to stay in touch if all they had access to was
VHF. It may well be the case that there is a jerk operator
in almost every repeater coverage area, but without the
ability to garner a like minded set of "on-the-air" players,
that jerk operator has no one to share his/her garbage
with.

> I've never heard *anything* on 2M or 440 that I wouldn't want a
> youngster to hear. I sure as hell can't say the same thing for HF and
> I'd prefer those HAMS (so-called "real" HAMS who passed the code test)
> not bring their bad practices and foul language up to VHF/UHF.
> Some of what I said was intended to be a bit facetious and cutting -
> to drive home a particular point. But ONLY some of it.

But your point is well noted. The major problem with hams
on the air who act as the "worst" examples of hams anywhere is
on HF.

> The "point' being - don't force code on good HAMS who don't need it to
> be good HAMS.

I don't think you need worry about that. We already
have "nocode" tech and that isn't going to change at
all. The last gasp of mandated coode testing is just
the 5 wpm for HF...and that will be gone soon.
How soon is probably in the late 2003/early 2004 timeframe.
If you are more than content with VHF, then even that
is of no concern.

What I would ask you to consider is that while the bilge of
amateurs seems to be on HF, they represent a small
minority and there are many other hams... Extras, Advanced
and Generals who detest the example that minority sets
for the rest of us to anyone that might hear them...be
that other hams, the public at large and/or the FCC.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3051. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 14:20:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD53FA4.AC188651@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42320

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That's where we have wound up, and it's the only real problem I ever had with
> the late restructuring. The practical effect was to destroy the Extra class
> license by making it possible to obtain with Novice knowledge and skill.

So have you burned your extra license in protest yet, Dick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3052. Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 16:01:01 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <udakn7rr6fab6b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 42321

Hello, all!

In the early 1990s I was at Palomar Observatory, on
one of my three pilgramages to that astronomical shrine,
when, on the way back to the car, I happened to see
some kids in strange uniforms holding a very large and
shiney card up in the air. I saw this through the viewfinder
of my video camera and, after doing a double take, I
shut off the machine and headed over to see what was
going with this!

The group on the sidewalk on Palomar Mountain was
from France and in fact was made up of French Boy
Scouts and their leaders. They had come all this way
to participate in a contest involving other Boy Scouts
from around the world, a contest involving very large
shiney cards and Morse Code.

As I restarted my video camera, aiming it in the
direction these folks were facing, which was north,
I asked one of the leaders what they were doing.
"We're in a contest to send a message from Mexico
to Canada," he said. "The team who is fastest and
most accurate, overall, wins." Soon enough, through
the viewfinder, I could see flashes from another
mountain top, confirming reception of the team's
message. The distance? About 60 miles! My
brother-in-law, who was with me, confirmed this.
"Oh, yeah," he said, "That's XXXX peak, up toward
Palm Springs!" Hey, I was impressed!

Let me see. What does the acronym ARRL mean?
Hmm. What could be done here? Hmm. Relay.
Morse Code. Low power. Temporay license.
Contest. Kits. All age groups. Prizes. Corporate
involvement. Hmm.

But to quote Steve Martin, "This could be the dawn
of a NEW AGE! We could . . . NAAAAAAH!"

Val Germann
KC0MUB

**

3053. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 18:39:41 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <N%eB8.7534$6T5.682614@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42322

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CD52C59.C51EDF31@townsqr.com...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CD3DF90.89694C49@IEEE.org...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Your postings are clearly anti-digital, Dick.
> > > > >
> > > > Yeah, RIGHT. You spring near a kilobuck for a STS-for PACTOR
instead
> > of just building
> > > > your own, as you insist that all us lesser mortals must do, while
I
> > busily work the
> > > > soundcard digital modes SEVERAL of them, and you make such a
statement
> > SOLELY because
> > > > I support the use and testing of CW in ham radio. And you still
act
> > like I'm the goat
> > > > here. But the readers know, old sot. They know.
> > > >
> > > All I have done is suggest that digital software and DSP programming
is
> > a good
> > > way for amateurs to experiment nowadays. You responded that we don't
> > need any
> > > digital experimentation and that the modes we have are good enough
for
> > the
> > > foreseeable future. Your postings are clearly anti-digital,
> > anti-experimentation,
> > > and anti-progress. What are you afraid of, Dick?
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> >
> > Cecil, the biggest breakthru in digital technology is the DSP side of
the
> > house where a receiver and to a lesser extent transmitter can be

dialed up
> > more or less on cue. It has come a long way but has a long way to go
as I
> > am sure you will admit. This is intriguing, just as the Collins
> > mechanical filter was intriguing about 50 years ago. And a DSP rig
will
> > do an ace job on CW and SSB.
> >
> > And while we are at it, we can apply software to synchronous detection
and
> > realize the promise made about 50 years ago that DSB signals with or
> > without pilot carriers can be spaced at 2 kHz and by ignoring things
not
> > identical on both sides do so without noticeable interference. The
FCC
> > would thank us firmly because it would finally put an end to FM for
> > communications and free up gazillions of Public Safety and commercial
> > channels without having them hop all over creation.
> >
> > Try attacking a commercial FM channel as a digital signal; why not,
> > Heathkit did it about 40 years ago and it had far better fidelity than
> > anything Armstrong ever envisioned.
> >
> > But no, you digifreaks gots to go out and attack the simplest (and
> > cheapest, wetware is really cheap) communication method known to man
> > because it gives you a manhood problem. BFD. Sure SSB is getting
very
> > long in tooth but its major failing is that the receiver is pretty
much on
> > its own; it is harder to process concentrated communication because it
> > does not supply a Rosetta Stone to do much translation or
auto-adjustment
> > with. Even NTSC television envisioned that with VIR and FM used the
> > identical sideband thing to do AFC with TV taking a few years to use
the
> > same method.
> >
> > No one is really defending the status quo except the ogres that exist
in
> > the minds of some digifreaks who seem to be able to drive themselves
to
> > neurosis with no help from me or anyone else. These things are
> > evolutionary and always have been but there seems to be a cadre of
yoyos
> > who feel called upon to build the New Jerusalem upon the ruins of the
old
> > one; and they are far better at creating the ruins than much else.
> >
> > For what it is worth, I like the idea of an 'futz-mode' band in the

middle
> > of the regular bands for the same reason it made sense to put Novices
> > there. Kept them out of trouble.
> >
> > Dick N&#65533;BK
>
> Cecil, Carl and Ed Hazer just *think* they're smart. This guy N0BK is
where
> the brains actually are.

Don't give me more credit than I have coming; lots of people here can and do blow my doors off technically. What I am good at is history and money so a system, computer or otherwise, is a capital investment with all that implies. A technician with an installed base that is generating the cash flow that pays the bills who pronounces it 'legacy' is a janitor who doesn't do floors and windows and deserves precisely the same fate.

3054. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 18:42:15 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <b2fB8.7537$6T5.682677@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42323

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CD53A75.DCF6FAC5@townsqr.com...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> >
> > No one is really defending the status quo except the ogres that exist
in
> > the minds of some digifreaks who seem to be able to drive themselves
to
> > neurosis with no help from me or anyone else. These things are
> > evolutionary and always have been but there seems to be a cadre of
yoyos
> > who feel called upon to build the New Jerusalem upon the ruins of the
old
> > one; and they are far better at creating the ruins than much else.
> >
>
> Precisely the situation, and it all reverts back to the fact that said
> individuals were never able to gain the sense of accomplishment in
amateur
> radio they gained in their comical careers.
> What that mostly means is they didn't want to do it enough to practice
the
> code. Somehow they feel compelled to translate all their frustrations
into and
> onto other hams who just did it. Of course, newcomers know nothing of
all
> this, so the frustrated ones grasp the opportunity to make it all look
like a
> "class warfare" situation when nothing of the sort is involved. How many
of us
> old-timer Extras would have participated for years in the VET program if
we
> didn't want any newcomers particularly Nicole Etches, to enter the
hobby? I've
> always encouraged every new ham to go wherever they wanted in ham radio,
and
> it was never an issue where that may have been, from remaining Nicole
tech to
> the full load and I have friends at every level. But to further their
Agenda,
> these louts fervently insist that we code supporters hate knockers. What
we
> actually hate is the very destructive attitude of these very persons. It

does
> more to destroy harmony and trust among hams than any other factor.
>
> In Worldradio Magazine last month was a first person article by a newer
ham in
> which she stated ".. I wound up with my Extra. (a friend) urged me to
get on
> HF, and suddenly I realized I didn't know HOW to get on HF.."
>
> That's where we have wound up, and it's the only real problem I ever
had with
> the late restructuring. The practical effect was to destroy the Extra
class
> license by making it possible to obtain with Novice knowledge and skill.

And this will pass with time if we don't let them get discouraged early in
their careers. All that has really happened is that the recruits are
greener than ever.

3055. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 18:59:00 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CD580D0.3080A4E9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42324

RadioClaire wrote:
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020502061005.06894.00006199@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> > >>You can't be seriously suggesting that ARRL's tax returns be considered as a
> > >>good answer to his question.
>
> They are really much more interesting than
> the "highly sanitized" Board Meeting Minutes
> and Pubicly Released Annual Financial Report.
>
> What I would like to see is the COMPREHENSIVE
> ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT for the ARRL !
>
> This Document [..known in the Industry as the CAFI]
> lists where every penny went to, and often to whom.
> If you want to know what's really going on, don't bother
> with the Budgetary Report, get the CAFR instead !!
>
> There's been alot of exposure, and many red faces, on
> the part of Local and County Governments when "Ordinary
> Citizens" have gotten ahold of a copy of their State, County and Local CAFI

If the Newington crowd ignores the organization's own
bylaws, then IMHO the CAFR should be even more revealing.
Read their Article 12 for yourself:

"Article 12:

No substantial part of the activities of our corporation
shall be the carrying on of propaganda, or otherwise
attempting to influence legislation, and our corporation
^^
shall not participate in, or intervene in (including the
publishing or distribution of statements) any political
campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office. ...".
>
> To SEE what I mean...go here---> http://www.cafrman.com/
>
> Again, I would LOVE to see the ARRL's un-redacted CAFR
> on somebody's website in the near future!

Let's see to it. Thanks,

73,
Clay N4AOX

3056. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 19:38:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD58A50.4C68A2D7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42325

Richard McCollum wrote:
> All that has really happened is that the recruits are greener than ever.

But possibly, thanks to technology, have a greater potential than ever.
I have traveled at 140 mph on the ground, thanks to Kawasaki technology,
a feat that my Grandfather would have had a hard time even conceiving (He
died in 1938).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3057. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 19:42:06 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <iWfB8.22$WQ4.15@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42326

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> If the Newington crowd ignores the organization's own
> bylaws, then IMHO the CAFR should be even more revealing.
> Read their Article 12 for yourself:

I read Article 12 very carefully, and I can only say that I have seen little (as in "No substatial part") attempt to influence legislation, and no participation in any campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

What I *do* see ARRL doing is working hard to work to advise our appointed regulators, the FCC, which is not in any sense prohibited in Article 12.

Sorry, Clay, but your membership in IODHW (International Order of Dismayed Hand Wringers) is revoked for cause. ("Cause your dump huck jeremiad is so far off target as to be laughable.")

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3058. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 20:06:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505160656.07448.00001332@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42327

In article <3CD53CB6.77B69D39@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>> Nowhere have I even suggested that digital experimentation isn't a
>> good thing, and you can't show where I did.
>
>I said that digital experimentation would be a good thing and you argued
>loud and long against it. Everyone who follows your postings will agree.

I follow most of the postings here on rrap. I cannot recall Dick, W0EX, ever writing that digital experimentation (whatever that means) was a bad thing, or that he was against it. If he "argued loud and long against it", as you say, Cecil, then I challenge you to produce the post(s) where he did so.

>> > Your postings are clearly anti-digital, anti-experimentation,
>> > and anti-progress.
>>
>> Your (and Carl's and Ed Hare's) mischaracterizations of my posts are so
>dishonest that I'm
>> quite certain the readers see through it all very clearly. How does it feel
>to be proven a
>> outright liar?

I don't know if Carl, Ed or Cecil are lying, or just mistaken.
>
>Would you like to retract the multiple slams and rants that you have made
>against
>digital experimentation for all the world to read?

Can you show us some of them, Cecil?

> Maybe we could agree on some
>statements.

Let's see what ya got.
>
>1. OOK/Morse is a digital mode.

Agreed.

>Coherent CW is hard for any mode to beat.

That depends on what you mean be "hard for any mode to beat". What are the criteria? Ease of use? Simplicity of equipment? Widespread use by hams? Speed? S/N? Bandwidth used? Immunity to interference?

I can come up with a set of criteria that make plain old AM voice "hard for any mode to beat".

>2. Writing software is a relatively straight forward design and development
>path as there is very little hardware design needed.

Disagree. It is possible to implement radio with hardware but no software. It's impossible to implement radio with software but no hardware.
>
>3. Slowly but surely, the RF world is going digital.

Disagree. RF is analog. You must define what you mean by "RF is going digital".

>It would be nice if
>hams participated in the design and development of some of the new systems
>that are sure to come.

Agreed.

So where are the posts, Cecil? Show us some - otherwise you are just blowing smoke. And show the whole post, not just quotes out of context.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3059. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 20:09:08 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CD59141.ECA1F2BA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42328

"KØHB" wrote:
When we see even former Ass. Dirs starting to squirm, me
thinks we be onto something!!??..

73,
Clay N4AOX

> Sorry, Clay, but your membership in IODHW (International Order of Dismayed
> Hand Wringers) is revoked for cause. ("Cause your dump huck jeremiad is so
> far off target as to be laughable.")
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

3060. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 20:21:40 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205052018220.32232-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42329

On 5 May 2002, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>The Novice license exam would consist of 25....
>
> The Technician class already consists of 25 questions and grants ALL
>Amateur priviledges above 50mHz.

Actually, it's 35 questions.

Don't forget about Stewart's mission to promote MURS..... That may justify his intent right there - trash the ARS. He has certainly tried to trash the newsgroups before with his MURS spam. Someone needs to educate him before he causes real damage.

>>Consistent with
>>the final form of the old Novice Class license examination, knowledge
>>of capacitors and inductors would not be required.
>
> Yeah...Let's try to hoodwink the FCC into creating a new license to
>allegedly "train" kids in radio electronics, then NOT require they learn about
>some of the very most basic of RF theory.
>
> Stewart, are you just doing this to get your name into the Federal
>Register?

Or the Federal "funny farm?"

3061. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 20:41:25 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <VNgB8.113$WQ4.86@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42330

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> When we see even former Ass. Dirs starting to squirm, me
> thinks we be onto something!!??..

Since I've never been an Assistant (or Associate) Director, and since I'm certainly not "starting to squirm", I guess that you'd better try to get re-instated in the IODHW.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

PS: Your proctologist called. Your head is ready.

3062. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 20:54:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <9_gB8.7114$vT1.588139@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42331

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD58A50.4C68A2D7@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > All that has really happened is that the recruits are greener than
ever.
>
> But possibly, thanks to technology, have a greater potential than ever.
> I have traveled at 140 mph on the ground, thanks to Kawasaki technology,
> a feat that my Grandfather would have had a hard time even conceiving
(He
> died in 1938).
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I don't see the connection but I'll take your word for it.

What it does mean is that those of us with some experience if we are not to lose these guys thru a process not of their making are going to have to get over green-as-grass Extras and get them going just as Novices were got going back in antiquity.

Assumptions are kind of important. West Point in the era of most of our Civil War generals was an exercise in 'What would Napoleon do?' which was admirable so long as you had the non-coms to pull it off. When you had soldiers that were behind a plow six weeks earlier and sergeants picked on their ability to beat up the privates all you got from the intricate manuvering was friendly fire.

This ain't Kansas any more, Toto.

3063. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 21:30:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505173020.27628.00001096@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42332

In article <20020503080149.06869.00006009@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>That is interesting detail information, however phrased in a somewhat
>>aggravating tone.
>
>If you found that aggravating, perhaps it would be best if you and I picked
>this up again when you are feeling better.

I feel fine. Why bother? :-)

You will again be patronizing and try to blow off anyone who
doesn't see your employer in the best of light. That's almost
SOP in here. :-)

3064. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 21:30:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505173022.27628.00001097@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42333

In article <v8UA8.5260$vT1.410945@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CD3DF90.89694C49@IEEE.org...
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM wrote:
>> > > Your postings are clearly anti-digital, Dick.
>> >
>> > Yeah, RIGHT. You spring near a kilobuck for a STS-for PACTOR instead
>of just building
>> > your own, as you insist that all us lesser mortals must do, while I
>busily work the
>> > soundcard digital modes SEVERAL of them, and you make such a statement
>SOLELY because
>> > I support the use and testing of CW in ham radio. And you still act
>like I'm the goat
>> > here. But the readers know, old sot. They know.
>>
>> All I have done is suggest that digital software and DSP programming is
>a good
>> way for amateurs to experiment nowadays. You responded that we don't
>need any
>> digital experimentation and that the modes we have are good enough for
>the
>> foreseeable future. Your postings are clearly anti-digital,
>anti-experimentation,
>> and anti-progress. What are you afraid of, Dick?
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Cecil, the biggest breakthru in digital technology is the DSP side of the
>house where a receiver and to a lesser extent transmitter can be dialed up
>more or less on cue.

That can be done with any combination of PLL, Fractional-N, or DDS frequency synthesizer..."dialing-up" both receiver and transmitter ("on cue" to a particular time if needed) over 20 years ago.

>It has come a long way but has a long way to go as I
>am sure you will admit. This is intriguing, just as the Collins
>mechanical filter was intriguing about 50 years ago.

Then all you are talking about is DSP FILTERING. Digital
Signal Processing can be much more than just filtering.

>And while we are at it, we can apply software to synchronous detection and
>realize the promise made about 50 years ago that DSB signals with or
>without pilot carriers can be spaced at 2 kHz and by ignoring things not
>identical on both sides do so without noticeable interference.

This has been available for years in SWL receivers found on
the shelves in consumer electronics stores.

>The FCC
>would thank us firmly because it would finally put an end to FM for
>communications and free up gazillions of Public Safety and commercial
>channels without having them hop all over creation.

What in the world are you nattering about here?

>Try attacking a commercial FM channel as a digital signal; why not,
>Heathkit did it about 40 years ago and it had far better fidelity than
>anything Armstrong ever envisioned.

It's already been done by others. Do you need application notes
of a quarter century ago to show this applied to all sorts of
demodulation?

>But no, you digifreaks gots to go out and attack the simplest (and
>cheapest, wetware is really cheap) communication method known to man
>because it gives you a manhood problem.

"Manhood problem?!?" :-)

Oh yes, "Real Men" and "Real Hams" are synonyms. "Real Hams"
work HF with CW for DX. :-)

>BFD.

Yes, such a deal you make... :-)

>Sure SSB is getting very
>long in tooth but its major failing is that the receiver is pretty much on
>its own; it is harder to process concentrated communication because it
>does not supply a Rosetta Stone to do much translation or auto-adjustment
>with.

[you are dangling sentence parts in an obscene manner... :-)]

Sorry, but there are patents that work rather well for digital
demodulation of SSB signals without any pilot carrier (the
"Rosetta Stone") for a reference. Works fine for the human
voice. Some difficulty with single sinusoids being modulation.

>Even NTSC television envisioned that with VIR and FM used the
>identical sideband thing to do AFC with TV taking a few years to use the
>same method.

You might be impressive as hell to the unwashed masses using
such acronyms glibbly...but you aren't really technically correct.
The doomed NTSC TV broadcast transmissions DO NOT NEED
Automatic Frequency Control for getting the correct channel
frequency. Frequency synthesized tuners handle that without
any AFC from any demodulator. The NTSC video is reduced
carrier level but quite enough level for demodulation AND, for
many years now has been the heterodyning source to extract
the FM sound carrier at the video detector as a 4.5 MHz FM
signal.

The Vertical Interlace period is used for other information...such
as closed-caption text.

With old-style TV and FM tuners, AFC was a nice feature to avoid
the drift of the LO. PLLs, Fractional-N PLLs, and other synthesized
frequency LOs eliminated all that Local Oscillator frequency-undrift
feedback. So much so that it is affordable in low-end consumer FM
receivers.

>No one is really defending the status quo except the ogres that exist in
>the minds of some digifreaks who seem to be able to drive themselves to
>neurosis with no help from me or anyone else.

Sorry, but the morseholics have been driving themselves further
into their deep neuroses (and quite a few psychoses, I suspect)
with the STATUS QUO "necessity" of keeping the morse test alive.

>These things are
>evolutionary and always have been but there seems to be a cadre of yoyos
>who feel called upon to build the New Jerusalem upon the ruins of the old
>one; and they are far better at creating the ruins than much else.

Then the manhood-waving morseholics have been in their Masada
on the clifftop, shouting at the world, waving their 20 WPM fists in
the air with imprecations that the Morse Masada Shall Not Fall!

The original Masada fell. The Morse Masada will fall evenually.

>For what it is worth, I like the idea of an 'futz-mode' band in the middle
>of the regular bands for the same reason it made sense to put Novices
>there. Kept them out of trouble.

Sure. Segregation. Isolation. Eliminate any interference from NEW
things that point to a "lesser manhood" on the legacy legates.

Go work some DX on HF with CW. It will make you feel better. :-)

3065. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 21:51:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505175115.04302.00001265@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42335

In article <VNgB8.113$WQ4.86@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>> When we see even former Ass. Dirs starting to squirm, me
>> thinks we be onto something!!??..
>
>Since I've never been an Assistant (or Associate) Director, and since I'm
>certainly not "starting to squirm", I guess that you'd better try to get
>re-instated in the IODHW.

You are SQUIRMING.

The Armenian judges are doing their chant.

3066. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 21:51:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505175116.04302.00001266@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42336

In article <9_gB8.7114$vT1.588139@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>What it does mean is that those of us with some experience if we are not
>to lose these guys thru a process not of their making are going to have to
>get over green-as-grass Extras and get them going just as Novices were got
>going back in antiquity.

Yes, old soldier, you have to get all those newcomers into the Proper Amateur Way, have them march in step to your cadence, and by all means show some respect when you shake your 20 WPM fist at them.

>Assumptions are kind of important. West Point in the era of most of our
>Civil War generals was an exercise in 'What would Napoleon do?' which was
>admirable so long as you had the non-coms to pull it off. When you had
>soldiers that were behind a plow six weeks earlier and sergeants picked on
>their ability to beat up the privates all you got from the intricate
>manuvering was friendly fire.

Having a bad week, old soldier?

Did you draw a long grey line along the upper Hudson River anytime except as a tourist?

>This ain't Kansas any more, Toto.

I think you think armies are all as Kipling wrote them.

Anytime you want to talk COMMUNICATIONS you holler...
otherwise stay out of the army surplus stores.

3067. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 21:51:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505175117.04302.00001267@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42334

In article <20020505160656.07448.00001332@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>3. Slowly but surely, the RF world is going digital.
>
>Disagree. RF is analog. You must define what you mean by "RF is going
>digital".

Booooo! Some "engineer."

Sorry, in older days RF *was* IMPLEMENTED as analog.

"RF" as in Radio Frequencies is just radio frequencies.

"RF" as a term is a rather all-embracing term to define many disciplines involving radio at common frequencies.

Nowadays "RF" is IMPLEMENTED as part-analog, part-digital circuitry.

Please, if you can't get your terms correct, don't post.

3068. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-05 23:27:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <zdjB8.431$WQ4.57@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42337

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> You are SQUIRMING.
>

That's laughable! I'm just another plain-brown-rrap'er pointing out to
N4AOX that he needs to search for a grip.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
non-former-Associate/Assistant Anything.

3069. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:15:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505201509.22556.00007379@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 42338

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

> Why do you think the ARRL backed 5WPM restructuring ...

If my memory serves, ARRL proposed a 5 wpm General, and a 12 wpm Advanced and Extra.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3070. Re: ___NO CODE=NO HAM.___

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:16:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <iXjB8.7875$0D.407288899@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42340

It GrayJL, aka Xray, can't get any more mileage out of it, so SteveBG,
Xray's illegitimate son, picks up the baton.

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3CD3E779.D4581545@adelphia.net...
> Gee, I dunno about the Troll-O-Meter. This old troll is repeated every
> couple months and getting pretty stale.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > >NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
> > >
> > >Suck it up, CBers. Suuuuuuuuuck it up.
> >
> > ====================
> > ||||||||||||||||||||
> > 0 1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
> > ====================
> > Digital Troll-O-Meter
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI

3071. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:16:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <jXjB8.7876$0D.407288899@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42339

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:809F969C68149A70.D9C5ABB8B234117E.8AF5B1CD0BD6B3E7@lp.airnews.net...
> On 01 May 2002 01:13:58 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
> >In article
<520A49981C43759F.A5371C7B0D9F3CDF.3D1396C70B7053E1@lp.airnews.net>,
> >"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:
> >
> >>On Thu, 25 Apr 2002 22:18:32 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> >><bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Society for Uncreative Radio Anachronism" There's just something
about
> >>>that that I don't like.
> >>
> >>But does it still have the belly dancers, mead, and coed topless
> >>wrestling?
> >
> >The belly dancers are over 60, the mead is only 3.2, and the coed
> >topless wrestlers are all male... :-)
>
> Well, we've found ways to fix that...but somehow it always comes down
> to me wandering around with a flaming mug of Bacardi 151 and no clue
> where my tent is...
>
> ...I can live with that.

I don't have a problem with that. What's the rest of it?

3072. Re: An Exchange with a Prospective Ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:18:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5ZjB8.7880$nG.407398574@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42342

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205021522.3eb159d8@posting.google.com...
> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3CCB0626.4305231A@ix.netcom.com>...
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> > > Hello, all!
> > >
> > > But, what came out in the exchanges that followed
> > > told me that it wasn't the code that stopped him,
> > > not really, but rather the fact that a "professional,
> > > FCC-licensed technician" was going to step
> > > DOWN into HAM, or rather, AMATEUR radio.
> >
> > "Amateur" here means "no pecuniary interest",
> > vs. "professional" meaning "making money at it"
> >
> > There are no "professional" DXers and such....
>
> Yes... most folks like to get PAID for their time.
>
> The trick is to find something you completely enjoy, while getting
> paid reasonably well for doing it. I'm lucky enough to work on RF
> data links for Unmanned Air Vehicle applications.
>
> Nowadays, my main interest in Amateur Radio is to provide Americans
> (who are interested in RF) a reasonable place to make a entry into the
> hobby and/or profession. I tend to be inclusive, rather than
> exclusive - and believe there should be a fairly easy way to become a
> ham, and strongly feel that we need to quickly replace the archaic and
> recently-eliminated HF/Morse-oriented Novice entry class, with
> something more up-to-date.
>
> While most adults will naturally have an aversion to the "Amateur"
> term, most younger folks won't... and this is where we should be
> concentrating our enlistment efforts - at the Junior High/High
> School/University age groups.

Youth groups such as scouting, royal rangers, 4h, etc.

3073. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:18:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020505201812.22556.00007380@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 42341

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>When we see even former Ass. Dirs starting to squirm, me
>thinks we be onto something!!??..

Hans was not squirming. He was laughing at you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3074. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:22:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <A1kB8.7881$IL.407559266@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42343

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:udakn7rr6fab6b@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> In the early 1990s I was at Palomar Observatory, on
> one of my three pilgramages to that astronomical shrine,
> when, on the way back to the car, I happened to see
> some kids in strange uniforms holding a very large and
> shiney card up in the air. I saw this through the viewfinder
> of my video camera and, after doing a double take, I
> shut off the machine and headed over to see what was
> going with this!
>
> The group on the sidewalk on Palomar Mountain was
> from France and in fact was made up of French Boy
> Scouts and their leaders. They had come all this way
> to participate in a contest involving other Boy Scouts
> from around the world, a contest involving very large
> shiney cards and Morse Code.
>
> As I restarted my video camera, aiming it in the
> direction these folks were facing, which was north,
> I asked one of the leaders what they were doing.
> "We're in a contest to send a message from Mexico
> to Canada," he said. "The team who is fastest and
> most accurate, overall, wins." Soon enough, through
> the viewfinder, I could see flashes from another
> mountain top, confirming reception of the team's
> message. The distance? About 60 miles! My
> brother-in-law, who was with me, confirmed this.
> "Oh, yeah," he said, "That's XXXX peak, up toward
> Palm Springs!" Hey, I was impressed!
>
> Let me see. What does the acronym ARRL mean?
> Hmm. What could be done here? Hmm. Relay.
> Morse Code. Low power. Temporay license.
> Contest. Kits. All age groups. Prizes. Corporate
> involvement. Hmm.
>
> But to quote Steve Martin, "This could be the dawn
> of a NEW AGE! We could . . . NAAAAAAH!"
>
> Val Germann
> KC0MUB

The "A" is not for Amateur. ARRL stands for "American Radio Relay League." American as not Canada, Mexico, Central America, nor South America. It is the national organization for United States amateurs. But when I say "America" some slick guy like Hans comes back with "Habla..."

3075. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:24:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <M2kB8.528$WQ4.27@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42344

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> > Why do you think the ARRL backed 5WPM restructuring ...
>
> If my memory serves, ARRL proposed a 5 wpm General, and a 12 wpm Advanced
and
> Extra.
>

Darn, Ed, now you've gone and spoiled his rant with a fact again. Shame,
shame......

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"The very powerful and the very stupid have one thing in common. Instead
of
altering their views to fit the facts, they alter the facts to fit their
views... which can be very uncomfortable if you happen to be one of the
facts
that needs altering." -- Doctor Who, Face of Evil

3076. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:26:15 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <dce807a13ca771c6e65b95f0659ad523.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42345

Heck, I've been off HF since 1969. My hangout IS 440. You'll usually find me on 444.850 in Rochester, the WB2KAO mo-chine (although I do get on others at times - often the N2HJD machine on one of its' many ports). I'll be getting back on HF though - probably next year. It would be nice if you were in the area and see what kind of a conversationalist you are. It could prove interesting.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA (former WB2OSP - extra ticket in 1966)

"You Betcha (Mike H." <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote in message news:3cd4ab6b.1277118098@news.newsville.com

> My point is this: The No-Code Techs on 2M (I look up their licenses
> on QRZ) more fit my definition of HAMS than MOST Generals and Extra's
> I hear on HF SSB. In short - I pray they stay where the hell they are
> and never come up and infect 2M or 440.
>

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3077. Re: Get bred (WAS: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:26:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <d5kB8.7883$ED.407311574@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42346

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:p00A8.66$ce4.10599@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote
>
> > I thought you were actaually serious abt this Novice-to-Digigeek farm
> > Hans.
>
> I am completely serious! I had some reservations as to whether FCC would
> buy into my idea, but I get more encouraged that the idea seems to be
> gaining traction and supporting comments from a wide variety of other
> amateurs. Maybe, just maybe, this is an idea right for the times.
Whatever
> happens, the comments have discredited the shabby ARRL effort to present
the
> FCC with a 'concensus'.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans, screw concensus. The ARRL needs to get a vision, then get some leadership. They only need one smart guy. Two would be nice, but one will do.

Brian/N0iMD
ARRL member

3078. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:28:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <n6kB8.7885$ZQ.407720300@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42347

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0204300438.793731fb@posting.google.com...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<X4nz8.2464$8O2.173117491@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0204291755.58b691ce@posting.google.com...
> >
> > > Because: No more benefit will accrue ham radio taken as a whole than
> > > it has where similar "new" modes have been allowed for eons above
> > > 30Mhz. Where precisely nothing new has happened too. OR what's the
> > > point to dedicating ham spectrum space just so that a few
> > > "experimenters" MIGHT emulate what the commecials are already doing?
> > > This is "advancement of the state of the art"??
> >
> > Is what we're doing now "advancement of the state of the art?"
> >
> >
> Absolutely not. Note that the techies amongst us RRAP dwellers who are
> proposing this "experimental subband" thing are dwelling here instead
> of beavering away on the bench "advancing the state of the art". The
> usual.
> >
> >
> > Lets give Hans' plan a chance. It might actually amount to something,
> > someday.
> >
> >
> When was the last time the FCC dedicated HF spectrum space to
> something anything which "might happen someday"??

1912?

3079. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:30:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <x8kB8.7888$sT.407784680@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42348

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CCEBE2B.C19E34A@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020429214928.20703.00001230@mb-mw.aol.com...
> > > In article <20020429065607.00704.00005058@mb-cq.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com
> > (W1RFI)
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)
> > >
> > > Yeah, I know somebody like that. Called me "jerk", "idiot", "anal
> > retentive"
> > > and a bunch of other names in this ng, just for pointing out some
simple
> > facts
> > > and asking a few simple questions.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times. Besides, I don't see
you
> > asking these types of questions of your cronies.
>
> You'd have to establish that Jim has cronies here. I really don't think
> you find Jim's questions tedious.

I do.

> The tedium probably comes from your
> inability to deliver a straight answer.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, like the FCC licensing requirements, I tend to not submit to any and
every question simply because someone asks it.

It really needs to be relavent.

Brian

3080. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:31:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <L9kB8.7889$XF.407388421@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42349

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:JtCz8.54698$Rw2.4380829@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Brian:
> >> Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times.
> >> Besides, I don't see you asking these types of
> >> questions of your cronies.
>
> Dave, K8MN:
> > You'd have to establish that Jim has cronies here.
> > I really don't think you find Jim's questions
> > tedious. The tedium probably comes from your
> > inability to deliver a straight answer.
>
> I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
>
> What was the question, again?
>
>
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona

Jim asks that you detail all recent (past year} Novice band activity.

Thanks,
Brian

3081. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:32:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xakB8.7891$iW.407863475@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42350

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020430190529.11987.00007016@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "K7JEB" k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net
>
> >I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
>
> As am I.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

You may also detail all your past years Novice subband activities. Show your work.

Thanks, Brian

3082. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:33:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD5CF5D.4762C74E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42352

N2EY wrote:
> I follow most of the postings here on rrap. I cannot recall Dick, W0EX, ever
> writing that digital experimentation (whatever that means) was a bad thing, or
> that he was against it. If he "argued loud and long against it", as you say,
> Cecil, then I challenge you to produce the post(s) where he did so.

I argued for digital experimentation and Dick argued against me. That is
evidence that he is against digital experimentation.

> I don't know if Carl, Ed or Cecil are lying, or just mistaken.

If Dick is not against digital experimentation, then why does he argue so
loud and long against my support for digital experimentation?

> Can you show us some of them, Cecil?

Pick any of my postings where I advocate digital experimentation. Dick
invariably came back against it. Waste your time looking them up if you
so desire.

> >2. Writing software is a relatively straight forward design and development
> >path as there is very little hardware design needed.
>
> Disagree. It is possible to implement radio with hardware but no software. It's
> impossible to implement radio with software but no hardware.

It is possible to use existing hardware and write new software. That's how PSK31
came into being.

> >3. Slowly but surely, the RF world is going digital.
>
> Disagree. RF is analog. You must define what you mean by "RF is going digital".

Military communications has gone digital. TV is going digital. AM is trying to
go digital. Why are you being such a horse's patootie?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3083. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:33:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <JbkB8.7893$OX.407925041@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42351

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020504220702.29940.00000898@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <20020503080408.06869.00006010@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> >>What mode do you use on 30 meters?
> >
> >Morse encoded OOK CW, the few times I have operated 30 meters.
> >
> >>What's your recent experience in the HF Novice bands?
> >
> >None.
> >
> OK. Simple, direct answers to simple, direct questions. I wonder why Kim
and
> Brian have such a hard time with those questions?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, now get to the point. Tell Ed that he has no credibility to comment on
the Novice subband refarming.

Brian

3084. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:35:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bdkB8.7894$LY.407950598@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42353

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CD0B33A.E8C91EB8@earthlink.net...
> K7JEB wrote:
> >
> > Brian:
> > >> Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times.
> > >> Besides, I don't see you asking these types of
> > >> questions of your cronies.
> >
> > Dave, K8MN:
> > > You'd have to establish that Jim has cronies here.
> > > I really don't think you find Jim's questions
> > > tedious. The tedium probably comes from your
> > > inability to deliver a straight answer.
> >
> > I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
> >
> > What was the question, again?
>
> It doesn't really matter, Jim. I think Brian not only believes that Jim
> has cronies, he probably has cohorts too.
>
> Dave K8MN

He has two cronies. As I read further, someone will probably admit to being
a cohort.

And it really does matter.

Dave, please detail your recent Novice subband activities. Show your work.

73, Brian

3085. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:36:11 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <aff1119a7cff9113763fb02821a21320.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42354

Forgive me, I don't understand. I would assume we are talking a method
to put some interest back into amateur radio (at least here, in the US).
The observation may have been of French youth, but any suggestion of
what to do (at least from the perspective of within the United States),
would likely involve the ARRL. American Radio Relay League. It would
also involve the FCC (again, involving the United States). Why would
you imply that the previous poster was suggesting that the 'A' in ARRL
stood for 'amateur' rather than 'American'?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:A1kB8.7881$IL.407559266@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com

>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:udakn7rr6fab6b@corp.supernews.com...
> > Hello, all!
> >
> > In the early 1990s I was at Palomar Observatory

(snip)

> > Let me see. What does the acronym ARRL mean?
> > Hmm. What could be done here? Hmm. Relay.
> > Morse Code. Low power. Temporay license.
> > Contest. Kits. All age groups. Prizes. Corporate
> > involvement. Hmm.
> >
> > But to quote Steve Martin, "This could be the dawn
> > of a NEW AGE! We could . . . NAAAAAAH!"
> >
> > Val Germann
> > KC0MUB
>
> The "A" is not for Amateur. ARRL stands for "American Radio Relay League."
> American as not Canada, Mexico, Central America, nor South America. It is
> the national organization for United States amateurs. But when I say
> "America" some slick guy like Hans comes back with "Habla..."

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3086. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:36:49 UTC
From: mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net
Message-ID: <3cd5cfe2.1351989237@news.newsville.com>
Source record: 42355

On Mon, 6 May 2002 00:26:15 +0000 (UTC), "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:

>Heck, I've been off HF since 1969. My hangout IS 440. You'll usually
>find me on 444.850 in Rochester, the WB2KAO mo-chine (although I do get
>on others at times - often the N2HJD machine on one of its' many ports).
>I'll be getting back on HF though - probably next year. It would be
>nice if you were in the area and see what kind of a conversationalist
>you are. It could prove interesting.
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA (former WB2OSP - extra ticket in 1966)
>
>
>
>"You Betcha (Mike H." <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote in message
>news:3cd4ab6b.1277118098@news.newsville.com
>
>> My point is this: The No-Code Techs on 2M (I look up their licenses
>> on QRZ) more fit my definition of HAMS than MOST Generals and Extra's
>> I hear on HF SSB. In short - I pray they stay where the hell they are
>> and never come up and infect 2M or 440.
>>
>
>
>--
>Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

Hi Jim,

If you're addressing me, I agree - would love to talk to you about our
favorite hobbies - HAM and SWL!

Take care,

Mike

3087. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:37:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <XekB8.7895$e%.408020072@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42356

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3Y7A8.1862$6T5.189181@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CD0B33A.E8C91EB8@earthlink.net...
> > K7JEB wrote:
> > >
> > > Brian:
> > > >> Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times.
> > > >> Besides, I don't see you asking these types of
> > > >> questions of your cronies.
> > >
> > > Dave, K8MN:
> > > > You'd have to establish that Jim has cronies here.
> > > > I really don't think you find Jim's questions
> > > > tedious. The tedium probably comes from your
> > > > inability to deliver a straight answer.
> > >
> > > I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
> > >
> > > What was the question, again?
> >
> > It doesn't really matter, Jim. I think Brian not only believes that Jim
> > has cronies, he probably has cohorts too.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Possibly even a few mechanics, minions, and lackeys.

Hey Dick, I'll keep track of his cronies and cohorts, you keep track of his
mechanics, minions, and lackeys.

BTW, what have your recent Novice subband activities amounted to?

Brian

3088. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:40:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <RhkB8.7897$S21.408107362@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42357

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:C4wA8.2687$vT1.248559@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> >>> I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
>
> >> It doesn't really matter, Jim. I think Brian not
> >> only believes that Jim has cronies, he probably
> >> has cohorts too.
>
> > Possibly even a few mechanics, minions, and lackeys.
>
> Not to mention the sycophants and stooges.

Hey guys, this is way too much for me.

I'll keep track of the cronies and cohorts.
Dick will keep track of his mechanics, minions, and lackeys.
Jim keeps track of his sycophants and stooges.

> And then there are opportunities for leadership in the
> positions of lead crony, stooge supervisor, consulting
> sycophant, mechanic vice president, etc. One has to
> work one's way up the hierarchy, though, by starting
> out as lackey associate.

What are our hazing ritual(s) going to be?

And BTW, what have your recent Novice subband activities been?

Thanks, Brian

3089. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:40:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD5D0F1.5321709@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42358

Richard McCollum wrote:
> What it does mean is that those of us with some experience if we are not
> to lose these guys thru a process not of their making are going to have to
> get over green-as-grass Extras and get them going just as Novices were got
> going back in antiquity.

You and I were once "green-as-grass" amateur radio operators. We were not
born with our present knowledge. I had all amateur frequency/power privileges
in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras. Nothing
has changed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3090. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:42:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <0kkB8.7898$jZ.407969177@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42359

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020502060639.13688.00001383@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <JtCz8.54698$Rw2.4380829@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:
>
> >I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
>
> Tnx Jim. Hope that makes me a crony of yours.
>
> >What was the question, again?
>
> There are at least two:
>
> "What mode do you use on 30 meters?"
>
> "What is your recent experience in the Novice bands?"
>
> For some reason, certain folks get very upset when asked those questions.
I
> don't know why.

Who'se upset? I simply haven't answered you because you value others
opinions who not only haven't answered, but haven't even been asked. Do
your homework before assuming that someone is upset.

73, Brian

3091. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:48:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <_pkB8.561$WQ4.202@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42360

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras.
Nothing
> has changed.

Are you saying that you know infinitely less than the present-day new
Extras? Hell, you are one! :-)

73, de Hans, K0HB

3092. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:52:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gtkB8.7904$Ag1.408559632@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42362

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0204300802.ea09ce4@posting.google.com...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<20nz8.2454$0j3.174775453@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020429214928.20703.00001230@mb-mw.aol.com...
> > > In article <20020429065607.00704.00005058@mb-cq.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com
> > (W1RFI)
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >My goodness, he sure gets testy when someone shows him up! :-)
> > >
> > > Yeah, I know somebody like that. Called me "jerk", "idiot", "anal
> > retentive"
> > > and a bunch of other names in this ng, just for pointing out some
simple
> > facts
> > > and asking a few simple questions.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> I forgot "twit".

Jim, what names have I ever called you?

> > Jim, you're questions get a bit tedious at times.
>
> Only to folks who don't want to answer them. They're simple, straight,
> direct questions, with simple, straight, direct answers. Like "what
> mode did you use on 30 meters" or "what recent experience do you have
> on 80 meters". You can't cheat an honest person.

Are you saying that you're hones or that I'm a cheater?

You cheat yourself by asking questions only of me, ready to declare that I
have no credibility to comment on the Novice subband refarming proposal, yet
ask no questions of your cronies, assuming that they have credibility to
spare, without proof.

> Wading through numerous reposts of old stuff to get to a comment that
> consists of "ROFLMAO" or "LOL" is tedious, too, but you don't see me
> calling the author the names I was called.

Jim, when have I ever typed ROTMGFL or LOUTL?

When have I ever called you a name?

> > Besides, I don't see you
> > asking these types of questions of your cronies.
>
> I don't know who you mean. Is there some rule that says if I ask a
> question of one person I must ask it of everyone?

Why do you assume that Ed Hare has recent Novice subband experience? Jim Bromley? Dave Heil?

OK, I'll call you a name: Hypocrite.

That's one. Start a tab.

73, Brian

3093. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 00:52:32 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ktkB8.7889$6T5.724639@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42361

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD5D0F1.5321709@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > What it does mean is that those of us with some experience if we are
not
> > to lose these guys thru a process not of their making are going to
have to
> > get over green-as-grass Extras and get them going just as Novices were
got
> > going back in antiquity.
>
> You and I were once "green-as-grass" amateur radio operators. We were
not
> born with our present knowledge. I had all amateur frequency/power
privileges
> in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras.
Nothing
> has changed.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

1952 is a tad before my time so we'll take your word for it. If the Novice, and later incentive licensing in general, had any real effect it was in stretching out the qualification period to something manageable. This is, incidentally, why I would like to see a time period pass before one could VE.

But your situation is really what prevailed under the old Class A, Class B system and you had to make it work on 160 or 10 to work phone.

Maybe like a lot of things, we view the recent past as 'normal' when it is anything but. Good Point.

3094. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:05:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <RFkB8.7909$Ws1.408954038@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42363

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCDC7F9.697BF5DE@townsqr.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3CCBFD0D.904CC667@townsqr.com...
> > >
> > > Dennis- thanks for the insight, you have explained some things that
needed
> > > explaining.
> > > The only failure I found in packet radio on VHF (not HF) was the
> > > narowmindedness of certain operators in that they abused the system to
the
> > > point that it was useless to everyone else.
> >
> > Pot calls kettle black ... Dick, you have some gall in calling ANYONE
> > "narrowminded."
> >
>
> You, the most narrowminded SOB on the planet- the dingaling for whom if
it
> isn't from the very latest technology it's only useless, even suggesting
anyone
> else might be?????
>
> Har-de har har!!!!!

Dick, do you even know what SOB means?

> > How did these operators "abuse the system?" Your previous reference
> > was WRT message forwarding ... clearly a highly useful application.
>
> So you're an eager proponent of SPAM, just like what we see on the net
> daily. No surprise whatever, in fact just what we've learned to expect
from you.

You're SPAM. You're so internally inconsistent that its a wonder you don't
implode.

> > > Carl seems to think that the answer
> > > was for the handful of hams involved to fund some AT&T version of
packet
> > radio
> > > that would have worked at Internet speeds.
> >

> > What I said was that the "system" stagnated at 1200 baud and didn't
> > have enough capacity to provide an acceptable level of service to
> > the large number of people who tried to use it ... that's just a fact
and
> > is indisuptable, except perhaps in Dick's fantasy world.
> >
> >
> > The problem is that too many users of packet radio did not bother
> > to become sufficiently technically knowledgable to be able to comprehend
> > the nature of the problems, recognize that they could be simply and
> > relatively economically solved to a very large degree, and see the
benefit
> > to all in doing so ... thus it didn't get done and packet pretty much
died.
>
> Ah, get with those generalities! Not a specific fact to be found!
Amazing!
> When there are NO specifics to toss out, generalize your way onto the High
> Ground. Didn't work, Karl, we all know what the situation was. THAT
wasn't it.
>
He spells it with a "C." That's a fact.

> > > I couldn't agree more that the only real failure is to fail to
attempt
> > > anything new at all.
> >
> > Your continued protestations here that things modern and useful
> > (or even basic fundamentals of communications, such as Shannon)
> > are "irrelevant" to amateur radio show that your statement is less
> > than totally honest.
>
> You're such an one-demensional jerk you can't begin to comprehend
anything
> about the overall state of ham radio or what is involved in making it go
on a
> daily basis. If you were you'd know that it operates quite well with no
mention
> of anyone named Shannon, and has for a hundred years. If Shannon was never
again
> even considered that wouldn't change. Long ago that was analyzed here on
rrap
> and the concensus from those who know is that Shannon is first mentioned
in a
> university EE program in the third year. A long search through my personal
> library of ARRL publications found no mention whatever of that name
through the
> latest handbook I had, and I finally found a couple pages on his theory in
my
> copy of

> Electrical Engineers Handbook, which was only a couple of years old. Do
YOU own
> a copy of the Electrical Engineers handbook? I doubt it, you already know
> everything, why waste a copy?

Sounds like Ed needs to start working on the 2004 edition.

> > That doesn't HAVE to be true, Dick ... first, it's easier (and cheaper)
than
> > ever
> > to "do advanced digital experimentation," with the availability of very
> > inexpensive
> > DSP development kits and FPGA development kits (hardward and software).
> >
> > The issue is NOT the availability of suitable hardware and software ...
for
> > a couple of hundred bucks you can set up to do your own DSP development
> > and design and program custom ASICs using FPGAs ... in your ham shack
lab
>
> Who the hell are you to tell other hams what they should do with their
hobby
> time?

You seem to think that I have unlimited time to first learn Morse Code, then spend yet more of it getting up to speed on YOUR FAVORITE MODE.

>You happen to work in your favorite wallow, so that's what you want to do.

As do you, and it isn't modern technology.

> Others are free do to likewise without you haranguing them nonstop. So
stuff it
> back where it belongs.

Ditto you and the Morse Code/CW lectures.

> > The ISSUE is that too many people (like you) haven't expended the effort
> > to stay anywhere NEAR current with such technology and therefore can't
> > even begin to envision what is possible and easily within reach ... if
only
> > one has the knowledge ...

Yet Jim wants to know what my recent experience is with a 170 year old "technology" on a 50 year old subband - So that I can have "credibility." You two are like peas in a pod.

> The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit who thinks every other
ham
> MUST be interested and involved in exactly the same thing you are. In
other
> words, you are pretty stupid.

The issue is that you're a one-demensional amateur who thinks every other
ham
must be interested and involved in Morse Code/CW exactly like you are.

> > Being so woefully lacking in relevant, useful knowledge (and it does
NOT
> > require an EE degree) is the biggest impediment
>
> Yep, that's our boy...if it isn't what he's doing, it just ISN'T worth
> mentioning, much less keeping. What a sad case he is.

Ditto you, Dick.

> > from, Dick ... unfortunately, there are lots of hams like you ... which
> > bodes
> > poorly for amateur radio.
>
> Comes the day we have too many like you there will BE NO ham radio.

On the other hand, Carl has the vision to ensure that amateur radio remains
viable. I wonder if he could oust Hanie?

73, Brian

3095. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:11:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FKkB8.8489$5f7.352982293@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42364

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020502061513.06894.00006202@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >> >The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit
> >
> >What great logic, what style, what class...I gotta
> >remember this great debating technique that Dick
> >seems to always return to.
>
> And he thinks that ARRL can win its spectrum battles by threating to call
the
> FCC names. I think there is a pattern there somewhere...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

There is a pattern there. Dick sees the ugly old woman with a wart on her
nose. The rest of us see the beautiful young lady.

3096. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:19:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <XSkB8.8490$Km7.353168786@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42365

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:AjxA8.2781$vT1.255272@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> Ed, W1RFI, wrote:
>
> > The FCC can issue a lot more warning letters than it
> > can issue NALs. I don't think that enforcement would
> > be well served if the FCC issued only NALs.
> >
> > In an ideal world, every rules violator would be instantly
> > fined. I think that what can be done in practice is a
> > reasonable second-best alternative.
>
> You will recall that I, as Founder of No Test International
> (NTI), proposed that the only qualification for an amateur
> radio license be a valid credit card number. Under that
> system, you'd know you screwed up when you got your monthly
> statement and found an instant payment to the FCC in response
> to an electronic NAL.
>
> ;-) Have a Nice Day.
>
>
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona

I like it, except there are a lot of people working in bargaining unit positions that seem to have excess cash laying about to throw the FCC's way whenever they want.

3097. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:21:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aUkB8.8491$_07.352568337@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42366

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CD08410.96ED177C@townsqr.com...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >Who the hell are you to tell other hams what they should do with their
hobby
> > >time? You happen to work in your favorite wallow, so that's what you
want to
> > >do. Others are free do to likewise without you haranguing them nonstop.
So
> > stuff
> > >it back where it belongs.
> >
> > But you must remain free to tell hams that they must do what YOU like to
do
> > with ham radio -- learn and use Morse code, eh?
> >
> > Is this another one of those double-standard things?
> >
> > >The ISSUE is that you're a one-demensional dipshit who thinks every
other ham
> > >MUST be interested and involved in exactly the same thing you are. In
other
> > >words, you are pretty stupid.
> >
> > Yes, I guess it is.
>
> That's right- YOU GUESS, and as usual, you guess wrong! There's a huge
difference
> in the minds of most of those who have one that is in any way open between
> believing that a fully qualified ham radio operator should be able to use
the most
> basic radio mode, and Carl insisting that anyone who sees any
communications value
> in CW has no interest whatever in anything more modern.
> That is the essense of this scuffle.

What are your recent experiences in the Novice subbands?

3098. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:22:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dVkB8.8494$9H6.351965469@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42367

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CCFE28A.E1DEB783@townsqr.com...
>
> So you'd allow him the right but not me. We see.
>

Depends. What are your recent experiences in the Novice subbands? Show
your work.

3099. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:23:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aWkB8.8495$Tl7.353149196@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42368

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020502061702.06894.00006203@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >So you'd allow him the right but not me. We see.
>
> In what way have I not allowed you anything here, Dick? Your constant use
of
> profanity and insult to others here demonstrates pretty clearly that no
one can
> control your actions.

Not even Dick can control his own actions. He lacks emotional maturity
amongst other things.

3100. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:24:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <6XkB8.8496$fm7.353155170@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42369

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020502133747.29664.00001054@mb-bk.aol.com...
> In article <3CD1397E.367DE3F9@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >> So you'd allow him the right but not me. We see.
> > >
> > >I think what Ed is suggesting, Dick, is that you follow one the teachings
of
> the
> > >Bible, i.e. Remove the moat from your own eye before complaining about
the
> speck
> > >in someone else's eye.
> >
> > ...it's a moat AND drawbridge, plus all the weeds growing on
> > the edge of the moat... :-)

What about the raw sewage floating in the moat?

3101. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:27:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <z_kB8.8497$Rv7.353442999@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42370

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3cd00afc_1@news7.fast.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message

> > You, the most narrowminded SOB on the planet- the dingaling for whom if
> > it isn't from the very latest technology it's only useless, even
suggesting
> > anyone else might be?????
>
> Dick,
>
> I have never said that "if it isnt' from the very latest technology it's
> only useless".

Jim says "if" is for children. But only when I say it.

3102. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:50:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <VjlB8.8511$YM7.353881522@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42371

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:aff1119a7cff9113763fb02821a21320.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:A1kB8.7881$IL.407559266@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com
>
> >
> > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > news:udakn7rr6fab6b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Hello, all!
> > >
> > > In the early 1990s I was at Palomar Observatory
>
> (snip)
>
> > > Let me see. What does the acronym ARRL mean?
> > > Hmm. What could be done here? Hmm. Relay.
> > > Morse Code. Low power. Temporay license.
> > > Contest. Kits. All age groups. Prizes. Corporate
> > > involvement. Hmm.
> > >
> > > But to quote Steve Martin, "This could be the dawn
> > > of a NEW AGE! We could . . . NAAAAAAH!"
> > >
> > > Val Germann
> > > KC0MUB
> >
> > The "A" is not for Amateur. ARRL stands for "American Radio Relay
League."
> > American as not Canada, Mexico, Central America, nor South America. It
is
> > the national organization for United States amateurs. But when I say
> > "America" some slick guy like Hans comes back with "Habla..."
>
> Forgive me, I don't understand. I would assume we are talking a method
> to put some interest back into amateur radio (at least here, in the US).
> The observation may have been of French youth, but any suggestion of
> what to do (at least from the perspective of within the United States),
> would likely involve the ARRL. American Radio Relay League. It would
> also involve the FCC (again, involving the United States). Why would
> you imply that the previous poster was suggesting that the 'A' in ARRL
> stood for 'amateur' rather than 'American'?

I didn't. He just doesn't like the word "amateur" to describe folks with a Part 97 license. And, no, you don't need to involve the ARRL in Scouting activities, as the French have proven. Besides, the ARRL has "THE BIG PROJECT."

By the way, the other Jim needs to know if you have any recent experience in the Novice subbands.

73, Brian

3103. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 01:54:55 UTC
From: mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net
Message-ID: <3cd5e24c.1356703095@news.newsville.com>
Source record: 42372

On Mon, 06 May 2002 00:36:49 GMT, mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net (You
Betcha (Mike H.)) wrote:

>On Mon, 6 May 2002 00:26:15 +0000 (UTC), "Jim Hampton"
><aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
>>Heck, I've been off HF since 1969. My hangout IS 440. You'll usually
>>find me on 444.850 in Rochester, the WB2KAO mo-chine (although I do get
>>on others at times - often the N2HJD machine on one of its' many ports).
>>I'll be getting back on HF though - probably next year. It would be
>>nice if you were in the area and see what kind of a conversationalist
>>you are. It could prove interesting.
>>
>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>Jim AA2QA (former WB2OSP - extra ticket in 1966)
>>
>>
>>
>>"You Betcha (Mike H." <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote in message
>>news:3cd4ab6b.1277118098@news.newsville.com
>>
>>> My point is this: The No-Code Techs on 2M (I look up their licenses
>>> on QRZ) more fit my definition of HAMS than MOST Generals and Extra's
>>> I hear on HF SSB. In short - I pray they stay where the hell they are
>>> and never come up and infect 2M or 440.
>>>
>>
>>
>>--
>>Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>
>
>Hi Jim,
>
>If you're addressing me, I agree - would love to talk to you about our
>favorite hobbies - HAM and SWL!
>
>Take care,
>
>Mike

Shoot - sorry, wrong JIM!!! Different "Jim" on rec.radio.shortwave.

But I'm sure it would be a pleasure nevertheless!

3104. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 02:51:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD5EFA6.D2712A56@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42373

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras.
> > Nothing has changed.
>
> Are you saying that you know infinitely less than the present-day new
> Extras? Hell, you are one! :-)

Nope, I'm saying new hams know infinitely less than they will after
being an active ham for 50 years.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3105. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 02:59:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020505225909.29123.00001211@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42374

In article <5f4fe4c2.0205040918.57276344@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>> What DO the liberals want? What IS their agenda? What could
>> possibly appease them, other than the one thing they really
>> want to impose upon us, which is global socialism? Keep in
>> mind, in a socialist world, things like Usenet, and comic strips
>> like Non-Sequitur, would not exist! After all, the ruling class of
>> liberal elites would no longer believe that they served any useful
>> purpose, since THEY would now be in power!
>
>...and what do conservatives want, Larry?

Stewart:

Well, to start, at least 50% of the ink and air time in the mass
media would be nice! Heck -- 25% would probably be all we
really need to get our message across! Unfortunately, with the
mass media wholly-owned by liberals with a socialist bent,
this is a pipe dream!

>When capitalism is allowed to run its course unchecked,

…A few people get wealthy, a lot of people get rich, and almost
everyone is able to earn a very high standard of living, without
being dependent on the government for cradle-to-grave support.
Of course, the only fly in this particular jar of ointment is that
people who can meet their own economic needs AREN'T
dependent on government, and are more likely to vote for
political leaders who tend to allow businesses to thrive by
keeping the heck out of their corporate hair.

>eventually ALL of the power will be
>concentrated in one individual...

Like whom, for instance? Bill Gates? Roight. He has ALL the
power in the computer industry. In a pig's eye…

>Yes, unchecked capitalism leads to Monarchy(a form of Dictatorship).

I thought this was 21st Century America, not Medieval Europe!
I'd sure love to watch some rich guy take over our government
and start up his own "Monarchy" here and now! ROFLMAO!!!
I'll give you a bit of advice if you want to try this yourself -- you'll
have to find a way to disarm 90 million American gun owners, all
at the same time, before it can ever happen!

>And, just like with a totalitarian
>communist state, a totalitarian Monarchy wouldn't allow comic stips
>with opposing points of view.

Probably not, but then, our theoretical totalitarian Monarchy would
have to figure out how to keep breathing with a chest full of lead
before they could disallow any comic strips!

>What we need Larry is a little more TOLERANCE of others and of other's
>viewpoints.

I have virtually infinite tolerance for other people's viewpoints. The
problem with liberal socialists is that they have absolutely no
tolerance for mine! Their intolerance is the very thing that "politicized"
me in the code testing requirements debate. Don't speak to me of
"tolerance" until Rush Limbaugh is doing daily guest editorials
on the NBC Nightly News.

>Any kind of government that is INTOLERANT of opposing
>viewpoints is bad.

Yup, I definitely agree here! We somehow managed to survive
eight years of just such a government, under the so-called
"leadership" of Mr. Bill Clinton (YOU call him "President," I
sure didn't!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

3106. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 03:01:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD5F1FE.55B0F1D7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42375

Richard McCollum wrote:
> But your situation is really what prevailed under the old Class A, Class B
> system and you had to make it work on 160 or 10 to work phone.

Nope, it was a little later than that - Novice and Conditional. But at
14 years of age in the 8th grade, I obtained all amateur frequency/power
privileges after memorizing the ARRL License Manual. I didn't know how
to put up a dipole. My Elmer explained it to me. I didn't know about
resonance and my Globetrotter, with its link coupling, wouldn't deliver
power to my dipole. So I traded it in on a Globe Scout which had a variable
pi-net output. I didn't know what a Transmatch or SWR was. I just followed
the dip and load instructions that came with the Globe Scout. About six years
later, I started understanding the theory.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3107. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 03:11:22 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <69fc1e6dd44a0669a105f56d20a5a8e7.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42376

Well, I had my novice ticket back in 62, but didn't give up on the novice bands until I got off HF in 69. Although active on CW at the 40 to 50 wpm level, I did have a bunch of nice slow qsos in the novice portions of the bands. My favorite experience was giving a WN2 in New Jersey his first taste of DX. At first, he called me K2AAY. After repeating the call (understand, he copied my name and other parts of the qso fine; he just didn't understand that his signal could be copied more than a couple of hundred miles away), he called me K6AAY and was quite excited about working California. Finally, I had to send (in CW) that he was talking to Guam and my call was KG6AAY. His fist then became VERY difficult to copy. I can appreciate how he felt as I had been in his shoes before. It was a lot of fun; unfortunately, I got out of amateur radio around 1982 and didn't get back in until 1993. I'm still working on getting up on HF (more than just a money thing, I now live in the city and space is at quite a premium). I've been on 440 since 93 and will eventually get back on HF. BTW, when I saw 'Fantastic Voyage' some years back, I found CW was still fairly easy despite not having copied Morse in some years. Writing a couple of CW programs also didn't hurt and from what I've heard with CW programs, I doubt I'll have too much trouble at 25 or 30 .... give me a couple of months and it should be back to a respectable speed.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:VjlB8.8511$YM7.353881522@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com

>
> I didn't. He just doesn't like the word "amateur" to describe folks with a
> Part 97 license. And, no, you don't need to involve the ARRL in Scouting
> activities, as the French have proven. Besides, the ARRL has "THE BIG
> PROJECT."
>
> By the way, the other Jim needs to know if you have any recent experience in
> the Novice subbands.
>
> 73, Brian

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3108. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 03:33:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <1QmB8.824$WQ4.441@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42377

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote

>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:A1kB8.7881$IL.407559266@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com
>

Jim,

Most of us on the newsgroup have Unclueful Brian screened out with our twit filters. When you answer his quarter-witted posts, his quotes get a free ride on your message through our twit filters, and then we have this mess on the floor from overflowing bit-buckets.

Thanks for your help in this matter.

73, Hans, K0HB

3109. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 03:57:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CD5FF1B.972C6B25@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42378

>
> As I've said, I've been actively monitoring SSB Phone for 3 years and
> there's way too many dolts and "lids" using phone on HF.

I've listened and used HF SSB for more than 2 years now and I
have heard very little "bad" stuff. Like less than 1% of all QSOs.
I'm discounting "newbie" errors. A newbie learns to avoid errors,
a lid never does.

Used to be, in LA there was a bad operator repeater on 147.435
W6NUT IIRC. Heard Riley H. is on that case now and trying
to get it cleaned up.

Only thing is that an idiot in Fartsburg Kentucky can be heard
for thousands of miles on HF, but only locally on VHF and UHF

>
>
> I've never heard *anything* on 2M or 440 that I wouldn't want a
> youngster to hear. I sure as hell can't say the same thing for HF and
> I'd prefer those HAMS (so-called "real" HAMS who passed the code test)
> not bring their bad practices and foul language up to VHF/UHF.

3110. Re: ___NO CODE=NO HAM.___

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 04:44:53 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ab638j51lec@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42385

Did anyone hear of the new proposal??? Anyone who passes the code test (at any level) must stay in the code portion of the bands, and also can only use morse code. No digital, no voice, nothing but code........ Overheard this at a hamfest this weekend.

"stevebg" <sbgood@njnet.com> wrote in message news:3CD20C99.604688C6@njnet.com...
> NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
>
> Suck it up, CBers. Suuuuuuuuuck it up.
>

3111. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 04:47:21 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ab638k61lec@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42387

I fish... just not *that* devoted to it. More of a way of socializing with friends and also having a few cold ones.... Usually don't catch much anyways.

:)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:ZIwA8.1276$jy3.1124@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote
>
> > Why not mount a mobile rig in the boat?
>
> You must not be a fisherman, or wouldn't ask that question!!!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "If people concentrated on the really important
> things of life, there'd be a shortage of fishing rods."
>
>
>

3112. Re: I guess I'm not dedicated enough

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 04:48:49 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ab638l71lec@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42384

Either must be some really bad sex or some really good fishing!!

Ryan

Real fishermen seem to derive such pleasure from the act to make it a close
> second to sex, whether the fish are biting or not, and are hence horrified
> that I sometimes listen to a walkman while doing it (the act of fishing,
> not the other one).
>
> Dennis Ferguson

3113. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 05:05:44 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ab638m81lec@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42386

I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently the rules state we cannot use our identifying callsigns, but can you imagine if a ton of people started operating there (fully in compliance of the rules as they otherwise stand) and ID'ed, and operated in an above-board professional manner? Might actually have a positive effect.

Ryan

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:ATwA8.1298$jy3.663@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> The following came from K3KO -- direct contact info is included if
> interested.
>
> (Incidentally, looks like they've found a way to make good use of 27MHz
> freqs down there -- they've turned them into ham freqs! FCC, are you
> listening?)
>
> ---
>
> Guys,
>
> I have been in contact several times with H44A (Sam).
>
> In conjunction with their National Disaster Office in the Solomon's,
> Sam is trying to get the locals licensed.
>
> There are many obstacles. The people of the Solomon's exist in a
> mostly non-cash environment. The personal purchase of anything like
> radio gear is out of the question.
>
> Sam is in need to donations of ham and CB gear. In H44, nine of the
> CB channels have been allocated to amateur radio. CB gear is quite
> useable for them.
>
> He will also welcome with "open arms" any ham from any country who
> wants to help out teaching (+ equipment work). Stays for weeks to
> months would be greatly appreciated.
>
> This might be a great opportunity for those interested in performing
> international good will via amateur radio.
>
> Sam and the director can be reached via E-mail:
>

> lotiyates@yahoo.com
>
> Sam is H44A and the director is Mr. Loti Yates.
>
> UNCLE SAM wants you!
>
> 73 de Brian/K3KO
>
>
>

3114. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 05:50:37 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <F09CEC5F793CD7A4.FDA4FC1C311734DD.958CD3113136FF03@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42379

On 05 May 2002 06:46:59 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

> WHOINTHEHELL are you trying to kid, Stew? 14 channels of 1/2 watt uhf FM
>and five channels of 2 watts of VHF- FM "overshadow" the Amateur Technician
>class..?!?!

Of course they do; you're not likely to be DF'd and sent mean letters
for making farty noises on FRS, and MURS lets you interfere with Taco
Cabana's drive-thru.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3115. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 07:40:18 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205060728350.32638-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42380

On Sun, 5 May 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
>> As I've said, I've been actively monitoring SSB Phone for 3 years and
>> there's way too many dolts and "lids" using phone on HF.
>
>I've listened and used HF SSB for more than 2 years now and I
>have heard very little "bad" stuff. Like less than 1% of all QSOs.
>I'm discounting "newbie" errors. A newbie learns to avoid errors,
>a lid never does.
>
>Used to be, in LA there was a bad operator repeater on 147.435
>W6NUT IIRC. Heard Riley H. is on that case now and trying
>to get it cleaned up.

Like the FCC really cares? The AA6TK/W6NUT repeater has been a problem for over 10 years. The only reason why the Southern California amateur community allows it to happen is because without it, all the misfits would be plaguing all the other repeaters. This way, they can merrily jam each other and leave the rest of the repeaters alone.

I would NOT be surprised one bit if the FCC got sued over having taken 147.435 off the air (should it do so) - especially as a result of all the misfits jamming all the other repeaters as a result. I'm certain that some sort of class action suit by the other repeater owners as to the capriciousness of the FCC [selective enforcement] action by not addressing the problem operators themselves (thus leading to "harm" of their own systems), not just the repeater where they congregate, would occur.

>Only thing is that an idiot in Fartsburg Kentucky can be heard
>for thousands of miles on HF, but only locally on VHF and UHF
>
>> I've never heard *anything* on 2M or 440 that I wouldn't want a
>> youngster to hear. I sure as hell can't say the same thing for HF and
>> I'd prefer those HAMS (so-called "real" HAMS who passed the code test)
>> not bring their bad practices and foul language up to VHF/UHF.

You obviously haven't lived in Southern California.....

At one time, some who ONLY listen to 147.435 were making bets on the average number of violations per MINUTE over a period of time, and some guesses were exceeding 10. Each "swear word" counted as a separate violation (and those counted since occasionally the "435" group did include someone under the age of 18).

3116. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 09:34:49 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Z6sB8.8346$6T5.786082@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42381

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD5F1FE.55B0F1D7@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > But your situation is really what prevailed under the old Class A,
Class B
> > system and you had to make it work on 160 or 10 to work phone.
>
> Nope, it was a little later than that - Novice and Conditional. But at
> 14 years of age in the 8th grade, I obtained all amateur frequency/power
> privileges after memorizing the ARRL License Manual. I didn't know how
> to put up a dipole. My Elmer explained it to me. I didn't know about
> resonance and my Globetrotter, with its link coupling, wouldn't deliver
> power to my dipole. So I traded it in on a Globe Scout which had a
variable
> pi-net output. I didn't know what a Transmatch or SWR was. I just
followed
> the dip and load instructions that came with the Globe Scout. About six
years
> later, I started understanding the theory.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Know the feeling, if I had understood all I knew at 14 the world would
have been in deep trouble.

3117. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 12:06:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506080652.27399.00001261@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 42382

In article <3CD5CF5D.4762C74E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> I follow most of the postings here on rrap. I cannot recall Dick, W0EX,
>ever
>> writing that digital experimentation (whatever that means) was a bad thing,
>or
>> that he was against it. If he "argued loud and long against it", as you
>say,
>> Cecil, then I challenge you to produce the post(s) where he did so.
>
>I argued for digital experimentation and Dick argued against me.

Produce some posts, Cecil.

>That is evidence that he is against digital experimentation.

It's only evidence if you can prodduce the posts.
>
>> I don't know if Carl, Ed or Cecil are lying, or just mistaken.
>
>If Dick is not against digital experimentation, then why does he argue so
>loud and long against my support for digital experimentation?

You are presuming your conclusion. Produce some posts.
>
>> Can you show us some of them, Cecil?
>
>Pick any of my postings where I advocate digital experimentation. Dick
>invariably came back against it. Waste your time looking them up if you
>so desire.

I have read them and I don't see Dick arguing against experimentation anywhere.
Maybe I missed it . Produce some posts and show us.

>> >2. Writing software is a relatively straight forward design and
>development
>> >path as there is very little hardware design needed.
>>
>> Disagree. It is possible to implement radio with hardware but no software.
>It's
>> impossible to implement radio with software but no hardware.
>
>It is possible to use existing hardware and write new software.

You still need the hardware.

>> >3. Slowly but surely, the RF world is going digital.
>>
>> Disagree. RF is analog. You must define what you mean by "RF is going
>digital".
>
>Military communications has gone digital.

We're not the military.

>TV is going digital.

The deadline when all (meaning, each and every) US TV station was supposed to go "digital" recently passed. Lots of noncompliance. Is the FCC pulling any licenses or demanding fines?

Do you know anyone that has a "digital" TV? Do YOU have one?

--

Show us some posts to back your claims, Cecil. Otherwise you are simply blowing smoke. Your excuses and name calling simply convince others that you don't know what you're talking about.

I suspect that you know there is some truth in what W0EX actually says. And that truth scares you silly. Thus all your evasion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3118. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 14:10:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD68EC8.E00E5F0C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42383

N2EY wrote:
> Show us some posts to back your claims, Cecil. Otherwise you are simply blowing
> smoke. Your excuses and name calling simply convince others that you don't know
> what you're talking about.

Your strategy is to wear people down by having them waste a lot of time digging up old postings only to have you nickpick them to death and deny what was said. Been there, done that, no thanks. What does it tell you that everytime Carl or I mention hams doing digital experimentation, Dick jumps on us with all four feet? Everyone who has been following these postings is free to make up his/her own mind. Those without your particular set of blinders will see things objectively. Here's just one example of Dick's response to my suggestion that hams experiment with digital modes. Ed seems to be able to read it OK.

****

From: W1RFI (w1rfi@aol.com)
Subject: Re: Radio Policy
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-02-11 16:30:46 PST

Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net wrote:

>CAM wrote:
>>Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams experimenting
>> with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the early
>> 1950's. There's almost no hardware design expertise necessary to buy a DSP
>> eval board and get to experimenting.

> Well, there you have it.

There you have what? That he wants to see just as many hams experimenting with digital radio as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the 50s? Why is that a "there you have it" sort of thing to you?

> You don't even know what you're saying.

Are you really faulting Cecil for wanting hams to experiment with DSP to easily implement digital techniques while you are using the DSP software for soundcards written by others to do your own experimentation?

Is this another "do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?

> Sure, lots of hams who can find LOTS of time and have the aptitude to learn
>the basics of DSP might benefit marginally from time spent with a
> evaluation board. LOTS of time.

Sure, good things sometimes do take lots of time. I spent lots of time learning antenna modeling -- I learned a lot in the process. I spent a lot more time

learning about RFI -- I think we can safely say that Amateur Radio benefited from that. Why do you feel that a ham who learns DSP will benefit only "marginally?"

****

--

cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3119. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 15:00:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <fUwB8.742$Jk.569@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42388

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote
>
> He will also welcome with "open arms" any ham from any country who
> wants to help out teaching (+ equipment work). Stays for weeks to
> months would be greatly appreciated.
>
> This might be a great opportunity for those interested in performing
> international good will via amateur radio.
>
> Sam and the director can be reached via E-mail:
>
> lotiyates@yahoo.com
>
> Sam is H44A and the director is Mr. Loti Yates.
>

Warning

Following a coup in June 2000, the Solomons have suffered widespread lawlessness and civil strife, including armed street battles in Honiara. The two main groups in the conflict, the Malaita Eagle Force (MEF - representing ethnic Malaitans on Guadalcanal Island) and the Isatabu Freedom Movement (IFM - representing natives of Guadalcanal) signed a peace agreement in October 2000. Sir Allan Kemakeza became prime minister in December 2001 and promised to restore peace and prosperity.

But the violence continued, and Australian-led peacekeepers stationed there to help implement the peace agreement left in early March 2002 due to deteriorating conditions. A New Zealand diplomat was murdered in late March 2002, and observers describe the current climate as 'virtual anarchy.' The war-torn Pacific nation's security situation seems to be sliding rapidly downhill. An outbreak of dengue fever and increasing numbers of malaria cases are adding to the misery.

Most foreign governments (eg, the US, New Zealand and Australian governments) have advised their nationals not to travel to the Solomons. If you do go, contact your embassy or consulate in Honiara for the latest information, in particular let them know if you're leaving Honiara.

3120. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 16:50:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gvozqt2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42389

On Mon, 6 May 2002 01:05:44 -0400, KC8PMX wrote:

>I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently the rules
>state we cannot use our identifying callsigns,

Where do you see that? The CB rules say that use of an FCC-issued
call sign is not required, but any "ID" is permitted. The one
caveat is that you do not use an FCC call sign issued to someone
else.

>but can you imagine if a ton
>of people started operating there (fully in compliance of the rules as they
>otherwise stand) and ID'ed, and operated in an above-board professional
>manner? Might actually have a positive effect.

Use a non-modified non-amplified type certified CB eadio on
authorized CB channels, and ID with callsigns assigned to you.
I see no violation there.

Required Disclaimer - the above posting is not legal advice and
should not be relied upon as such. Legal advice cannot be given
for your use except by the licensed and wualified attorney whom you
retain or who otherwise acquires the obligation to protect your
interests.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

3121. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 19:01:12 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CD6D2D7.5E1A9CBE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42390

We will see who gets the last laugh.

73,
Clay N4AOX

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> >When we see even former Ass. Dirs starting to squirm, me
> >thinks we be onto something!!??..
>
> Hans was not squirming. He was laughing at you.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3122. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 19:09:37 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CD6D4CF.CD5BA642@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42391

The only thing I need a grip on is the "books". Then we
will see who contributed to what (unless there has been some
Andersen style shredding). We won't need a fuzzy look
through a pseudo-witness who portrays he was there and saw
all, but on the otherhand was never there.

73,
Clay N4AOX

"KØHB" wrote:
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > You are SQUIRMING.
> >
>
> That's laughable! I'm just another plain-brown-rrap'er pointing out to
> N4AOX that he needs to search for a grip.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> non-former-Associate/Assistant Anything.

3123. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 19:18:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <0GAB8.1028$663.91930@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42392

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> We will see who gets the last laugh.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

Ohmygawd, I'm shaking in my boots! Could you be right?

Now, it is obvious that the opposite of right is left and that three lefts make a right or 3l=r. It is also clear that wrong is the opposite of right so -w=r. So this would make 3l=r=-w which means that 3l=-w. Now, since left is the opposite of right (-l=r) this would mean -l=r=-w, which playing with the math gives me l=-r=w and so left is the same as wrong (yes, I could have done this in fewer steps, but I didn't feel like doing that). Now, since l=w and 3l=r that would make 3w=r. This means that three wrongs make a right. Of course, since 3 is an odd number, this situation doesn't work out with any values for r and w except 0 which would mean that r=0 and w=0 and l=0, although the last one I don't really care about. This means that right and wrong are mathematically identical and so classifying things as right or wrong is pointless because both of them are the same. And since there is no difference between right and wrong, that would make me always right and you always wrong and isn't that one of the things rrap is all about?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3124. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 19:29:56 UTC
From: Radio Vulnavia <dexevzeeps3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <UQAB8.1047$663.93642@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42393

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:aff1119a7cff9113763fb02821a21320.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Forgive me, I don't understand. I would assume we are talking a method
> to put some interest back into amateur radio (at least here, in the US).

In all honesty, pse give me one good reason why today's kids would want
to go thru the trouble of putting up antennas, buying (grossly overpriced)
ham gear from dealers with attitudes like the Squid character on SpongeBob
Squarepants, put up with TVI/RFI, risk lightning hitting saidsame antennas
and burning down the house etc...etc.. when for about $500.00 they can get a
brand new
Dell or Gateway P4/1.2 GHz multimedia machine and be playing
with interactive music/video/games etc over a modem or DSL.....?

> The observation may have been of French youth, but any suggestion of
> what to do (at least from the perspective of within the United States),
> would likely involve the ARRL. American Radio Relay League. It would
> also involve the FCC (again, involving the United States). Why would
> you imply that the previous poster was suggesting that the 'A' in ARRL
> stood for 'amateur' rather than 'American'?
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Most of today's kids do not even know what a CB Radio is, let alone the ARRL,
The whole CB thing happened before they were born. Finally we had some kids
show up at last year's Field Day. They looked around for about 10 minutes and
rode off on their bikes. They commented the whole thing of a bunch of "old men"
talking on radios in a tent was "wierd". Said alot. Ham radio is obsolete guys.

Sorry.

3125. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:12:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506161242.04302.00001305@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42398

In article <1QmB8.824$WQ4.441@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Most of us on the newsgroup have Unclueful Brian screened out with our twit
>filters. When you answer his quarter-witted posts, his quotes get a free
>ride on your message through our twit filters, and then we have this mess on
>the floor from overflowing bit-buckets.
>
>Thanks for your help in this matter.

Thanks ever so much Monsenior for the "critical review" of others.

How are your powerboat repairs going? Are you dedicated yet?

3126. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:12:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506161242.04302.00001304@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42400

In article <fUwB8.742$Jk.569@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote
>>
>> He will also welcome with "open arms" any ham from any country who
>> wants to help out teaching (+ equipment work). Stays for weeks to
>> months would be greatly appreciated.
>>
>> This might be a great opportunity for those interested in performing
>> international good will via amateur radio.
>>
>> Sam and the director can be reached via E-mail:
>>
>> lotiyates@yahoo.com
>>
>> Sam is H44A and the director is Mr. Loti Yates.
>
>Warning
>
>Following a coup in June 2000, the Solomons have suffered widespread
>lawlessness and civil strife, including armed street battles in Honiara. The
>two main groups in the conflict, the Malaita Eagle Force (MEF - representing
>ethnic Malaitans on Guadalcanal Island) and the Isatabu Freedom Movement
>(IFM - representing natives of Guadalcanal) signed a peace agreement in
>October 2000. Sir Allan Kemakeza became prime minister in December 2001 and
>promised to restore peace and prosperity.

Do you just hate it when you spoil your own rants?!?

All that Guadalcanal stuff is confusing...first its go-go-go and then
its a warning-no-go. You need State Department help.

Good luck on this now.

3127. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:12:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506161243.04302.00001307@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42395

In article <6XkB8.8496$fm7.353155170@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >Bible, i.e. Remove the moat from your own eye before complaining about the
>> >speck in someone else's eye.
>>
>> ...it's a moat AND drawbridge, plus all the weeds growing on
>> the edge of the moat... :-)
>
>What about the raw sewage floating in the moat?

Are you referring to r.r.a.p.? :-)

3128. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:12:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506161243.04302.00001306@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42401

In article <d22b54c3.0204300438.793731fb@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
>news:<X4nz8.2464$8O2.173117491@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>...
>> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>> news:d22b54c3.0204291755.58b691ce@posting.google.com...
>>
>> > Because: No more benefit will accrue ham radio taken as a whole than
>> > it has where similar "new" modes have been allowed for eons above
>> > 30Mhz. Where precisely nothing new has happened too. OR what's the
>> > point to dedicating ham spectrum space just so that a few
>> > "experimenters" MIGHT emulate what the commecials are already doing?
>> > This is "advancement of the state of the art"??
>>
>> Is what we're doing now "advancement of the state of the art?"
>>
>Absolutely not. Note that the techies amongst us RRAP dwellers who are
>proposing this "experimental subband" thing are dwelling here instead
>of beavering away on the bench "advancing the state of the art". The
>usual.

Like yourself, they don't need to learn more...or even do more.
They merely have to command and others are expected to obey.

It would seem that you want "new" technology already developed,
the ad flyers already printed up, the goods in the stores so that
you can whine and bitch about those "new" technologies "aren't any
improvements on good old fashioned CW on HF." :-)

>> Lets give Hans' plan a chance. It might actually amount to something,
>> someday.
>>
>When was the last time the FCC dedicated HF spectrum space to
>something anything which "might happen someday"??

1934. Get with the program, old timer.

3129. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:12:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506161244.04302.00001308@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42402

In article <20020506080652.27399.00001261@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3CD5CF5D.4762C74E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>>I argued for digital experimentation and Dick argued against me.
>
>Produce some posts, Cecil.

Sorry about spoiling your nitpicky rant, but I saw those posts and
Cecil is right.

>>That is evidence that he is against digital experimentation.
>
>It's only evidence if you can prodduce the posts.

Those posts were visible on AOL, your ISP. If you have trouble
getting regular postings, contact AOL.

>>If Dick is not against digital experimentation, then why does he argue so
>>loud and long against my support for digital experimentation?
>
>You are presuming your conclusion. Produce some posts.

What kind of posts do you desire? Wooden? Metal? Vinyl-
coated metal? If you need lots of posts, contact your local
builder's supply or stores such as Home Depot or Lowe's.

>I have read them and I don't see Dick arguing against experimentation
>anywhere. Maybe I missed it . Produce some posts and show us.

You missed it. Try contacting AOL Member Services via the
"keyword" button.

>You still need the hardware.

Are posts hardware? Or are you just stringing barbed wire on
messages?

>We're not the military.

No? You and others have argued that you are "in a service."

You are not a "serviceman?"

>Do you know anyone that has a "digital" TV? Do YOU have one?

We do. Works fine. Lots more channels than analog-TV in the
same bandwidth.

>Show us some posts to back your claims, Cecil.

Are you sure you aren't an actor? Sounds just like some SS man
at a train depot in those old black and white WW2 prop films,
"Show your papers!"

I have to admit that those tailored long leather overcoats looked
sharp. Are you wearing one when demanding those posts?

>Otherwise you are simply blowing smoke.

Smoking is supposed to be bad for you. When erecting all those
wooden posts it might be a fire danger. Please don't put anyone
in danger.

>Your excuses and name calling simply convince others that you don't
>know what you're talking about.

Produce some posts showing Cecil making excuses and name-calling.

>I suspect that you know there is some truth in what W0EX actually says. And
>that truth scares you silly. Thus all your evasion.

W0EX scares lots of folks, silly.

Remember that he was using "store-and-forward" ASR28 paper tape
before you were old enough for your first license. That's a techie
breakthrough. For W0EX.

Produce your own posts. We can dig it.

3130. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:12:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506161245.04302.00001309@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42399

In article <geomac-623FA0.13384829042002@news.uswest.net>, George McCouch
<geomac@hopkinsville.net> writes:

>Hello Len,
>
>I just looked at one and found it interesting that Arthur Anderson did
>the work. Of course if I took the time to look at the financial
>statement published in QST I probably would have known it, but
>interesting just the same.
>
>73
>George
>W3GEO

One can glean a lot of data on organizations by looking at the
normally-public data as you state. What is interesting in the
federal tax forms is information on salaries and number of
employees for a given year. The "top five" paid employees and
all the officers are duly listed. From that, one can infer
approximately what the salaries are for the other 106 paid
employees. Salary information is normally kept out of
the public eye...including the employees.

Judging from the amounts listed, the statements of altruism
and noble self-sacrifice for some cause seems a bit hollow.

The "Residence Radio Club" of an important official comes to
mind. :-)

3131. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:12:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506161246.04302.00001311@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42394

In article <20020505201812.22556.00007380@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
>>When we see even former Ass. Dirs starting to squirm, me
>>thinks we be onto something!!??..
>
>Hans was not squirming. He was laughing at you.

Now, now, Ed...don't get all disagreeable here.

Implications of "everyone laughing at someone" in postings is grade-school-level computer-modem technique. Immature.

That's on the order of saying that another "should act nice or nobody will like you..." :-)

Take a breather and come back when you feel better.

3132. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:12:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506161246.04302.00001310@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42397

In article <zdjB8.431$WQ4.57@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>> You are SQUIRMING.
>
>That's laughable! I'm just another plain-brown-rrap'er pointing out to
>N4AOX that he needs to search for a grip.

The Armenian Judges went home, decided you weren't worthwhile protesting anything.

Please get your boat fixed so you can fuggetaboud amateur radio. Act dedicated.

If nothing else, try reposting those "Little Billy Beeper" stories again.

3133. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:12:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506161247.04302.00001312@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 42396

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gvozqt2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

> Required Disclaimer - the above posting is not legal advice and
> should not be relied upon as such. Legal advice cannot be given
> for your use except by the licensed and wualified attorney whom you
> retain or who otherwise acquires the obligation to protect your
> interests.

Understood that only "wualified attornies" are acceptible.

Thank you for the pro sonny bono advice. :-)

3134. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:18:03 UTC
From: mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net
Message-ID: <3cd6e2dd.2176261648@news.newsville.com>
Source record: 42403

On Mon, 06 May 2002 19:29:56 GMT, "Radio Vulnavia"
<dexevzeeps3@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:aff1119a7cff9113763fb02821a21320.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
>> Forgive me, I don't understand. I would assume we are talking a method
>> to put some interest back into amateur radio (at least here, in the US).
>
>In all honesty, pse give me one good reason why today's kids would want
>to go thru the trouble of putting up antennas, buying (grossly overpriced)
>ham gear from dealers with attitudes like the Squid character on SpongeBob
>Squarepants, put up with TVI/RFI, risk lightning hitting saidsame antennas
>and burning down the house etc...etc.. when for about $500.00 they can get a
>brand new
>Dell or Gateway P4/1.2 GHz multimedia machine and be playing
>with interactive music/video/games etc over a modem or DSL.....?
>
>> The observation may have been of French youth, but any suggestion of
>> what to do (at least from the perspective of within the United States),
>> would likely involve the ARRL. American Radio Relay League. It would
>> also involve the FCC (again, involving the United States). Why would
>> you imply that the previous poster was suggesting that the 'A' in ARRL
>> stood for 'amateur' rather than 'American'?
>>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim AA2QA
>
>Most of today's kids do not even know what a CB Radio is, let alone the ARRL,
>The whole CB thing happened before they were born. Finally we had some kids
>show up at last year's Field Day. They looked around for about 10 minutes and
>rode off on their bikes. They commented the whole thing of a bunch of "old men"
>talking on radios in a tent was "wierd". Said alot. Ham radio is obsolete guys.
>
>Sorry.

Some of your points are well taken, but much of what you've said is
simply untrue:

Ham Radio equipment, while much of it is pricey, is no longer (and
really never has been) "grossly" overpriced. Antenna systems are as
cheap as they've ever been.

A trip to EBay and a little background can net a pretty good deal.

Check out the used gear at Univeral Radio. I will admit however, that the "staff" at Universal ranges from good to bad salesperson-ship.

TVI/RFI - stay off 6M ;)

Spend a little more and turn that dandy new PC into a dandy new HAM set.

Ham Radio is FAR from obsolete. While its great to get kids involved, many won't until young adulthood. There is no end to what is possble in HAM radio regarding communication via portable/mobile gear that simply cannot be accomplished from a keyboard hooked to the Internet.

Mobile access to the Internet??? And you thought HAM radio was expensive????

I'm 40 and have been interested for years and am only NOW getting ready to take my first HAM test.

A shame also that many parents would no doubt discourage conversation between their (supervised) child and a "damn foreigner"...ah well.

But children DO take interest in HAM radio - the key is generating more interest.

"Irving's conclusions were completely untenable. I thought his scholarship was sloppy and unreliable and did not meet even the most basic requirements of honest and competent historical research." (Richard Evans, Lying About Hitler, p.70)

3135. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 20:37:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <zQBB8.1151$663.101938@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42404

Ye Olde Organ Grinder wrote

>
> Please get your boat fixed
>

Boat runs just fine, like a thoroughbred, as I mentioned in my original
message on the topic. Never was broken.

Go fix your organ.

73, K0HB

3136. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 21:34:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <cFCB8.8716$R75.437276998@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42405

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:69fc1e6dd44a0669a105f56d20a5a8e7.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Well, I had my novice ticket back in 62, but didn't give up on the
> novice bands until I got off HF in 69. Although active on CW at the
> 40 to 50 wpm level, I did have a bunch of nice slow qsos in the novice
> portions of the bands.

Jim, thanks for the info. If I read Jim/N2EY correctly, I have more credibility than you to comment on the ARRL Novice band refarming petition because my Novice experience was much more recent than yours in 1969. Anyway, I think your comments are equally as valid as mine, so Jim's is not an opinion that I subscribe to.

> My favorite experience was giving a WN2 in New
> Jersey his first taste of DX. At first, he called me K2AAY. After
> repeating the call (understand, he copied my name and other parts of
> the qso fine; he just didn't understand that his signal could be copied
> more than a couple of hundred miles away), he called me K6AAY and was
> quite excited about working California. Finally, I had to send (in CW)
> that he was talking to Guam and my call was KG6AAY. His fist then
> became VERY difficult to copy. I can appreciate how he felt as I had
> been in his shoes before.

Jim, my favorite Novice experience was cutting down a 40 M Novice band dipole for 28.5 MHz. My favorite ham experience was hearing U5MIR calling on 2M while I was on Guam.

It was a lot of fun; unfortunately, I got
> out of amateur radio around 1982 and didn't get back in until 1993. I'm
> still working on getting up on HF (more than just a money thing, I now
> live in the city and space is at quite a premium). I've been on 440
> since 93 and will eventually get back on HF. BTW, when I saw 'Fantastic
> Voyage' some years back, I found CW was still fairly easy despite not
> having copied Morse in some years. Writing a couple of CW programs also
> didn't hurt and from what I've heard with CW programs, I doubt I'll have
> too much trouble at 25 or 30 .... give me a couple of months and it
> should be back to a respectable speed.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Jim, for HF, try stationary mobile at the local park. No one should complain about TVI or zoning.

73,
Brian/N0iMD

3137. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 21:35:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <rGCB8.8717$O75.437273898@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42406

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:1QmB8.824$WQ4.441@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote
>
> >
> > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> > news:A1kB8.7881$IL.407559266@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com
> >
>
> Jim,
>
> Most of us on the newsgroup have Unclueful Brian screened out with our
twit
> filters. When you answer his quarter-witted posts, his quotes get a free
> ride on your message through our twit filters, and then we have this mess
on
> the floor from overflowing bit-buckets.
>
> Thanks for your help in this matter.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

There goes Han's with the name calling again.

3138. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 21:46:20 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <MQCB8.8726$Ta5.437373297@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42407

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:5UcA8.1239$Ss1.436@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

> Please go mate yourself.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

The Amateur's Code
The Radio Amateur is

CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the pleasure of others.

LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs, local clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur Radio in the United States is represented nationally and internationally.

PROGRESSIVE...with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and efficient station and operation above reproach.

FRIENDLY...slow and patient operating when requested; friendly advice and counsel to the beginner; kindly assistance, cooperation and consideration for the interests of others. These are the hallmarks of the amateur spirit.

BALANCED...radio is an avocation, never interfering with duties owed to family, job, school or community.

PATRIOTIC...station and skill always ready for service to country and community.

--The original Amateur's Code was written by Paul M. Segal, W9EEA, in 1928.

3139. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 21:51:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tVCB8.8729$8s5.437852332@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42408

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gvozqt2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 6 May 2002 01:05:44 -0400, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently the
rules
> >state we cannot use our identifying callsigns,
>
> Where do you see that?

Phil, it was decide on here a couple of years ago.

3140. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 21:56:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <A_CB8.8731$iz5.438025436@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42409

```
"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:n6kB8.7885$ZQ.407720300@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0204300438.793731fb@posting.google.com...
> > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:<X4nz8.2464$8O2.173117491@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:d22b54c3.0204291755.58b691ce@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > > Because: No more benefit will accrue ham radio taken as a whole than
> > > > it has where similar "new" modes have been allowed for eons above
> > > > 30Mhz. Where precisely nothing new has happened too. OR what's the
> > > > point to dedicating ham spectrum space just so that a few
> > > > "experimenters" MIGHT emulate what the commecials are already doing?
> > > > This is "advancement of the state of the art"??
> > >
> > > Is what we're doing now "advancement of the state of the art?"
> > >
> > >
> > Absolutely not. Note that the techies amongst us RRAP dwellers who are
> > proposing this "experimental subband" thing are dwelling here instead
> > of beavering away on the bench "advancing the state of the art". The
> > usual.
> > >
> > >
> > > Lets give Hans' plan a chance. It might actually amount to something,
> > > someday.
> > >
> > >
> > When was the last time the FCC dedicated HF spectrum space to
> > something anything which "might happen someday"??
>
> 1912?
>
1918?
```

3141. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 22:00:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Z1DB8.8732$rD5.438117699@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42410

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020505201509.22556.00007379@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>
> > Why do you think the ARRL backed 5WPM restructuring ...
>
> If my memory serves, ARRL proposed a 5 wpm General, and a 12 wpm Advanced
and
> Extra.

Only after they backed a "No Change" position, then FCC said that wasn't an
option.

3142. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 22:04:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <86DB8.8736$CD5.438126659@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42411

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CD2175E.4D9B9091@townsqr.com...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > Excuse me folks, but isn't ALL of Amateur Radio supposed to be to some
> > > degree experimenters?
> >
> > Some hams think the legacy modes are all we'll ever need.
>
> And who might they be?

Dick Carrol, for one.

So far we haven't had any of them turn up here on rrap.
> How do you know they think that?

Because one legacy mode is considered to be more important than all the
other legacy modes and yet to be developed modes combined. Its a simple
inference from your past 5 years of postings.

3143. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 22:09:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <maDB8.8738$_M5.438388115@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42412

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CD3511E.8ACA296A@townsqr.com...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Some hams think the legacy modes are all we'll ever need.
> > >
> > > And who might they be? So far we haven't had any of them turn up
here on rrap.
> > > How do you know they think that?
> >
> > Because they badmouth hams experimenting with digital modes every
> > chance they get.
>
> Who on RRAP *are* you referring to now, Old Sot? Carl? I thought he
badmouthed
> everything BUT digital. It couldn't be me, all I badmouth is Carl, you,
and Ed
> occasionally when he gets a kink in his tail which clearly has negative
effects on
> his reading comprehension.

You bad mouth me.

> As for who is actually DOING digital, as opposed to yakking about
forcing all others
> to do it, It sure isn't you and Carl. You have the yakking market
cornered.

You have the MO mule market cornered.

> > Your postings are clearly anti-digital, Dick.
>
> Yeah, RIGHT. You spring near a kilobuck for a STS-for PACTOR instead of
just building
> your own, as you insist that all us lesser mortals must do, while I busily
work the
> soundcard digital modes SEVERAL of them,

You work AT them. You have yet to make them work.

and you make such a statement SOLELY because
> I support the use and testing of CW in ham radio. And you still act like
I'm the goat

> here.

Mule.

> But the readers know, old sot. They know.

> > Doesn't
> > the FCC desiring that members of the ARS upgrade to the 21st century
> > indicate to you that the handwriting is on the wall?
>
> The FCC really couldn't care less what hams do. One or two *individual employee*/hams
> have made noises on their own. The Commission couldn't care less about what modes we
> use. If you believe the modes we use will save our frequencies when the right $$$$$
> comes asking, you're a dreaming fool.

Mule.

3144. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 22:15:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QfDB8.8745$uR5.438477028@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42413

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:bu_A8.6646$6T5.564838@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

> For
> that matter, the quest to decode morse on a compooter is right up there in
> the stupidity department as well.

Should be a cake walk. That's what computers excel at. CW is digital,
after all.

Brian/N0iMD

3145. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 22:17:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kiDB8.8747$SV5.438591841@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42414

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD4A411.21BF7124@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > My real question is why all the emphasis on mode?
>
> The emphasis is on experimentation, not on mode. It's just natural to
> experiment with new modes.
>
> > You guys are demanding the mode be set first and in fact seem to be hung
> > up on mode.
>
> Not true. We are suggesting that hams experiment more. The legacy modes
> have been experimented with for the better part of a century so they are
> in the area of diminishing returns. It's only logical to experiment in
> areas that have not been saturated with experimentation already.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I think I'll drop down on 5 MHz and see if its suitable for amateur use.
I'll join the year long ARRL experiment already in progress. Hihihi

3146. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 22:21:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <VIDB8.8754$F_5.438712563@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42415

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CD53A75.DCF6FAC5@townsqr.com...

> That's where we have wound up, and it's the only real problem I ever had
with
> the late restructuring. The practical effect was to destroy the Extra
class
> license by making it possible to obtain with Novice knowledge and skill.

Dick, when did the Extra exam go away? And copying a code tape at 20wpm is
no indication of HF skill. You should know that.

3147. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 22:24:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YoDB8.8757$616.438782257@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42416

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD5D0F1.5321709@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > What it does mean is that those of us with some experience if we are not
> > to lose these guys thru a process not of their making are going to have
to
> > get over green-as-grass Extras and get them going just as Novices were
got
> > going back in antiquity.
>
> You and I were once "green-as-grass" amateur radio operators. We were not
> born with our present knowledge. I had all amateur frequency/power
privileges
> in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras.
Nothing
> has changed.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cec, not everyone came into amateur radio green. Some were military or commercial ops who found it easy to translate their occupation over to amateur radio.

3148. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 22:26:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2qDB8.8758$826.438812810@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42417

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD5EFA6.D2712A56@IEEE.org...
> "K�HB" wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >
> > > in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras.
> > > Nothing has changed.
> >
> > Are you saying that you know infinitely less than the present-day new
> > Extras? Hell, you are one! :-)
>
> Nope, I'm saying new hams know infinitely less than they will after
> being an active ham for 50 years.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I'm waiting for them to argue this.

3149. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 22:44:47 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205061444.48a13464@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42418

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<ab1ip1$4n9$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5f4fe4c2.0205040918.57276344@posting.google.com...
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> news:<20020503230516.01774.00002588@mb-cg.aol.com>...
> > > What DO the liberals want? What IS their agenda? What could
> > > possibly appease them, other than the one thing they really
> > > want to impose upon us, which is global socialism? Keep in
> > > mind, in a socialist world, things like Usenet, and comic strips
> > > like Non-Sequitur, would not exist! After all, the ruling class of
> > > liberal elites would no longer believe that they served any useful
> > > purpose, since THEY would now be in power!
> >
> > ...and what do conservatives want, Larry? When capitalism is allowed
> > to run its course unchecked, eventually ALL of the power will be
> > concentrated in one individual...
>
> Since that has failed to happen after 200+ years of a capatalistic
> American society, I find your statement wholly without merit.
> Indeed, there aren't even good examples on a single industry basis.

You dunce... I said UNCHECKED. CAN'T YOU READ ENGLISH?

> > Yes, unchecked capitalism leads to
> > Monarchy(a form of Dictatorship).
>
> Per chance you meant monopoly?

No - I meant just what I said.

> > And, just like with a totalitarian
> > communist state, a totalitarian Monarchy wouldn't allow comic stips
> > with opposing points of view.
>
> Come back when you get your definitions straight.

Go FUCK YOURSELF, ASSHOLE.

> > What we need Larry is a little more TOLERANCE of others and of other's
> > viewpoints. Any kind of government that is INTOLERANT of opposing
> > viewpoints is bad.
>
> Conservatives allow far more toleramce than the liberals seem to.
>
> Liberals don't even want discussion/debate on their ideas.

I'm NOT a liberal, DICKHEAD.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Fuck OFF.

3150. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-06 23:17:45 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205061517.217de477@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42419

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020505225909.29123.00001211@mb-mu.aol.com>...
> >eventually ALL of the power will be
> >concentrated in one individual...
>
> Like whom, for instance? Bill Gates? Roight. He has ALL the
> power in the computer industry. In a pig's eye…

I'm just saying if their WASN'T an oppossing viewpoint, and capitalism was allowed to proceed unchecked, it would lead to monarchy.

I'm just as against pure liberalism as the next guy... but I wouldn't want to live in a society where business was allowed to proceed unchecked - like if Rockefeller and Carnegie were allowed to continue unchecked about 100 years ago... Things would have been much different by now.

3151. Re: The Truth About Most Hams [from rec.radio.cb]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 00:28:18 UTC
From: avoobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <7c427561.0205061628.2bcbaed5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

hfa9315@alaska.usa.com (HFA_9315) wrote in message
news:<e97ee11a.0205060851.33048afa@posting.google.com>...
> As a Ham operator of many years one thing still holds true. Most hams
> are silly little snobs who use radio to build up their sense of self
> worth. All of you "good hammie" types may reply with a flame if you
> like, but the truth remains the truth.
>
> Turn on your 2 mtr rig and listen to the local repeater. How does the
> content of conversation differ than what is encounted on local AM CB?
> There are good operators and lids on both.
>
> The term CBer is a broad term. To some it means conversing on CH 19.
> To others it may mean a 4 watt AM base station and a 5/8 wave ground
> plane. Then to some it may mean a big bad amp that can key down "a
> gazillion
> watts". To me, a nice Galaxy running 30 watts pep into a three element
> beam up around 65 feet defines it for me. The point is, what ever
> defines it for you is OK. There aren't a bunch of silly little people
> with silly little minds defining what is acceptable for others.
>
> I have spoken with more interesting people on the freeband than one
> could ever hope to encounter on the ham bands. I have observed more
> good
> operators on 11 mtrs than on the "real" bands...ie 15, 20 mtrs, etc.
> The best part is that the conversation involves more than "type of
> rig" or
> "signal report" that is so common the the ham bands.
>
> Just a quick note to the "good hammie types". I hold an advanced class
> license (WA9???) and have held said class for more years than I care
> to remember.
>
> Haming could be a wonderful hobby. Instead it is nothing more than a
> bunch of small minds with low self esteem hoping to invoke their
> warped
> thoughts on others. Having some sort of "power" in their local club
> some how
> increases their self worth in their sad little world.
>
> Want to try some SSTV? Take a look around 27.775....or maybe packet?
> look around 27.900. Oh, the FM DX has been rolling in around
> 26.675.....see
> what I mean? These 11 mtr guys are the ones having the fun on the

> radio, and
> isn't fun what it's supposed to be about? (And don't spew that crap
> about "hams" and "public service"..... you are all useless as far as
> that goes and you and I both know it).
>
> Up Here in "the land of Lincoln" I'm having a blast with my radios.
> I'd
> like to "wave a hand" to everyone and will be listening on 27.555
> USB(local
> and DX).
>
> I am and will always be a CBer..... and proud of it.
>
> 73's and good DX,
> Jim

Well Jim, you certainly sound authentic, with that callsign and all. I wonder if all hams feel the same way as you do?

-Aaron

3152. Re: ___NO CODE=NO HAM.___

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 00:49:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CD724A4.DAEBB2D4@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42445

Wow, that would get a bunch of new hams on the air!

Assuming the proposal was serious, what on earth would it prove? Lots
of us, including myself, don't have all that much interest in CW. I
support learning and testing it, but my interest is not all that much.

If there was such a thing, I know I wouldn't even be a ham.

- Mike KB3EIA -

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> Did anyone hear of the new proposal??? Anyone who passes the code test (at
> any level) must stay in the code portion of the bands, and also can only use
> morse code. No digital, no voice, nothing but code........ Overheard this
> at a hamfest this weekend.
>
> "stevebg" <sbgood@njnet.com> wrote in message
> news:3CD20C99.604688C6@njnet.com...
> > NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
> >
> > Suck it up, CBers. Suuuuuuuuuck it up.
> >

3153. Re: The Truth About Most Hams [from rec.radio.cb]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 00:49:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <swFB8.1590$663.140022@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42421
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Aaron H. Voobner" <avoobner@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:7c427561.0205061628.2bcbaed5@posting.google.com...
> hfa9315@alaska.usa.com (HFA_9315) wrote in message
news:<e97ee11a.0205060851.33048afa@posting.google.com>...
> > As a Ham operator of many years one thing still holds true. Most hams
> > are silly little snobs who use radio to build up their sense of self
> > worth. All of you "good hammie" types may reply with a flame if you
> > like, but the truth remains the truth.

Troll-O-Meter

S1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 +10 +20
----+----+----+----+----+----+----+----+----+-----+------
||||||||||||
----+----+----+----+----+----+----+----+----+-----+------

This presentation was not up contemporary professional
troll standards. The post lacked the range of total color
necessary to make it interesting.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3154. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 01:12:27 UTC
From: stewart teaze <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <%RFB8.9194$9A5.384954539@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42422

Uh, sorry about the tirade... I guess I've just become intolerant of all this intolerance.

Time for me to take a leave of absense from this looney bin, once again.

Stewart - horseshoe7 - N0MHS - E Pluribus Unum

3155. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 01:16:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506211621.06459.00001201@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 42424

In article <zQBB8.1151$663.101938@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Boat runs just fine, like a thoroughbred, as I mentioned in my original
>message on the topic. Never was broken.

...then the HANDSOME BOY should be out on the water using
it, no? Either than or put the "thoroughbred" out to stud.

>Go fix your organ.

All my organs work just fine. One organ has a crank in its side.
Do any of your organs have a crank?

My little monkey is broken, can't dance. Poor thing.

3156. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 01:16:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506211622.06459.00001202@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 42426

In article <YoDB8.8757$616.438782257@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CD5D0F1.5321709@IEEE.org...
>> Richard McCollum wrote:
>> > What it does mean is that those of us with some experience if we are not
>> > to lose these guys thru a process not of their making are going to have to
>> > get over green-as-grass Extras and get them going just as Novices were got
>> > going back in antiquity.
>>
>> You and I were once "green-as-grass" amateur radio operators. We were not
>> born with our present knowledge. I had all amateur frequency/power
privileges
>> in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras.
Nothing
>> has changed.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Cec, not everyone came into amateur radio green. Some were military or
>commercial ops who found it easy to translate their occupation over to
>amateur radio.

Only the MORSEMEN, Brian...only the morsemen. Amateur morsemen regard themselves as professional. You've READ of their exploits. In HERE.

Non-morsemen have to begin at the bottom of the ladder, the back of the bus, and drink from different water fountains no matter what their experience. They tell me so and also that amateur radio works by different physics than all other radio so everyone not a morseman is a "beginner," a "neophyte," and "knows absolutely nothing about amateur radio." They tell me this.

All must begin at the bottom regardless. The long-timers need (apparently desperately) some "beginners" and "neophytes" to jump on. It makes them feel soooooo good.

3157. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 01:16:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506211623.06459.00001203@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 42425

In article <MQCB8.8726$Ta5.437373297@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
>news:5UcA8.1239$Ss1.436@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
>> Please go mate yourself.
>>
>> With all kind wishes,
>>
>> de Hans, K0HB
>
>The Amateur's Code
>The Radio Amateur is
>
>CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
>pleasure of others.
>
>LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs, local
>clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur Radio in
>the United States is represented nationally and internationally.
>
>PROGRESSIVE...with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and efficient
>station and operation above reproach.
>
>FRIENDLY...slow and patient operating when requested; friendly advice and
>counsel to the beginner; kindly assistance, cooperation and consideration
>for the interests of others. These are the hallmarks of the amateur spirit.
>
>BALANCED...radio is an avocation, never interfering with duties owed to
>family, job, school or community.
>
>PATRIOTIC...station and skill always ready for service to country and
>community.
>
>--The original Amateur's Code was written by Paul M. Segal, W9EEA, in 1928.

Apparently amateurs didn't have sex or mating in 1928. There's
no reference to "mating oneself" as per the HANDSOME BOY
instructions. He is a powerboat owner. A vulgar boatman.

3158. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 01:16:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506211624.06459.00001204@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 42423

In article <kiDB8.8747$SV5.438591841@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CD4A411.21BF7124@IEEE.org...
>> Richard McCollum wrote:
>> > My real question is why all the emphasis on mode?
>>
>> The emphasis is on experimentation, not on mode. It's just natural to
>> experiment with new modes.
>>
>> > You guys are demanding the mode be set first and in fact seem to be hung
>> > up on mode.
>>
>> Not true. We are suggesting that hams experiment more. The legacy modes
>> have been experimented with for the better part of a century so they are
>> in the area of diminishing returns. It's only logical to experiment in
>> areas that have not been saturated with experimentation already.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>I think I'll drop down on 5 MHz and see if its suitable for amateur use.
>I'll join the year long ARRL experiment already in progress. Hihihi

Marvelous idea. It is important to watch pioneering in the making, exploring new spectral territory, "testing the waters" to see if they are pure enough for the amateurs. That's "unexplored territory."

Is Martha Stewart a ham? She would be perfect for the job.

3159. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 01:16:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020506211625.06459.00001205@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 42427

In article <QfDB8.8745$uR5.438477028@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:bu_A8.6646$6T5.564838@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>> For
>> that matter, the quest to decode morse on a compooter is right up there in
>> the stupidity department as well.
>
>Should be a cake walk. That's what computers excel at. CW is digital,
>after all.

McCollum was born an Extra. He said so at least twice in here.
You and all others have to bear with him.

Years ago I got a demonstration of a professional programmer's recreational project of an automatically speed-adaptive morse decoder program that could handle a wide variation in dot-dash ratios. Worked fine on a less-than-50-MHz-clock PC. He just wanted to see if it could be done better than all other efforts of its time. It could.

Problem is, there wasn't any real market for it. Commercial folks didn't need it (they didn't use any morse code), the military expressed no interest (only a few other militaries use it). Long-time ham morsemen thought it an abomination before God. I brought over my little Icom receiver to his place and we put up a quickie long-wire to monitor some ham CW signals. Dull copy, nothing interesting... "code within code" of all those abbreviations.

I suggested doing a TTY converter but he wasn't interested, too "ordinary," no real challenge in that, been done in both hardware and software. He went on to other projects, dropping any further work after seeing the relative non-content of the ham communications. We couldn't find any commercial OOK CW signals off the ham bands.

He could be called "stupid" and lots of other epithets...especially if he pulled down some good bucks for making computer code (five integer dollar digits per annum...and that was years ago).

3160. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 01:23:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <v0GB8.1650$663.145790@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42428

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020506211621.06459.00001201@mb-mo.aol.com...
> In article <zQBB8.1151$663.101938@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K&#65533;HB"
> <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >Boat runs just fine, like a thoroughbred, as I mentioned in my original
> >message on the topic. Never was broken.
>
> ...then the HANDSOME BOY should be out on the water using
> it, no?

Fishing season opens Saturday at 0001CST. I'll be on the water then. Wish
me luck.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3161. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 01:31:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <38GB8.1668$663.146822@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42429

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> >FRIENDLY...slow and patient operating when requested; friendly advice and
> >counsel to the beginner; kindly assistance, cooperation and consideration
> >for the interests of others.

> Apparently amateurs didn't have sex or mating in 1928.

Mating comes under the heading of FRIENDLY above, at least the way K0CKB
practice it. Especially that slooooooooow and patient operating.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3162. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 01:33:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020506213335.29123.00001271@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42430

In article <3CD3E6F9.3ABD4A31@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>
>Larry, was that rant a response to the cartoon, or was it your
>impression of the kid in the cartoon? 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

The source and purpose of my posting should have been perfectly
obvious to anyone with an IQ in the 90's or above. However, for YOUR
benefit, yes, it was my response to the cartoon.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3163. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:00:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NyGB8.8937$Fh2.446895241@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42431

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:38GB8.1668$663.146822@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> > >FRIENDLY...slow and patient operating when requested; friendly advice
and
> > >counsel to the beginner; kindly assistance, cooperation and
consideration
> > >for the interests of others.
>
> > Apparently amateurs didn't have sex or mating in 1928.
>
> Mating comes under the heading of FRIENDLY above, at least the way K0CKB
> practice it. Especially that slooooooooow and patient operating.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans, she's mating herself? Perhaps she's her own best friend. Reminds me
of a song that Burnadette Peters sang on Saturday Night Live years ago.

3164. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:09:00 UTC
From: stewart teaze <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <0HGB8.9233$MA6.386798028@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42432

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD535CA.76F75562@IEEE.org...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
> > >Yes, unchecked capitalism leads to Monarchy(a form of Dictatorship)
> >
> > Stew...just WHICH capitalist entity has ever become a Monarchy due
to
> > capitalism?

All of the Monarchies.

>
> Stewart seems to be confusing economic systems with political systems.
> Capitalism is NOT a political system. Capitalism is an economic system
> that allows the ownership and control of the means of production to
> reside in the hands of the citizens rather than in the hands of a
> socialist/fascist government.

Come on... I never said our system WAS an absolute capitialist system - in
fact, THAT WAS THE WHOLE POINT OF MY POST! ... that it is a BALANCED
society, where both sides "check" each other.

Ahhhh - just forget the whole thing, folks... it just isn't worth my time to
deal with people misinterpreting my words.

Later.

3165. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:09:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1HGB8.8947$at2.447252509@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42433

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020506211622.06459.00001202@mb-mo.aol.com...
> In article <YoDB8.8757$616.438782257@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >news:3CD5D0F1.5321709@IEEE.org...
> >> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >> > What it does mean is that those of us with some experience if we are
not
> >> > to lose these guys thru a process not of their making are going to
have to
> >> > get over green-as-grass Extras and get them going just as Novices
were got
> >> > going back in antiquity.
> >>
> >> You and I were once "green-as-grass" amateur radio operators. We were
not
> >> born with our present knowledge. I had all amateur frequency/power
> privileges
> >> in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras.
> Nothing
> >> has changed.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >Cec, not everyone came into amateur radio green. Some were military or
> >commercial ops who found it easy to translate their occupation over to
> >amateur radio.
>
> Only the MORSEMEN, Brian...only the morsemen. Amateur morsemen
> regard themselves as professional. You've READ of their exploits. In
> HERE.

By Golly!!! Thanks for the reminder.

> Non-morsemen have to begin at the bottom of the ladder, the back of
> the bus, and drink from different water fountains no matter what their
> experience. They tell me so and also that amateur radio works by
> different physics than all other radio so everyone not a morseman
> is a "beginner," a "neophyte," and "knows absolutely nothing about
> amateur radio." They tell me this.

Right-O again.

> All must begin at the bottom regardless. The long-timers need
> (apparently desperately) some "beginners" and "neophytes" to
> jump on. It makes them feel soooooooo good.

C'mon in. The waters fine except for a few Baby Ruth's at the bottom of the pool.

By the way, how do you think I'm doing in the credibility department? I found one OT honest enough to admit that his most recent experience in the Novice subbands was in 1969. So it would appear that I have more credibility than him, according to the "What's your recent experience..." criterion.

73,
Brian

3166. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:18:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NPGB8.8963$Fy2.447406511@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42434

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020506080652.27399.00001261@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3CD5CF5D.4762C74E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> I follow most of the postings here on rrap. I cannot recall Dick, W0EX,
> >ever
> >> writing that digital experimentation (whatever that means) was a bad
thing,
> >or
> >> that he was against it. If he "argued loud and long against it", as you
> >say,
> >> Cecil, then I challenge you to produce the post(s) where he did so.
> >
> >I argued for digital experimentation and Dick argued against me.
>
> Produce some posts, Cecil.

Gimme.

> >That is evidence that he is against digital experimentation.
>
> It's only evidence if you can prodduce the posts.

Gimme, gimmme.

> >> I don't know if Carl, Ed or Cecil are lying, or just mistaken.
> >
> >If Dick is not against digital experimentation, then why does he argue so
> >loud and long against my support for digital experimentation?
>
> You are presuming your conclusion. Produce some posts.

Gimme, gimme, gimme.

> >> Can you show us some of them, Cecil?

Gimme, gimme, gimme, gimme.

> >Pick any of my postings where I advocate digital experimentation. Dick
> >invariably came back against it. Waste your time looking them up if you
> >so desire.
>
> I have read them and I don't see Dick arguing against experimentation
anywhere.
> Maybe I missed it . Produce some posts and show us.

Gimme, gimme, gimme, gimme, gimme.

Jim's always expecting someone to give him something.

BTW Cecil, what's your most recent experience in the Novice subbands (quick, go make a contact so you'll have more credibility than me)?

3167. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:21:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD73A2F.814809C2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42435

stewart wrote:
> I'm just saying if their WASN'T an oppossing viewpoint, and capitalism
> was allowed to proceed unchecked, it would lead to monarchy.

What does the economic system of Capitalism have to do with our political system? An economic system cannot repeal The Constitutional Republic.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3168. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:26:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mXGB8.8973$nQ2.447991903@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42436

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD68EC8.E00E5F0C@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Show us some posts to back your claims, Cecil. Otherwise you are simply
blowing
> > smoke. Your excuses and name calling simply convince others that you
don't know
> > what you're talking about.
>
> Your strategy is to wear people down by having them waste a lot of time
digging
> up old postings only to have you nickpick them to death and deny what was
said.
> Been there, done that, no thanks.

It's not his only strategy. Often he asks relatively simple questions.
When answered, no matter the answer, he can jump up and say, "Aha! You lack
credibility..., you don't have enough time in the chow hall, the latrine, or
the motor pool."

He sulks away when you don't play his games.

> What does it tell you that everytime Carl
> or I mention hams doing digital experimentation, Dick jumps on us with all
> four feet?

Cause he's a mule?

> Everyone who has been following these postings is free to make up
> his/her own mind. Those without your particular set of blinders will see
> things objectively. Here's just one example of Dick's response to my
suggestion
> that hams experiment with digital modes. Ed seems to be able to read it
OK.

(Snip of Dick bashing digital modes)

There you go giving in to his demands. Not necessary.

3169. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:27:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD73BA7.6A9E68F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42437

Brian P Burke wrote:
> BTW Cecil, what's your most recent experience in the Novice subbands (quick,
> go make a contact so you'll have more credibility than me)?

Probably the last straight key night.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3170. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:33:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020506223330.29123.00001273@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42438

In article <3ccec4f6_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3c@fast.net>
writes:

>
>Yes ... the 1-2 gal/hr for a 3000 hp diesel sounds VERY light to me.
>
>The 50 hp Perkins 108 diesel on my 42 ft. cruising sailboat burned
>about 0.75 gal/hr at 6-7 kt. cruise ...
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

A friend of mine who is an AMTRAK conductor tells me that the
GM-EMD diesel-electric locomotives get around .5 MPG at cruising
speed; and use around 12 - 15 GPH at idle. What he couldn't tell
me is the voltage/current that these things deliver to the traction
motors that drive the train. Anyone know?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3171. Re: Turn up the wick (Was: Novice refarming)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:33:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020506223331.29123.00001274@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42439

In article <d22b54c3.0204292022.1fb0efc1@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>>
>Last I heard Sussex County has the biggest brassiere factory in the
>world, it ain't all bad.

Brian:

That would be the Playtex plant here in Dover, Kent County, about 1 mile from where I live! They don't make the bras here, they just produce the material they're made from, which is shipped to Puerto Rico to be sewed into the finished product. Then the finished bras are shipped back here, packaged, warehoused, and distributed.

The big industry in Sussex County is poultry. The chickens in Sussex Co. outnumber the people by at least 20 to one at any given time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3172. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:33:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020506223331.29123.00001275@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42440

In article <5f4fe4c2.0205061444.48a13464@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

Horseshoe7 replied to Bill Sohl:

>You dunce... I said UNCHECKED. CAN'T YOU READ ENGLISH?
>
>> > Yes, unchecked capitalism leads to
>> > Monarchy(a form of Dictatorship).
>>
>> Per chance you meant monopoly?
>
>No - I meant just what I said.
>
>> > And, just like with a totalitarian
>> > communist state, a totalitarian Monarchy wouldn't allow comic stips
>> > with opposing points of view.
>>
>> Come back when you get your definitions straight.
>
>Go FUCK YOURSELF, ASSHOLE.
>
>> > What we need Larry is a little more TOLERANCE of others and of other's
>> > viewpoints. Any kind of government that is INTOLERANT of opposing
>> > viewpoints is bad.
>>
>> Conservatives allow far more toleramce than the liberals seem to.
>>
>> Liberals don't even want discussion/debate on their ideas.
>
>I'm NOT a liberal, DICKHEAD.
>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>
>Fuck OFF.

I think Horseshoe7 picked the wrong screen name. Should have
chosen the part of the horse that the tail is attached to.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3173. Re: There's a challenger, CAM!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:34:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <93HB8.8990$F%2.448380314@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42441

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:HOGz8.101$%i4.2@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

How would you know Hans? I'm 'posed to be caught up in your filter.

3174. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 02:51:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ab7fragpe1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42442

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205061444.48a13464@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<ab1ip1$4n9$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:5f4fe4c2.0205040918.57276344@posting.google.com...
> > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> > news:<20020503230516.01774.00002588@mb-cg.aol.com>...
> > > > What DO the liberals want? What IS their agenda? What could
> > > > possibly appease them, other than the one thing they really
> > > > want to impose upon us, which is global socialism? Keep in
> > > > mind, in a socialist world, things like Usenet, and comic strips
> > > > like Non-Sequitur, would not exist! After all, the ruling class of
> > > > liberal elites would no longer believe that they served any useful
> > > > purpose, since THEY would now be in power!
> > >
> > > ...and what do conservatives want, Larry? When capitalism is allowed
> > > to run its course unchecked, eventually ALL of the power will be
> > > concentrated in one individual...
> >
> > Since that has failed to happen after 200+ years of a capatalistic
> > American society, I find your statement wholly without merit.
> > Indeed, there aren't even good examples on a single industry basis.
>
> You dunce... I said UNCHECKED. CAN'T YOU READ ENGLISH?

Are you then suggesting that conservatives want unchecked
capitalism? If yes, please cite.

> > > Yes, unchecked capitalism leads to
> > > Monarchy(a form of Dictatorship).
> >
> > Per chance you meant monopoly?
>
> No - I meant just what I said.

Strange, I don't ever recall getting that outcome
as a concept in either economics or political
science.

> > > And, just like with a totalitarian
> > > communist state, a totalitarian Monarchy wouldn't allow comic stips
> > > with opposing points of view.
> >
> > Come back when you get your definitions straight.

>
> Go FUCK YOURSELF, ASSHOLE.

So much for credible discussion.

> > > What we need Larry is a little more TOLERANCE of others and of other's
> > > viewpoints. Any kind of government that is INTOLERANT of opposing
> > > viewpoints is bad.
> >
> > Conservatives allow far more toleramce than the liberals seem to.
> >
> > Liberals don't even want discussion/debate on their ideas.
>
> I'm NOT a liberal, DICKHEAD.

Frankly, I don't think you have a clue as to what you are.

> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Fuck OFF.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3175. No Comment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 03:26:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <%PHB8.1922$663.169963@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42443

OK guys, I couldn't have made this up. I forward it without comment.

73, de Hans, K0HB

----- Original Message -----
From: ac6wd@juno.com
To: icom73@hotmail.com ; ianjerri@ncplus.net ; va7dp@shaw.ca ;
DL3MIB@t-online.de ; carverh@aol.com ; geratol@yahoogroups.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2002 4:11 AM
Subject: [geratol] (unknown)

Man what fun Ham Radio is. Keep in mind I haven't even listened to CW for
over 7 years. K1B was on 28.020 with nobody coming back to his CQ's, so I
dug out a straight key I had around here for some reason, grabbed my
electric guitar cord (for the 1/4 plug) and 2 alligator clipped jumpers
and tried to send out my call sign. DA..... what's an "A"? I finally got
a AC6WD sent out (I think). What was that he sent back? Da..... what's
a 559? Got that sent out. (I think) Did I work him? Who knows! Who cares!
It was challenging though. I'll have to wait now for all of the logs to
be downloaded to the Web site to find out.
I NEED A RIGBLASTER!
Rick

3176. Re: The ARRL's Federal Tax Statements in .PDF (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 04:07:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CD752F8.8C229110@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42444

Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
> We will see who gets the last laugh.

I dunno about the last laugh. You're certainly doing your part to
generate sheer volume of laughter.

Dave K8MN

3177. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 04:37:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507003704.27628.00001128@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42446

In article <1HGB8.8947$at2.447252509@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>C'mon in. The waters fine except for a few Baby Ruth's at the bottom of the >pool.

Is THAT what you call those things?!?

I'm having too many Snickers outside the pool... :-)

>By the way, how do you think I'm doing in the credibility department? I >found one OT honest enough to admit that his most recent experience in the >Novice subbands was in 1969. So it would appear that I have more >credibility than him, according to the "What's your recent experience..." >criterion.

"Credibility" doesn't really exist here. It is all virtual and in the minds of the posters.

The OTs in here are MANLY MEN of great VIGOR and
COURAGE, smell of sweat, and attract flies like women.
Withoutadoubt they are Masters of the Radio Universe
by their own admission.

Novices are something they are not, never were, for supermen
of radio were born that way. In every post one can picture
their great big S out front for all to see.

This is non-existant existentialism, putting Descartes before de horse.

Beep, beep

3178. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 05:26:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507012628.07514.00006050@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42447

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/06/02 16:12 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020506161243.04302.00001307@mb-bh.aol.com>

>>What about the raw sewage floating in the moat?
>
>Are you referring to r.r.a.p.? :-)

Either that or lunch at your house.

3179. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 05:30:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507013018.07514.00006053@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42448

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/06/02 21:16 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020506211622.06459.00001202@mb-mo.aol.com>

>Only the MORSEMEN, Brian...only the morsemen. Amateur morsemen
>regard themselves as professional. You've READ of their exploits. In
>HERE.
>
>Non-morsemen have to begin at the bottom of the ladder, the back of
>the bus, and drink from different water fountains no matter what their
>experience.

Not according to you. Why, only a few DECADES ago, you were passing a
million plus messages via RTTY nets for Uncle Sam.

Pretty (un)impressive to me!

3180. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 05:33:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507013320.07514.00006054@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42449

>Subject: Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/06/02 16:12 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020506161242.04302.00001305@mb-bh.aol.com>

>
>How are your powerboat repairs going? Are you dedicated yet?

I dare say Hans is more dedicated than you are licensed.

3181. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 05:35:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507013553.07514.00006055@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42450

>Subject: Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/07/02 00:37 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020507003704.27628.00001128@mb-bj.aol.com>

>I'm having too many Snickers outside the pool

If you're hanging around any pools, I dare say the snickers are coming
from those around you... ! ! !

3182. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 06:03:29 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ab8flo4j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42460

So..... could someone/some group start the Amateur Radio Relay League? Sure that would cause a stink.....

Ryan

> The "A" is not for Amateur. ARRL stands for "American Radio Relay League."
> American as not Canada, Mexico, Central America, nor South America. It is
> the national organization for United States amateurs. But when I say
> "America" some slick guy like Hans comes back with "Habla..."
>
>

3183. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 06:12:45 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ab8flp5j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42461

As far as the word amateur goes.... I see the two distinct definitions of the word....

If you pronounce the word like am-a-cher I see the perception of the word meaning the opposite of professional, as least the perception of the word from people.

If you pronounce the word like am-a-two-er, I see the perception of people alot different from people.

I percieve the word, as the actual definition of the word, which translates as "for the love of" or "the love of" and then add the word radio and it becomes, "for the love of radio."

I do however agree with statements made earlier, that the words amateur radio is possibly a detriment to the hobby service. Most people who are not as educated as some percieve the meaning of the word "amateur" to mean non-professional. I wonder what word would be better though, at least until the general public becomes more educated. Even the words "ham radio" holds a certain connotation with the general non-licensed public.

I guess in the meantime, I will continue to strive to positively change peoples negative or ignorance of what this hobby really is about.

Ryan KC8PMX

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:aff1119a7cff9113763fb02821a21320.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Forgive me, I don't understand. I would assume we are talking a method
> to put some interest back into amateur radio (at least here, in the US).
> The observation may have been of French youth, but any suggestion of
> what to do (at least from the perspective of within the United States),
> would likely involve the ARRL. American Radio Relay League. It would
> also involve the FCC (again, involving the United States). Why would
> you imply that the previous poster was suggesting that the 'A' in ARRL
> stood for 'amateur' rather than 'American'?
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:A1kB8.7881$IL.407559266@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com
>
> >
> > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message

> > news:udakn7rr6fab6b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Hello, all!
> > >
> > > In the early 1990s I was at Palomar Observatory
>
> (snip)
>
> > > Let me see. What does the acronym ARRL mean?
> > > Hmm. What could be done here? Hmm. Relay.
> > > Morse Code. Low power. Temporay license.
> > > Contest. Kits. All age groups. Prizes. Corporate
> > > involvement. Hmm.
> > >
> > > But to quote Steve Martin, "This could be the dawn
> > > of a NEW AGE! We could . . . NAAAAAAH!"
> > >
> > > Val Germann
> > > KC0MUB
> >
> > The "A" is not for Amateur. ARRL stands for "American Radio Relay
League."
> > American as not Canada, Mexico, Central America, nor South America. It
is
> > the national organization for United States amateurs. But when I say
> > "America" some slick guy like Hans comes back with "Habla..."
>
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3184. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 06:25:00 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ab8flq6j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42459

Great.... makes yet another under-utilized band.....
>
> TVI/RFI - stay off 6M ;)
>

>
> Ham Radio is FAR from obsolete. While its great to get kids involved,
> many won't until young adulthood. There is no end to what is possble
> in HAM radio regarding communication via portable/mobile gear that
> simply cannot be accomplished from a keyboard hooked to the Internet.
>

Agreed.... but I do not think we should be giving kids licenses as much as
at least waiting till they become teenagers.

> A shame also that many parents would no doubt discourage conversation
> between their (supervised) child and a "damn foreigner"...ah well.
>

I also could care less to talk/type/key to someone else in a different
country at this point. No possible chance that I will ever get to meet
them, so what is the point. However, traveling within the US is a much more
realistic expectation for myself at least and where I will direct my
communications to.

> But children DO take interest in HAM radio - the key is generating
> more interest.
>

Again, I do believe that more needs to be done, not only at the local level,
and from our larger organizations, not just the ARRL. QWCA, FISTS, and many
more that I can't remember at this time of typing, need to also step up to
the plate too. That is just smart business. They will need new members in
the future and active involvment is important. I have tried and tried
again to get some assistance from hams in my area, to help get into the
local schools to do presentations but never got any help. I can only do so
much. But this is normal within the ham community, 10-20 percent actually
get involved, and the others don't.

Ryan

3185. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 06:30:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ab8flr7j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42458

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:MQCB8.8726$Ta5.437373297@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
> news:5UcA8.1239$Ss1.436@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> > Please go mate yourself.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> The Amateur's Code
> The Radio Amateur is
>
> CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
> pleasure of others.

Except on 80 and 40 meters.

> BALANCED...radio is an avocation, never interfering with duties owed to
> family, job, school or community.

Agreed... it is not a career, unless you are making money as a side effect
from the hobby. I.E., you work for Kenwood, Icom, etc...

> PATRIOTIC...station and skill always ready for service to country and
> community.

Except for the WO-WO operators.....

Ryan

3186. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 06:47:51 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ab8fls8j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42457

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gvozqt2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 6 May 2002 01:05:44 -0400, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently the
rules
> >state we cannot use our identifying callsigns,
>
> Where do you see that? The CB rules say that use of an FCC-issued
> call sign is not required, but any "ID" is permitted. The one
> caveat is that you do not use an FCC call sign issued to someone
> else.

I cannot seem to find that either, but just going by what the "old-timers"
say, after all, they SHOULD know all the rules by heart since they have been
in the hobby for so long. I currently nor have owned a CB rig, but have
used one in a multi-car convoy circumstance.

>
> >but can you imagine if a ton
> >of people started operating there (fully in compliance of the rules as
they
> >otherwise stand) and ID'ed, and operated in an above-board professional
> >manner? Might actually have a positive effect.
>
> Use a non-modified non-amplified type certified CB eadio on
> authorized CB channels, and ID with callsigns assigned to you.
> I see no violation there.
>
Exactly.... operation completely within the law, except the ID issue using a
ham callsign, at least till I can get a clear answer somewhere on that note.

Ryan

>

3187. Good job, Ed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 09:27:44 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <k6NB8.9673$vT1.818378@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42451

Note that we will be blessed with El Presidente at South Sioux City NE
this year. Your survival last year must have had something to do with it.

Have they changed your job description to 'Point Man' or 'Roadie' yet???

Dick N&#65533;BK

3188. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 11:11:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hDOB8.9486$9M3.460233960@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42452

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020507013320.07514.00006054@mb-cc.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 05/06/02 16:12 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020506161242.04302.00001305@mb-bh.aol.com>
>
> >
> >How are your powerboat repairs going? Are you dedicated yet?
>
> I dare say Hans is more dedicated than you are licensed.

Dave wouldn't take that dare. Dares are dangerous.

3189. Re: No Comment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 11:13:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <rFOB8.9487$BE3.460098771@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42453

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:%PHB8.1922$663.169963@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> OK guys, I couldn't have made this up. I forward it without comment.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: ac6wd@juno.com
> To: icom73@hotmail.com ; ianjerri@ncplus.net ; va7dp@shaw.ca ;
> DL3MIB@t-online.de ; carverh@aol.com ; geratol@yahoogroups.com
> Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2002 4:11 AM
> Subject: [geratol] (unknown)
>
>
> Man what fun Ham Radio is. Keep in mind I haven't even listened to CW for
> over 7 years. K1B was on 28.020 with nobody coming back to his CQ's, so I
> dug out a straight key I had around here for some reason, grabbed my
> electric guitar cord (for the 1/4 plug) and 2 alligator clipped jumpers
> and tried to send out my call sign. DA..... what's an "A"? I finally got
> a AC6WD sent out (I think). What was that he sent back? Da..... what's
> a 559? Got that sent out. (I think) Did I work him? Who knows! Who cares!
> It was challenging though. I'll have to wait now for all of the logs to
> be downloaded to the Web site to find out.
> I NEED A RIGBLASTER!
> Rick

Way to go! Hopefully this wasn't an emergency comm.

3190. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 11:17:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <MIOB8.9488$Ix3.459977826@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42454

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD73BA7.6A9E68F@IEEE.org...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > BTW Cecil, what's your most recent experience in the Novice subbands
(quick,
> > go make a contact so you'll have more credibility than me)?
>
> Probably the last straight key night.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Darn it. You're more credible than me.

If I keep this up, Jim will be able to pigeon hole my last Novice operating experience, and declare, "Aha! You're not credible to comment on the Novice subband refarming."

3191. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 12:07:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507080710.07448.00001381@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42455

In article <3CD68EC8.E00E5F0C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Show us some posts to back your claims, Cecil. Otherwise you are simply
>blowing
>> smoke. Your excuses and name calling simply convince others that you don't
>know
>> what you're talking about.
>
>Your strategy is to wear people down by having them waste a lot of time
>digging
>up old postings only to have you nickpick them to death and deny what was
>said.

"nickpick"?

All I do is ask simple, direct questions and point out people's
logical errors and other mistakes. Plus ask for objective evidence of
some claims. Some people don't like that, because it points out facts
they don't like. Like the fact that a claim of having "worked all bands,
lots of times" is false. or that "there's nobody there" on the Novice bands
is based on a few experiences a dozen or more years ago.

Suppose somebody said "PACTOR II is no good", but had never used the mode
and knew little or nothing about it. How much credibility would they have
with you?

>Been there, done that, no thanks.

The only time I can recall you digging up old posts was to argue endlessly
about a typo involving "comparing" vs. "comparting".

> What does it tell you that everytime Carl
>or I mention hams doing digital experimentation, Dick jumps on us with all
>four feet?

"Jumps on you with all four feet"? That's a different thing than being
against experimentation. Perhaps he is simply pointing out some facts you
don't like.

For example, despite all the preaching by Carl and yourself about
experimentation,
the only HF amateur activity Carl has mentioned actually DOING with his ham
license is DXing and ragchewing on SSB. Now there's absolutely nothing wrong
with his doing those things. And the only "digital experimentation" you talk
about is
using your store-bought SCS box. Again, nothing wrong with that, either. But it

does seem to get a bit "do as I say, not as I do".

>Everyone who has been following these postings is free to make up
>his/her own mind.

That's why I'm asking you to provide some backup to your claims.

>Those without your particular set of blinders will see
>things objectively.

What blinders?

>Here's just one example of Dick's response to my
>suggestion
>that hams experiment with digital modes. Ed seems to be able to read it OK.

Let's see what you've got:
>
>**********
******
>From: W1RFI (w1rfi@aol.com)
>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Date: 2002-02-11 16:30:46 PST

February 11 - almost 3 months ago.

>
>Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net wrote:
>
>>CAM wrote:
>>>Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams experimenting
>>> with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the early
>>> 1950's. There's almost no hardware design expertise necessary to buy a DSP
>>> eval board and get to experimenting.
>
>> Well, there you have it.
>
>There you have what? That he wants to see just as many hams experimenting
>with
>digital radio as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the 50s? Why is
>that a "there you have it" sort of thing to you?
>
>> You don't even know what you're saying.
>
>Are you really faulting Cecil for wanting hams to experiment with DSP to
>easily
>implement digital techniques while you are using the DSP software for
>soundcards written by others to do your own experimentation?
>
>Is this another "do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?
>
>> Sure, lots of hams who can find LOTS of time and have the aptitude to

>learn
>>the basics of DSP might benefit marginally from time spent with a
>> evaluation board. LOTS of time.
>
>Sure, good things sometimes do take lots of time. I spent lots of time
>learning
>antenna modeling -- I learned a lot in the process. I spent a lot more time
>learning about RFI -- I think we can safely say that Amateur Radio benefited
>from that. Why do you feel that a ham who learns DSP will benefit only
>"marginally?"
>
>**
****
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
All W0EX writes in this post is

"there you have it"

and

"Sure, lots of hams who can find LOTS of time and have the aptitude to
learn the basics of DSP might benefit marginally from time spent with a
evaluation board. LOTS of time."

Is any of that not true?

I don't see anything in that post to indicate that W0EX is against
experimentation
of any kind by hams. He's just pointing out some obvious facts. Like the simple
fact that for many if not most hams, the ROI on doing the eval board thing is
simply too low.

Is any of that not true?

If the above post is the best you can do, Cecil, then it's clear you are simply
blowing smoke.

Or maybe you're just mad that I borrowed your "if is for children" mealy-mouth
excuse.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3192. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 12:07:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507080711.07448.00001382@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42456

In article <20020506223330.29123.00001273@mb-mu.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>A friend of mine who is an AMTRAK conductor tells me that the
>GM-EMD diesel-electric locomotives get around .5 MPG at cruising
>speed; and use around 12 - 15 GPH at idle.

I think the locos referred to a F40PHs, which are special 4000 HP units. Their fuel consumption is relatively high because they also provide head-end power (HEP) for the train, instead of steam. HEP is 480V, 60 Hz, three phase, and is used for heat, air conditioning, lighting, and other purposes on the passenger cars.

>What he couldn't tell
>me is the voltage/current that these things deliver to the traction
>motors that drive the train. Anyone know?

Typical traction motor voltage is nominally 600 volts with DC traction motors, but it varies depending on speed and load. Traction motors are series DC motors because of their torque curve. Typical use is one traction motor per axle. So a six-axle 4000 hp unit has six traction motors, each requiring about 900 amperes at 600 volts to deliver full power (1 HP = 746 watts in an ideal motor).

The latest models of diesel electric locomotive use brushless AC traction motors, fed with variable-frequency AC.

Lots more info on the EMD and GE websites. Some railfans have web pages devoted to locomotive operating manuals. Neat stuff!

--

Lessee, if the loco gets .5 MPG pulling the train, and there are 200 passengers aboard, the resulting effeciency is 100 passenger-miles per gallon - at 90 MPH.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

3193. Re: The Truth About Most Hams [from rec.radio.cb]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 14:12:40 UTC
From: tarquinlinbin <cr7000@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <btnfdu4o76faeg4btqitai3v4lvduv00h8@4ax.com>
Source record: 42462
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 6 May 2002 17:28:18 -0700, avoobner@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner)
wrote:

>
>Well Jim, you certainly sound authentic, with that callsign and all. I
>wonder if all hams feel the same way as you do?
>
>-Aaron
Hi all,
well i just joined this thread half way through so havent got the full
story.

To me it doesnt matter whether your on CB or have an A/B or novice
ticket. To me its all about having a good chat,passing knowledge and
experience around and meeting new people. The medium through which
that can be done for me may be over a pint of Guiness,on a cb,on a
HF/VHF/UHF tranciever or via the internet.

I really can't understand the rivalry between various factions.

I started as a straight40 am illegal cb'er,i progressed to illegal ssb
then a B licence and now have had an A licence for maybe 6 years or
so ??. I listen more than talk and only talk/jump into conversations
when i have something useful to add. I dont blather on about sig
strengths and all that but some do.

In the end its a use it or lose it situation. Id rather have two old
duffers going on about sig strengths and quality on 2m fm than have
the whole band clear and the DTI's greedy eyes resting upon it!!.

So enough of this rivalry people!

joe G0 Manchester uk
DONT HIT REPLY TO EMAIL,MY EMAIL IS CR7000 AT HOTMAIL DOT COM

3194. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 14:17:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD7E208.8AA9748E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42463

N2EY wrote:
> "nickpick"?
>
> All I do is ask simple, direct questions ...

Sure you do, Jim, simple-minded primrose path questions.

> "Jumps on you with all four feet"? That's a different thing than being
> against experimentation. Perhaps he is simply pointing out some facts you
> don't like.

It's pretty obvious to the most casual observer that the fact Dick doesn't
like is digital experimentation by hams. I suggest digital experimentation
and he comes back with, "Well, there you have it", as if I had suggested
slaying the sacred calf. He wound up that posting with an admonition that
if someone has enough time for digital experimentation, they should instead
be practicing Morse code. Why am I not surprised that you support that agenda?

> That's why I'm asking you to provide some backup to your claims.

I did below but you dismissed it as expected.

> Let's see what you've got:
> All W0EX writes in this post is "there you have it"
>
> I don't see anything in that post to indicate that W0EX is against
> experimentation of any kind by hams.

Of course you don't, Jim. That's why it is a waste of time to go dig up
posts to prove a point to you. You reject any and all points that don't
match your agenda.

"Well, there you have it" is a negative response in virtually everyone's
book except yours. With your deny-everything attitude, it is a waste of
time to go digging up old posts. If Ed can understand Dick's negativism
toward digital experimentation, why do you try to deny it? You remind
me of a guy I used to work with. When asked what he would do if he were
caught red-handed in bed with the neighbor's wife, he said, "I'd deny it".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3195. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 15:00:18 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <6_RB8.9891$vT1.843011@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42464

>> stewart wrote:
>> I'm just saying if their WASN'T an oppossing viewpoint, and capitalism
>> was allowed to proceed unchecked, it would lead to monarchy.

> Cecil, W5DXP, wrote:
> What does the economic system of Capitalism have to do with our political
> system? An economic system cannot repeal The Constitutional Republic.

It has always seemed to me that capital-L Liberalism works best under a monarchy. Having all the power concentrated in one person who rules by decree means that radical reforms can be easily and efficiently carried out. For such reforms to be accepted by the masses requires that the government be embodied in one, very public personage who leads by example and personal style. It helps if that person is groomed from birth in a political dynasty to play the role. And, to make the reforms a permanent part of the national culture, it is important that the person remain in power over his or her lifetime and that an orderly succession occur at death.

The most successful liberal presidents in the 20th century were Roosevelt and Kennedy: Roosevelt was elected president-for-life -- literally. And remember what Kennedy's presidency was called? Camelot. Each made one man, the president, the central figure in the government. Each swept into office with overtly radical change in the offing, almost like a change of dynasty. Each had a certain "style" that could be effectively communicated to the common people.

It could be argued that the unsuccessful presidencies in the US, particularly in the late 20th century, were those of men who were either (or both) unstylish, almost buffoonish caricatures of themselves or grim, gray, humorless, androids who, only when absolutely required to do so, would make a public speech, but only one carefully crafted by their minions and only delivered in a stultifying monologue.

The exception, which, paradoxically, proves the thesis is the presidency of Ronald Reagan. Reagan's public (and private) persona had much of the stylish trappings of monarchy that made the man genuinely liked by the populace. And this popularity made it possible for his political affiliates to finally begin pecking away at the New Deal and New Frontier reforms instituted by his liberal predecessors.

So... Who can be king now?

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3196. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 15:14:32 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <sbSB8.766$Yi6.110@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42465

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote

>
> So... Who can be king now?
>

King Colin The First?

73, Hans, K0HB

3197. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 17:32:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205070932.25f548d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42466

K0HB wrote:

> Mating comes under the heading of FRIENDLY above, at least the way K0CKB
> practice it. Especially that slooooooooow and patient operating.

Accuracy transcends speed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3198. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 19:00:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507150021.19503.00001314@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 42469

In article <ab8flp5j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>I do however agree with statements made earlier, that the words amateur
>radio is possibly a detriment to the hobby service.

It's almost a psychological maxim that radio amateurs are wanting
recognition on a "professional" level...hence the long-ago self-label
of "HAM." Saying "ham radio" instead of "amateur radio" is much
more self-satisfying and avoids carrying around all the emotional
connotation of "amateurism" as being of "lesser value."

This seems to be very strong on the devotees who want to embrace
amateur radio as a Lifestyle, assuming a personna of expertise or
greatness through longevity and purely hobby activities of long tenure.
The ARRL reinforces the Lifestyle image in its publications. To the
League it is the Holy Grail of existance, as well it should be for an
organization whose headquarters and officers must maintain a kind
of "professional amateur" environment-existance for survival.

>Most people who are not
>as educated as some percieve the meaning of the word "amateur" to mean
>non-professional. I wonder what word would be better though, at least until
>the general public becomes more educated. Even the words "ham radio" holds
>a certain connotation with the general non-licensed public.

Ryan, the general public has had a chance to be "educated" for half a
century of the existance of all kinds of media input. The Big Org up
near Hartford just hasn't done its job in getting media attention in all
that time. The Big Org fools its members into thinking that "the word
is out to the public" when the most it does is to get the word to those
already IN the hobby.

The general public will perceive "ham radio" as a hobby, about on the
same level as scanning listeners or CB users or those playing around
with FRS handhelds. Take any formal or informal poll on that subject
and the statement will be true.

The general public doesn't see any "service" aspect as exemplified by
the individual hams who NEED some "belonging" and excuse for
doing their thing. Too many hams have gone the delusional route of
adopting a virtual paramilitary "service" rationale for engaging in a
HOBBY. That hobby is technologically-intensive but the "servicemen"
are into the "service" aspects almost to the point of obsessive
delusions replacing actual education in the technical arts.

An interesting sidelight to the "serviceman" type of hobbyist is the demographics of US amateur radio. Flip through any amateur radio publication collection spanning the last half century, observe the pictures of various hams and "profile" them. There are two very major profile aspects: Hams are male, hams are white.

Yes, there are exceptions but those only "prove" that exceptions exist. The overwhelming majority of radio amateurs are male and white. Much more so than the general population of the USA.

The above would have been understandable in the first half of the last century. White male predominance was common in all technological-trade fields of endeavor then. The white male predominance in ham radio continues throughout the last half of the last century and continues into the new millenium. That white predominance is diluted to include most races and ethnicities in other techno-trade activities. While females are getting more and more involved in everything outside of the home, ham radio continues its second-class status of females as objects in the "YL" and "XYL" labels (approved traditional abbreviations).

Let's look at the international scene of radio in the last half of the past century. The state of the general radio art has vastly improved worldwide, spurred on primarily by business, trade and the ability to offer or promise a better quality of life for everyone. Focus on amateur radio. Outside of single-channel, single-user SSB on HF, the pioneering in new modes and methods has come from outside the USA...in "foreign" lands of mixed ethnicities. NB: G3PLX's surname of "Martinez" is not exactly in the Anglo-Saxon fashion. :-)

Focus on amateur radio organizations. Who was the most resistant to change in amateur radio regulations in the last half of the past century? The ARRL...as the holdout on S25.5 changes at the IARU meeting. The ARRL's latest "policy" on code test changes is a no-policy position, a null, a hands-off either-way position. The US administration's position on 1.7.1 at WRC-03 will follow the IARU recommendation, not the non-policy of the ARRL.

What seems to be the case is a predominently male, white organization essentially controlling the mindsets of a quarter of the licensed radio amateurs in the USA who also appear to be male and white. By many examples that Big Org is almost ultra-conservative and very resistant to change of any kind.

>I guess in the meantime, I will continue to strive to positively change
>peoples negative or ignorance of what this hobby really is about.

That's a laudible effort and should be applauded by hams.

I would caution some choices of words. Non-amateurs are able to observe what the ham radio hobby "is about." It is out in the open, nothing concealed, and well publicized in the ham radio area.

The general public is not stupid. It is simply not fully informed of certain hobby activities. Ignorance is not stupidity. Those two words are linked by the same emotional baggage as the link of "amateur" with "professional."

3199. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 19:00:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507150022.19503.00001315@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 42470

In article <ab8flo4j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>So..... could someone/some group start the Amateur Radio Relay League? Sure
>that would cause a stink.....
>
>Ryan

Some could, but that would run into a copyright infringement over
the A-R-R-L, the org at Newington being very upset and very legal
over the Name being "very similar." This happens from time to time
in other organizations and corporations with trademarks as well as
copyrights.

RCA Corporation had some minor flaps with the Radio Club of
America in the 1970s even though "RCA" (the corporation) had
long-time legally-filed trademarks and all kinds of copyrights as
precedents. There was a corporate-wide TM and Copyright packet
that all staff had to read and study in the beginning 1970s which
opened with the warning that all identification of the corporation
outside SHALL include the word "Corporation" following "RCA."

Some are VERY serious about trademarks and copyrights.

The Radio Club of America now uses "RCA" regularly in its ID.
While it was founded five years before the ARRL, the RCA
club apparently did not contest the original forming of Radio
Corporation of America and their old trademarks before WW2.

There's all the baggage of Territorial Imperative and Eminent Domain,
etc., by the organization that has had a virtual monopoly on amateur
radio control in the USA. Devout members would be up in arms, ready
to fight (and probably spill blood) over "attacks" on "their" organization.

The word "Relay" in A-R-R-L long since lost any significance once
telegrams got cheap about a half century ago. See the origins of
that once-local-CT club about why that club was orginally formed.

There should be NO dispute over starting a national organization
under some distinctive name. "Amateur Radio League" might make
it through copyrights although "ARL" is still "close" to ARRL. With
some experimentation a distinctive name could be derived, such as
"Radio Amateur League" or "RAL." :-)

Image is everything for identification. An organization Name could
be made from the word "radio" such as "Radio Amateur Development
Independent Organization" or "Radio Amateur Development and

Interest Organization." There are many possibilities, but a final choice would have to take into account non-infrigement, however close, on existing orgs plus the psychological-marketing look and feel of the name.

Whatever a new organization, it must withstand the onslaught of the Old Believers (examples: Brakob, Heil, Roll, Carroll, etc.) who will raise the Hue and Cry of "it can't work because it isn't as 'big' (noble, wonderful, etc., etc., etc.) as The League." There will be endless attempts at humiliation by these Devout Fedayin and usual insults will be rounded up and delivered. That's a guarantee.

3200. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 19:00:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507150023.19503.00001317@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 42467

In article <MIOB8.9488$Ix3.459977826@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Darn it. You're more credible than me.
>
>If I keep this up, Jim will be able to pigeon hole my last Novice operating
>experience, and declare, "Aha! You're not credible to comment on the Novice
>subband refarming."

You will also have to show your posts.

Jim likes to conduct lengthy post-mortems.

Erect enough posts and he can string verbal barbed wire on
them. That keeps the sheep docile and contained.

3201. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 19:00:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507150023.19503.00001316@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 42468

In article <3CCEBFA7.31751BF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <aag08v$1c3t$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
>> (Dennis Ferguson) writes:
>>
>> >If amateur experimentation with packet radio was a "failure" then I'd
>> >suggest that if experimental failures like this would happen in amateur
>> >radio every few years or so the service would be much better off in
>> >terms of justifying its existance. In an experimental service even
>> >things that don't work out can teach things of great value. The only
>> >real "failure" is the failure to attempt anything new at all.
>
>Ya mean like attempting to get a ham ticket?

Sig Heil is back to that schtick, is he?

>> Good words. I suspect that the amateur radio community thinking
>> won't allow that or "failure." Failure is taken as a "weakness" and
>> no self-important radio amateur wants to be "weak" or wimpish.
>> Everything new must be laid out for them, already developed, plus
>> explanatory articles on the new stuff printed in QST to make it
>> "official" for amateur radio use. What will immediately follow are
>> ready-made, designed-by-others equipment which the amateurs
>> can buy, install, and then brag about their operating on the cutting
>> edge of technology...without knowing much about it except for some
>> important buzzphrases used to impress others. :-)
>
>The scenario needn't bother you, Len. You aren't a ham and aren't an
>ARRL member.

...and judging by some of the comments of the pretender to the
Biggest Baddest Ham Hock title, few will bother to emulate Heil.

Such an attitude towards potential newcomers, tsk, tsk.

It's a good thing State "retired" you. God Help the USA if such
an attitude were part of US foreign policy.

>You are free to experiment to your heart's content. You'll
>just not be able to do any communicating on the ham bands.

Study the big, big table of allocations in Part 2, Title 47 CFR, and
tell me again how "forbidden" I am to "not communicate on the
ham bands."

3202. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 19:27:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <XUVB8.1166$Yi6.860@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42471

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Whatever a new organization, it must withstand the onslaught of
> the Old Believers (examples: Brakob, Heil, Roll, Carroll, etc.) who
> will raise the Hue and Cry of "it can't work because it isn't as 'big'
> (noble, wonderful, etc., etc., etc.) as The League." There will be
> endless attempts at humiliation by these Devout Fedayin and
> usual insults will be rounded up and delivered. That's a guarantee.
>

The Olde Organ Grinder lies again. To save you the trouble of a Google
search, here is a verbatim extract from a post by Brakob on rrap.

Doncha just hate it when you're shown to be a liar?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

From: K0HB (k0hb@arrl.org)
Subject: Re: Puke.
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-05-22 13:34:36 PST

On Tue, 22 May 2001 11:18:12 GMT, Kim-W5TIT says:

> *If* the ARRL ever did move to a position such as this,
> don't you think that it would create less competition
> with other groups?

First, I don't think competition is a bad thing.

Second, I don't see any other clubs or associations out there
in credible competition with ARRL.

My good friend Don Stoner, W6TNS (SK), had the right idea when
he founded NARA ("National Amateur Radio Association" --
where have you seen those words lately), but I think Don made
a mistake when he tried to run it out of his own deep pockets.
It just never achieved critical mass.

But the competition would have been good for ARRL and Amateur
Radio.

73, Hans, K0HB

PS: Lest you dismiss Don as some sort of old timer with no vision,
he was the guy who sparkplugged the first Amateur Radio satellite,
OSCAR-1, and was a founding member of AMSAT.

3203. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 19:33:57 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CD82C25.CAB1318C@psu.edu>
Source record: 42472

Larry, It was a joke! I put a smiley in there so people would would know
that. I won't try to make any funnies with you again. I apologize.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3CD3E6F9.3ABD4A31@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> > >Larry, was that rant a response to the cartoon, or was it your
> > >impression of the kid in the cartoon? 8^)
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Mike:
>
> The source and purpose of my posting should have been perfectly
> obvious to anyone with an IQ in the 90's or above. However, for YOUR
> benefit, yes, it was my response to the cartoon.

3204. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 19:44:12 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <27806b676dc40eba703cf2ff4a6e6434.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42473

You make some good points. Everyone wants something for nothing. Note that Juno and Net Zero are down to 10 hours a month free - if you can get that. One used to be able to get ball games on the internet if the local stations didn't carry the game. You still can, but it went from free to $10.00 per month. The advertisers are getting on to the fact that no one is spending; therefore, they won't pay as much. The free ride is nearly over.

You make an excellent point about the high power machines though. Gee, daddy and mommy can buy this nice piece of equipment, I can play games, and I can meet neat people on the internet. Hmmm. We just had a guy in Greece, NY (just North of Rochester) arrested for raping a 14 year old girl he met on the internet. Now, there are 27 more charges and more complaints being filed every day. Seems he met girls and women on the internet, got them over to his house, and had some 'fun'. The ages (so far) range from 11 to 30. Nice guy. Nice internet. Oh, BTW, my former ISP had a lot of problems on 9/11 and I was without internet service for a week. No biggie, but the radio has always worked - even if my power was off.

In any case, so what will junior do once he graduates from high school? I've noticed that now our engineering colleges have more and more foreign students. Am I to assume everyone will get a degree in business administration and learn to manipulate companies and electric power distribution such as happened recently?

Seems no one wants to actually work anymore. Too bad, it won't be much fun being a 3rd world country. Then you can also forget about the internet as most people won't be able to afford it.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Radio Vulnavia" <dexevzeeps3@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:UQAB8.1047$663.93642@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net

> In all honesty, pse give me one good reason why today's kids would want
> to go thru the trouble of putting up antennas, buying (grossly overpriced)
> ham gear from dealers with attitudes like the Squid character on SpongeBob
> Squarepants, put up with TVI/RFI, risk lightning hitting saidsame antennas
> and burning down the house etc...etc.. when for about $500.00 they can get a
> brand new
> Dell or Gateway P4/1.2 GHz multimedia machine and be playing
> with interactive music/video/games etc over a modem or DSL.....?
>

> Most of today's kids do not even know what a CB Radio is, let alone the ARRL,
> The whole CB thing happened before they were born. Finally we had some kids
> show up at last year's Field Day. They looked around for about 10 minutes and
> rode off on their bikes. They commented the whole thing of a bunch of "old men"
> talking on radios in a tent was "wierd". Said alot. Ham radio is obsolete guys.
>
> Sorry.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3205. An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 20:19:12 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0205071219.2aab53a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42474

This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet. But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.

If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.

Just think:
1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be introduced to it for the first time ever.
3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for old men.
4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important, as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at a young age.
5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts. If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet@@@jasonhsu.com
http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html

3206. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 21:08:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <cnXB8.10070$8T5.474274988@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42475

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0205070932.25f548d9@posting.google.com...
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > Mating comes under the heading of FRIENDLY above, at least the way K0CKB
> > practice it. Especially that slooooooooow and patient operating.
>
> Accuracy transcends speed.

So Dick cannot use the "Banana Boat Swing" with his mate?

3207. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 21:20:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <lyXB8.10082$3b6.474698887@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42476

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020507080710.07448.00001381@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <3CD68EC8.E00E5F0C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> Show us some posts to back your claims, Cecil. Otherwise you are simply
> >blowing
> >> smoke. Your excuses and name calling simply convince others that you
don't
> >know
> >> what you're talking about.
> >
> >Your strategy is to wear people down by having them waste a lot of time
> >digging
> >up old postings only to have you nickpick them to death and deny what was
> >said.
>
> "nickpick"?
>
> All I do is ask simple, direct questions and point out people's
> logical errors and other mistakes.

What is the logical error or mistake of the date of a persons latest Novice
subband experience?

> Plus ask for objective evidence of
> some claims. Some people don't like that, because it points out facts
> they don't like. Like the fact that a claim of having "worked all bands,
> lots of times" is false. or that "there's nobody there" on the Novice
bands
> is based on a few experiences a dozen or more years ago.

Then why does the ARRL, Hans, and Jim say the bands have "outlived their
usefulness," and want them put to some other use?

> Suppose somebody said "PACTOR II is no good", but had never used the mode
> and knew little or nothing about it. How much credibility would they have
> with you?

Quit talking about Dick when he's not around to defend hisself.

> >Been there, done that, no thanks.
>
> The only time I can recall you digging up old posts was to argue endlessly
> about a typo involving "comparing" vs. "comparting".

>
> > What does it tell you that everytime Carl
> >or I mention hams doing digital experimentation, Dick jumps on us with
all
> >four feet?
>
> "Jumps on you with all four feet"? That's a different thing than being
> against experimentation. Perhaps he is simply pointing out some facts you
> don't like.

Like Reagan said, "Facts are stupid things."

> For example, despite all the preaching by Carl and yourself about
> experimentation,
> the only HF amateur activity Carl has mentioned actually DOING with his
ham
> license is DXing and ragchewing on SSB.

Many of the inventions "of ham radio" have come from professionals who also
happened to hold amateur licenses.

> Now there's absolutely nothing wrong
> with his doing those things.

It must not be fine. Why do you ask, "When was the last timeyou .... xxx,
because your credibility is at stake"

> And the only "digital experimentation" you talk
> about is
> using your store-bought SCS box. Again, nothing wrong with that, either.
But it
> does seem to get a bit "do as I say, not as I do".

The SCS box just can't compare with a spring loaded, silver plated actuator,
can it?

> >Everyone who has been following these postings is free to make up
> >his/her own mind.
>
> That's why I'm asking you to provide some backup to your claims.

Really?

> >Those without your particular set of blinders will see
> >things objectively.
>
> What blinders?

The Crony blinders?

3208. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 21:37:11 UTC
From: l566cx@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <41749911.0205071337.3ca96b4c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42477
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Had no trouble accessing the site with Netscape 6.2.
His site does say "Optimized for IE 6" so if lesser browsers won't
work then I guess it's just "tuff titty" untill those people upgrade
to IE which now has over 97% of the broswer share...

The URL agian for those that missed it is

http://www.ab7sl.com

It's the nicest ham site I have ever visited and it is 100% FREE!!!

Martin

3209. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 22:14:13 UTC
From: eccraigjr@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020507181413.20751.00007923@mb-mm.news.cs.com>
Source record: 42478

>This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
>But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
>hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.
>
>If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
>be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
>astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
>
>Just think:
>1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community
>knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
>2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be
>introduced to it for the first time ever.
>3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for
>old men.
>4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of
>kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be
>immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important,
>as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at
>a young age.
>5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the
>first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts.
>If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .
>
>Jason Hsu, AG4DG
>usenet@@@jasonhsu.com
>http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html

Jason,

This is a dynamite idea. Thanks for sharing it.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

P.S. Notice how I resisted saying the idea was ...ready?..."outta this world!"
(Until now, that is.)

3210. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 22:18:22 UTC
From: eccraigjr@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020507181822.20751.00007926@mb-mm.news.cs.com>
Source record: 42479

>I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently the rules
>state we cannot use our identifying callsigns, but can you imagine if a ton
>of people started operating there (fully in compliance of the rules as they
>otherwise stand) and ID'ed, and operated in an above-board professional
>manner? Might actually have a positive effect.
>
>Ryan

I fully agree with this concept. BTW, there's no rule that states that you
cannot use your callsign as your "handle" as long as you're using equipment
that's type-accepted for CB.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3211. RM-10413

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 23:08:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <E7ZB8.1615$Yi6.333@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42480

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10413
Amateur Service Rules Governing)
Operating Privileges)
)

REPLY COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments REPLY specifically to the comments of Timothy J. Fiebig, K2TF.

I. Discussion:

While Mr. Fiebigs' comments fly the flag of "experimentation and progress", I feel they would have three undesirable consequences if adopted as written.

A. LITTLE ROOM FOR THE PROPOSED EXPERIMENTATION "PARK"

In other comments on RM-10413 I have suggested that the current "Novice" CW segments on 10, 15, 40, and 80 meters ought to be assigned to an "experimental park". This would provide significant space (375 kHz) spread over 4 HF bands.

Mr. Fiebig suggests the "experimental park" be limited to "25-50 kHz". This would amount to just a token allocation, and would be of limited use since it would likely exist in only one (or perhaps two) of the HF bands.

A wider range of frequency choices ought to be provided to give experimenters access to the different propagation characteristics of several HF bands.

B. NOVICE CW SEGMENTS WOULD REMAIN

Part of the reason for the unpopularity of the Novice license and it's decline in recent years is that the current allocations tend to isolate Novices into small ghetto's away from mainstream amateur operations. Thus the few remaining Novice licensees have fewer and fewer opportunities for contacts, and they are isolated from

the advantage of interaction with more experienced amateurs in the 'mainstream' parts of the bands, damping their inclination to remain active and upgrade their skills.

Mr. Fiebig's proposal does not remove the current Novice CW ghetto's; it simply diminishes their size and relocates them slightly in the band, effectively reinforcing the sense of 'second class RF citizens' of these licensees.

C. DIMINISHES SPECTRUM FOR DIGITAL OPERATIONS

While Mr. Fiebig "talks the talk" for promoting digital operations, his proposal in fact diminishes the amount of space available to digital modes by establishing large "CW exclusive" segments in areas where digital operations are now allowed.

This serves to elevate the protection given to Morse operation, establishes an exclusive CW turf which does not now exist, a precedent which is undesirable for the future growth of digital modes.

II. Summary

Mr. Fiebigs' proposal would:

1. Give only token space to new experimentation.
2. Perpetuate the "Novice ghetto syndrome".
3. Diminish the amount of spectrum available to digital operations.

Rather than move amateur radio forward, these factors actually are regressive, and the proposal should be dismissed.

Respectfully,

Hans Brakob, K0HB

3212. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 23:22:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_kZB8.10130$wd3.413437173@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42481

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0205071219.2aab53a0@posting.google.com...
> This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
> But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
> hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.
>
> If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
> be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
> astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
>
> Just think:
> 1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community
> knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
> 2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be
> introduced to it for the first time ever.
> 3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for
> old men.
> 4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of
> kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be
> immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important,
> as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at
> a young age.
> 5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the
> first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts.
> If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> usenet@@@jasonhsu.com
> http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html

Jason, the "Old Hands" on this group don't necessarily want young people or even more people in amateur radio. They treat it as their own private playground and want to keep it that way. They've already played "King of the Hill" and the outcome has been carved in granite. No newcomers need apply.

Anyway, I think its a great idea.

3213. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 23:34:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gwZB8.10141$8o3.413718814@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42482

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0205030353.5bbcfa8f@posting.google.com...
> FCC has been deemphasizing code testing since 1975, when they first
> tried to implement a nocodetest license. Then came the end of sending
> tests, multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank options, and medical
> waivers.

Perhaps not. It appears that 1991 is the first year that code was
deemphasized.

3214. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 23:36:04 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ExZB8.1733$Yi6.0@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42483

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote

> This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
> But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
> hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.

What a great idea, Jason! I've forwarded a copy of your message to my
District Director.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3215. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-07 23:39:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5BZB8.10146$lx3.413934617@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42484

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020504180645.26630.00000214@mb-cs.aol.com...

> 2) FCC got rid of the old Novice because there were very few of them
issued for
> many years. For more than 15 years the Tech has been the first license of
most
> new hams. This was going on even before the Tech lost its code test in
1991.
> Back then, most newcomers looked at the requirements for Tech vs. Novice,
> compared them to the privileges, and went straight to Tech.

I disagree. I think most failed at actual Morse Code use, then "upgraded"
to a license that would allow them to actually communicate.

3216. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 01:06:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507210651.27454.00007558@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 42485

>Subject: Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/07/02 15:00 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020507150021.19503.00001314@mb-cm.aol.com>

>It's almost a psychological maxim that radio amateurs are wanting
>recognition on a "professional" level...hence the long-ago self-label
>of "HAM." Saying "ham radio" instead of "amateur radio" is much
>more self-satisfying and avoids carrying around all the emotional
>connotation of "amateurism" as being of "lesser value."

Now you are a psychologist, Lennie?

Having BEEN an "Amateur" for 29 years, I can say with informed certainty
that this is nothing but foolishness on your part.

The term "Ham" was applied to Amateurs before there was any significant
difference between "Amateurs" and what you term professionals.

>This seems to be very strong on the devotees who want to embrace
>amateur radio as a Lifestyle, assuming a personna of expertise or
>greatness through longevity and purely hobby activities of long tenure.

If by this you mean that we take pride in what we do as both hobbyists or
volunteers, then you'd be correct. Amateur Radio does take on a life of it's
own...Of course we know this eats at you because you cannot, by your own
inhibitions, ba a part of that life.

Sucks to be you.

>The ARRL reinforces the Lifestyle image in its publications. To the
>League it is the Holy Grail of existance, as well it should be for an
>organization whose headquarters and officers must maintain a kind
>of "professional amateur" environment-existance for survival.

And such similar "lifestyles" are not enjoyed by the devotee's of other
pasttimes?

Puh-leeze.

>Ryan, the general public has had a chance to be "educated" for half a
>century of the existance of all kinds of media input. The Big Org up
>near Hartford just hasn't done its job in getting media attention in all
>that time.

Lennie, Lennie, Lennie...lying agian.

>The Big Org fools its members into thinking that "the word
>is out to the public" when the most it does is to get the word to those
>already IN the hobby.

The only one you are fooling is yourself, Your Ineptness. Especially when we see evidence of this to the contrary in our everyday lives.

IE: Chattanooga Free Press, March 31st 2002, Page E1(Lifestyle Section), lead item. "In Internet Age, ham radio still attracts hobbyists". Took up top 1/4th of page and 1/3rd of back page with color photos and thorough write-up on current licensing prerequisites and modern-day Amateur Radio programs and practices.

Notable in it's absence was any reference to a need for a degree in night-school engineering.

>The general public will perceive "ham radio" as a hobby, about on the
>same level as scanning listeners or CB users or those playing around
>with FRS handhelds. Take any formal or informal poll on that subject
>and the statement will be true.

And I can also take a poll that asks what they think about the moon landings and many think it was staged and never happened. Do I believe them...???

>The general public doesn't see any "service" aspect as exemplified by
>the individual hams who NEED some "belonging" and excuse for
>doing their thing.

Thank-you Mr. Gallup.

>Too many hams have gone the delusional route of
>adopting a virtual paramilitary "service" rationale for engaging in a
>HOBBY.

Oh...??? And you have come to this "informed" opinion by WHAT direct interaction with Amateur Radio or Amateur Radio licensees? on RRAP...?!?! LOLOLOLOLOLOLOLOL ! ! ! !

>That hobby is technologically-intensive but the "servicemen"
>are into the "service" aspects almost to the point of obsessive
>delusions replacing actual education in the technical arts.

I reitereate my above inquiry. Serious answers only, Your Slanderishness. No smileys...facts only, please.

>An interesting sidelight to the "serviceman" type of hobbyist is the
>demographics of US amateur radio. Flip through any amateur radio
>publication collection spanning the last half century, observe the
>pictures of various hams and "profile" them. There are two very
>major profile aspects: Hams are male, hams are white.

OK...and what does this prove? That because I happened to take interest in Amateur Radio and my decendents came from Europe that somehow that gilds my opinions or participation ?

>Yes, there are exceptions but those only "prove" that exceptions
>exist. The overwhelming majority of radio amateurs are male and
>white. Much more so than the general population of the USA.

It will be interesting to see how Lennie comes up with an explanation how gender and race formulate Amateur policy. I am further interested in seeing how he suggests that anyone has prevented anyone that chose to do so from pursuing a license.

>The above would have been understandable in the first half of the
>last century. White male predominance was common in all
>technological-trade fields of endeavor then. The white male
>predominance in ham radio continues throughout the last half of
>the last century and continues into the new millenium. That white
>predominance is diluted to include most races and ethnicities in
>other techno-trade activities.

Geeze, Lennie...You really are grasping for some really thin straws. Bad Lennie. Of course you have tried the race and gender cards before only to be dealt back jokers and duces.

What a pathetic putz.

>While females are getting more and
>more involved in everything outside of the home, ham radio
>continues its second-class status of females as objects in the
>"YL" and "XYL" labels (approved traditional abbreviations).

No more than some men object to "Old Man" or "Old Boy". You have a point to make?

>NB: G3PLX's surname of "Martinez" is not exactly
>in the Anglo-Saxon fashion.

Another racist reference? Of what importance is this fellow's heritage other than a pitiful newsgroup travesty perpetrated by a lonely old man with no meaningful lifestyle of his own?

More putziness by someone who should know better. This is how you generate respect for "professional engineers"...???

You KNOW our opinion on that......

>What seems to be the case is a predominently male, white
>organization essentially controlling the mindsets of a quarter of
>the licensed radio amateurs in the USA who also appear to be
>male and white. By many examples that Big Org is almost
>ultra-conservative and very resistant to change of any kind.

Sheesh. What ignorance. What bigotry. What else was I expecting...?!?!

3217. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 01:13:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gvrgj83.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42486

On 06 May 2002 20:12:47 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>Understood that only "wualified attornies" are acceptible.

The courts regularly dump on otherwise licensed attornies who give
advice in legal subjects where their experience or training.in
that subject is less than adequite. An example would be if I
were to give advice on immigration law without the specialized
training and experience necessary, or even if I were to have
same but a strong track record of being wrong.

In the criminal arena it is expressed as "inadeuate assistance
of counsel", the convicted felon's first line of appeal, the
"dude" defense ("some other dude done it") having failed at the
trial level.
>
>Thank you for the pro sonny bono advice. :-)

I think Cher has better legs, myself...

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3218. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 01:13:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gvrgmn4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42487

On Mon, 06 May 2002 21:51:21 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>> >I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently the
>rules
>> >state we cannot use our identifying callsigns,
>>
>> Where do you see that?
>
>Phil, it was decide on here a couple of years ago.

But you said "the rules state". Where in the Rules does it so state?

Citations to r.r.a.p. postings are not acceptable in most legal
proceedings, although I've seen citations to sources that were
even weirder...

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3219. Re: Good idea, except...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 01:17:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020507211749.07832.00003239@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 42488

In article <20020507080711.07448.00001382@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>Lessee, if the loco gets .5 MPG pulling the train, and there are 200
>passengers
>aboard, the resulting effeciency is 100 passenger-miles per gallon - at 90
>MPH.
>
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

Oh yes, there is no doubt that this is one of the most efficient methods of transporting people currently available to modern technology -- and will be difficult to improve upon in the future! On a typical day, me and my Paratransit bus will transport an average of 13 passengers, and I usually use around 13 gallons of diesel fuel in 125 - 130 miles of driving (we'll call it 130 miles to make it easy). So I'm getting 10 passenger miles per gallon, or 10% the efficiency of a diesel-electric locomotive. This doesn't seem so bad until you figure that a typical AMTRAK train weighs in at around 500 tons (or more!) and the biggest of the busses I drive weigh about 7 tons (empty), and I'm averaging 50 MPH (or less) to the train's 90. It's a good thing I don't drive to/from work in a 10 MPG gas-guzzling SUV!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3220. Re: No Comment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 01:17:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020507211749.07832.00003238@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 42489

In article <%PHB8.1922$663.169963@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>
>Man what fun Ham Radio is. Keep in mind I haven't even listened to CW for
>over 7 years. K1B was on 28.020 with nobody coming back to his CQ's, so I
>dug out a straight key I had around here for some reason, grabbed my
>electric guitar cord (for the 1/4 plug) and 2 alligator clipped jumpers
>and tried to send out my call sign. DA..... what's an "A"? I finally got
>a AC6WD sent out (I think). What was that he sent back? Da..... what's
>a 559? Got that sent out. (I think) Did I work him? Who knows! Who cares!
>It was challenging though. I'll have to wait now for all of the logs to
>be downloaded to the Web site to find out.
>I NEED A RIGBLASTER!
>Rick

Hansl:

Sounds like OM Rick made a fine effort to get on CW under spur-of-the-moment conditions, using the tools at had. Also seems like after 7 years away from CW, he could still copy well enough to get down the call signs and signal reports. All in all, seems like a good example of the ability hams possess to use CW to communicate under austere conditions IF they know the Morse code! And, of course, once he gets his Rigblaster, he'll then be able to add the wide world of digital modes to his capabilities! This could motivate him to get off the Geritol Net and start doing something interesting and useful in amateur radio! You won't get any complaints from me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3221. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 01:20:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020507212025.27454.00007560@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 42490

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/07/02 15:00 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020507150023.19503.00001316@mb-cm.aol.com>

>>Ya mean like attempting to get a ham ticket?
>
>Sig Heil is back to that schtick, is he?

And why not? YOU said you were going to get an "Extra Lite" out of the box. Well, the box has been open for two years now, and you've done nothing of the sort.

But it's nothing we didn't expect. You can't even keep your own promises, let alone step up to someone else's challenges.

>>You are free to experiment to your heart's content. You'll
>>just not be able to do any communicating on the ham bands.
>
>Study the big, big table of allocations in Part 2, Title 47 CFR, and
>tell me again how "forbidden" I am to "not communicate on the
>ham bands."

Then fire up, Lennie! Let's hear you! Let's see just how efficiently you can radiate RF under the technical parameters of Part 15! Pick a frequency! Pick a mode! Go for it! With the field strength limits of Part 15, you MIGHT be heard down the block!

Assuming, of course, your neighbor isn't using his garage door opener at the same time!

BBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA! ! ! ! ! ! !

See ya on 20 meters, Your Putziness!

NOT!

3222. Re: No Comment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 01:59:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hE%B8.10259$wa6.418471300@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42491

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020507211749.07832.00003238@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <%PHB8.1922$663.169963@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"K HB"
> <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >
> >Man what fun Ham Radio is. Keep in mind I haven't even listened to CW for
> >over 7 years. K1B was on 28.020 with nobody coming back to his CQ's, so I
> >dug out a straight key I had around here for some reason, grabbed my
> >electric guitar cord (for the 1/4 plug) and 2 alligator clipped jumpers
> >and tried to send out my call sign. DA..... what's an "A"? I finally got
> >a AC6WD sent out (I think). What was that he sent back? Da..... what's
> >a 559? Got that sent out. (I think) Did I work him? Who knows! Who cares!
> >It was challenging though. I'll have to wait now for all of the logs to
> >be downloaded to the Web site to find out.
> >I NEED A RIGBLASTER!
> >Rick
>
> Hansl:
>
> Sounds like OM Rick made a fine effort to get on CW under spur-of-the-
> moment conditions, using the tools at had. Also seems like after 7 years
> away from CW, he could still copy well enough to get down the call signs
> and signal reports. All in all, seems like a good example of the ability
> hams possess to use CW to communicate under austere conditions IF they
> know the Morse code! And, of course, once he gets his Rigblaster, he'll
then
> be able to add the wide world of digital modes to his capabilities! This
> could motivate him to get off the Geritol Net and start doing something
> interesting and useful in amateur radio! You won't get any complaints
from me!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Remember Larry, you're the guy on the mountain with the compound fracture
and a screaming wife, and you saviour is asking, "Da..... what's a 559?"

3223. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 02:08:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <nM%B8.10266$Xh6.418671956@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42492

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gvrgmn4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 06 May 2002 21:51:21 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >> >I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently the
> >rules
> >> >state we cannot use our identifying callsigns,
> >>
> >> Where do you see that?
> >
> >Phil, it was decide on here a couple of years ago.
>
> But you said "the rules state". Where in the Rules does it so state?

I didn't say anything about the rules, just that "we" decided. Look, if an ad hoc group can decide to administer code exams via Farnsworth rather than Morse as specified in the "rules," certainly r.r.a.p. can decide not to permit Part 97 callsigns on Part 95 radio. Its called anarchy. Its OK, that's how things are done now.

> Citations to r.r.a.p. postings are not acceptable in most legal
> proceedings, although I've seen citations to sources that were
> even weirder...

Phil, what is your most recent Novice subband experience?

Thanks,
Brian/N0iMD

3224. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 04:36:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508003635.20470.00001409@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 42494

In article <27806b676dc40eba703cf2ff4a6e6434.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>You make some good points. Everyone wants something for nothing. Note
>that Juno and Net Zero are down to 10 hours a month free - if you can
>get that. One used to be able to get ball games on the internet if the
>local stations didn't carry the game. You still can, but it went from
>free to $10.00 per month. The advertisers are getting on to the fact
>that no one is spending; therefore, they won't pay as much. The free
>ride is nearly over.

Ever listen to ball games on a broadcast receiver? I did that way back in grade school in the 1940s as I've done all that time since up to 2002. Never paid a dime for any game (at 12 cents a kilowatt-hour, a little AC-DC BC receiver of 50 Watts demand costs about a penny a game). Advertisers pay for all those games...with some exceptions such as the Wisconsin State Football Network and some others.

I have two CDs of about 1.1 GB total capacity storing nothing but device datasheets and application notes. Those were obtained over the Internet without extra charge. I expect those to be as free as they were on paper years ago...except they don't have to be requested over the phone but are available over the Internet...to anyone knowing the URL.

>You make an excellent point about the high power machines though. Gee,
>daddy and mommy can buy this nice piece of equipment, I can play games,
>and I can meet neat people on the internet. Hmmm.

The "Reverend" Jim Jones used ham transceivers to keep his South American cult in "Jamestown" in contact with a San Francisco "church." Maybe it was to keep the Kool-Aid coming? Shall we hold amateur radio to the same standards you are trying to establish for the Internet?

According to the US Census Bureau, one out of five households in the US in the year 2001 had some form of Internet connection. In a nation of about 300 million citizens, that is a LOT of households. Do you want the entire Internet banned because of ONE pervert's actions in NY state?

>(so far) range from 11 to 30. Nice guy. Nice internet. Oh, BTW, my
>former ISP had a lot of problems on 9/11 and I was without internet
>service for a week. No biggie, but the radio has always worked - even
>if my power was off.

Yes, just like 10 million folks in my neighborhood "always had their radios working" during the Northridge Earthquake and the subsequent cutoff of ALL electric power. Everyone did NOT have enough batteries. The no-charge-to-listener broadcast stations all had emergency generators.

"CW gets through when nothing else will?" Even without electric power? Of any kind? How much power output can you get out of a Baygen ham transceiver (if there was such a thing)?

Where were all the glorious ham nets during a REAL emergency in 1994?

>In any case, so what will junior do once he graduates from high school?
>I've noticed that now our engineering colleges have more and more
>foreign students. Am I to assume everyone will get a degree in business
>administration and learn to manipulate companies and electric power
>distribution such as happened recently?

"Junior" will probably do all right. He's already been exposed to computers and they aren't evil, expensive things to him.

Are you talking about a new "Enron" of that future where "everyone has a BA degree and doing 'manipulating?'" Keep up with the latest news. Good old Enron has been uncovered to do some dirty tricks in the state of California about electric power rate hiking and suchlike.

Oh, and on that subject of electricity in California, my local neighborhood NEVER had any brownouts or blackouts that were supposed to be everywhere here (according to the easterners). No problem. Our local electricity provider was producing enough e-power to SELL it to part of the state.

My nephew is an electric power broker in the state of Minnesota. Makes a fantastic income for an ex-USN sub nuke plant PO. Do you want to get into a family-oriented shouting match? I'd advise not to go there...you'd be walking into a minefield without a sweeper.

>Seems no one wants to actually work anymore. Too bad, it won't be much
>fun being a 3rd world country.

I'm retired so I won't take such a dim, nihilistic view. I just don't see it around me...and I observe pretty good. So does my wife. We've worked all our lives and just enjoy the heck out of the Internet in retirement.

>Then you can also forget about the
>internet as most people won't be able to afford it.

Aren't you into some gross exaggeration there? Yes, four out of five households in the USA do NOT have Internet access. Three out of four citizens do NOT have a cell phone subscription in 2002. The numbers keep growing FOR these new services. If they are deemed desireable by the public, they will be purchased.

You can delude yourself all you want on demanding folks "work" for everything...just like you did when younger? Sounds like an old whine uncorked every generation by forty- and fiftysomethings crying in their drinks. That sort of whining was something done in the ancient city of Pompeii, too.

You stay on the thought that amateur radio is all about "work" and manual-everything. You can add generating your own electricity, too, since the electric power is from a dreaded infra-structure utility. That isn't free.

3225. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 04:36:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508003637.20470.00001410@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 42493

In article <XUVB8.1166$Yi6.860@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Whatever a new organization, it must withstand the onslaught of
>> the Old Believers (examples: Brakob, Heil, Roll, Carroll, etc.) who
>> will raise the Hue and Cry of "it can't work because it isn't as 'big'
>> (noble, wonderful, etc., etc., etc.) as The League." There will be
>> endless attempts at humiliation by these Devout Fedayin and
>> usual insults will be rounded up and delivered. That's a guarantee.
>
>The Olde Organ Grinder lies again. To save you the trouble of a Google
>search, here is a verbatim extract from a post by Brakob on rrap.
>
>Doncha just hate it when you're shown to be a liar?

Don't you just HATE it when you've NOT proved a damn thing,
old woman?

Hans, you are INCONSISTENT. You have only ONE position,
that of your own opinion-of-the-moment.

A few days ago you were whining "forget ham radio for the summer"
after you took out your power boat. Now you are busy promoting
ONE posting of yours which has a serious OMISSION.

You have, as everyone has seen, almost taken up arms against
anyone dissing the ARRL since YOU were some kind of official
district person there once...then you pull out the following gem of
a PAST posting in an attempt to "prove" your far-sighted noble
views.

>-------------------------------
>From: K0HB (k0hb@arrl.org)
>Subject: Re: Puke.
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Date: 2001-05-22 13:34:36 PST
>
>On Tue, 22 May 2001 11:18:12 GMT, Kim-W5TIT says:
>
>> *If* the ARRL ever did move to a position such as this,
>> don't you think that it would create less competition
>> with other groups?
>
>First, I don't think competition is a bad thing.

>
>Second, I don't see any other clubs or associations out there
>in credible competition with ARRL.
>
>My good friend Don Stoner, W6TNS (SK), had the right idea when
>he founded NARA ("National Amateur Radio Association" --
>where have you seen those words lately), but I think Don made
>a mistake when he tried to run it out of his own deep pockets.
>It just never achieved critical mass.
>
>But the competition would have been good for ARRL and Amateur
>Radio.
>
>73, Hans, K0HB
>
>PS: Lest you dismiss Don as some sort of old timer with no vision,
>he was the guy who sparkplugged the first Amateur Radio satellite,
>OSCAR-1, and was a founding member of AMSAT.
>--

Some THIRTY YEARS AGO a fella called Don Stoner and another,
Pierre Goral, KI7UA, founded the Stoner-Goral Company now known
as SGC. Their "little" company in Belleview, Washington, is doing
nicely and their SGC-2020 is a very good HF SSB transceiver that
sells to both private boat owners as well as radio amateurs. You've
probably not looked deep into that little SGC-2020..."managers"
don't do much technical work and don't really appreciate good design
unless they've laid personal-approval hands on it. Good stuff in that
2020, especially the embedded microcontroller integration.

But you didn't mention that, did you? No, your PAST posting only
pulled out the golly gee-whiz buzz things of acronyms and SPACE
like you were on "intimate terms" with space stuff. Pfui.

Ham radio did NOT invent satellites, doesn't have the funding to
launch anything. Not even close to the monies needed. All those
ham-sats have to depend on the generosity of others who DO fund
the space launches. You imply that ham radio is so technically
groovy and forget ALL about the launch folks who make it possible.
More pfui and ingratitude on your part.

Is designing and building a satellite some kind of marvelous techno-
trip? Not really. It requires only common-sense restricted-power,
unusual environment design rules. Those rules have ALREADY
BEEN PROVEN before OSCAR-1 was even considered. You need
more contacts with NASA and JPL to confirm that...something I did
back in the 1960s in Pasadena. Want to tell me "all about" Mars
Mariner payloads? The Apollo Lunar Surface Experiment Package?
A few other unmanned payloads? NPC-200 certification for ordinary
soldering? All assembly and QC under 10-power stereo microscopes?
Have YOUR gloved hands ever been inside a space-borne payload?

Go ahead, make everyone's day by calling others "liars."

Hans, your trouble is, as stated before, INCONSISTENCY. You don't have a consistent position for any more than about a week. Actually, that's a good thing because nobody can pin you down. You can claim "rightness" without a worry by pulling out SELECTED old postings. You are a vacillator, a sort of broad-band, unstable oscillator in action. That doesn't produce a good signal.

3226. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 04:38:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CD8ABBD.8E36385B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42495

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CCEBFA7.31751BF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <aag08v$1c3t$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net
> >> (Dennis Ferguson) writes:
> >>
> >> >If amateur experimentation with packet radio was a "failure" then I'd
> >> >suggest that if experimental failures like this would happen in amateur
> >> >radio every few years or so the service would be much better off in
> >> >terms of justifying its existance. In an experimental service even
> >> >things that don't work out can teach things of great value. The only
> >> >real "failure" is the failure to attempt anything new at all.
> >>
> >Ya mean like attempting to get a ham ticket?
>
> Sig Heil is back to that schtick, is he?

I don't know anyone named "Sig". As for me, my opinion of you hasn't
changed.
>
> >> Good words. I suspect that the amateur radio community thinking
> >> won't allow that or "failure." Failure is taken as a "weakness" and
> >> no self-important radio amateur wants to be "weak" or wimpish.
> >> Everything new must be laid out for them, already developed, plus
> >> explanatory articles on the new stuff printed in QST to make it
> >> "official" for amateur radio use. What will immediately follow are
> >> ready-made, designed-by-others equipment which the amateurs
> >> can buy, install, and then brag about their operating on the cutting
> >> edge of technology...without knowing much about it except for some
> >> important buzzphrases used to impress others. :-)
> >>
> >The scenario needn't bother you, Len. You aren't a ham and aren't an
> >ARRL member.
>
> ...and judging by some of the comments of the pretender to the
> Biggest Baddest Ham Hock title, few will bother to emulate Heil.

Did I misstate something? Are you a radio amateur? Are you an ARRL
member? Do you have any connection whatever with amateur radio?

> Such an attitude towards potential newcomers, tsk, tsk.

You've admitted that you really have no intention of obtaining an amateur license. That hardly makes you a potential newcomer. Naw, your real playground is here in this newsgroup before a small readership.

> It's a good thing State "retired" you. God Help the USA if such
> an attitude were part of US foreign policy.

Who "retired" you, Len? Does it tweak your nose that I believe you to be full of beans?

> >You are free to experiment to your heart's content. You'll
> >just not be able to do any communicating on the ham bands.
>
> Study the big, big table of allocations in Part 2, Title 47 CFR, and
> tell me again how "forbidden" I am to "not communicate on the
> ham bands."

We're not speaking of your ability to play Part 15 Buck Rogers games, Len. Just be certain not to interfere with licensed users.

Dave K8MN

3227. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 05:37:41 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <4AB80479BC9B0191.361FCB30662875BB.029980D3438CCAC4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42496

On 06 May 2002 20:12:47 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>Understood that only "wualified attornies" are acceptible.

How does one wualify an attorney? It sounds sufficiently painful (to
the attorney, of course) to be greatly entertaining.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3228. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 05:43:43 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <473F952AE708F8E3.9CE06B3DBDC9CDEA.337D16E861A1246C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42497

On 7 May 2002 13:19:12 -0700, jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote:

>If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
>be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
>astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.

Hopefully they won't let him use the good radio, but will send him
outside to try it with an HT.

Better still, make him walk home afterward.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3229. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 05:45:08 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abbjj72251g@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42515

And it would not necessarily have to be him (Lance), as well as there are a variety of people in the public eye respected by youth, that would also be a good influence.

Rednecks had that country singer/ ham!! :)

Ryan

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:f7d9a152.0205071219.2aab53a0@posting.google.com...
> This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
> But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
> hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.
>
> If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
> be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
> astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
>
> Just think:
> 1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community
> knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
> 2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be
> introduced to it for the first time ever.
> 3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for
> old men.
> 4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of
> kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be
> immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important,
> as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at
> a young age.
> 5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the
> first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts.
> If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> usenet@@@jasonhsu.com
> http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html

3230. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 05:58:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508015813.29950.00005230@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 42498

>Subject: Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 05/08/02 00:38 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3CD8ABBD.8E36385B@earthlink.net>

>We're not speaking of your ability to play Part 15 Buck Rogers games,
>Len. Just be certain not to interfere with licensed users.

Maybe he can start a Part 15 Users Group in SoCal....say, a handful of folks within a couple miles of his location?

I am still waiting to hear the results of his mobile operations on 11 meters...the same 11 meters he claimed at one time was soooooo useful to those who defiantly choose to not get an Amateur license.

Also still waiting to have him tell us which radio service was created for "strictly recreational" purposes. We know whcih one's can be USED for that purpose, however he has yet to either admit he was wrong or correct himself. None exisits, per 47CFR en toto.

Am also still waiting for his presentation on microwave techniques. You remember...Lennie struted his stuff about how much "professional engineers" had to offer Hams, however, he's not the one to do it...Of course he's not.

And also waiting on his revelation as to which VE session he sat at to get his "out of the box" Extra Lite.

Come to think of it, just about everything Lennie has started in here has been left waiting...by him.

Why am I not surprised...????

73

Steve, K4YZ

3231. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 06:30:12 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abagk4$ig2$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42499

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:_kZB8.10130$wd3.413437173@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:f7d9a152.0205071219.2aab53a0@posting.google.com...
> > This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
> > But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
> > hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.
> >
> > If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
> > be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
> > astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
> >
> > Just think:
> > 1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community
> > knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
> > 2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be
> > introduced to it for the first time ever.
> > 3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for
> > old men.
> > 4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of
> > kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be
> > immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important,
> > as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at
> > a young age.
> > 5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the
> > first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts.
> > If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .
> >
> > Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> > usenet@@@jasonhsu.com
> > http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html
>
> Jason, the "Old Hands" on this group don't necessarily want young people
or
> even more people in amateur radio. They treat it as their own private
> playground and want to keep it that way. They've already played "King of
> the Hill" and the outcome has been carved in granite. No newcomers need
> apply.
>
> Anyway, I think its a great idea.

The Osbournes. In space.

&%K'IN QRM!

Corry

--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"

3232. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 06:37:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508023703.20806.00007044@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 42501

>Subject: Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/08/02 00:36 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020508003635.20470.00001409@mb-ma.aol.com>

>Ever listen to ball games on a broadcast receiver? I did that way back
>in grade school in the 1940s as I've done all that time since up to 2002.

You've NOT been able to get selected games on local broadcast game when it was blacked out by the respective league, Your mNarrowmindedness.

>I have two CDs of about 1.1 GB total capacity storing nothing but
>device datasheets and application notes. Those were obtained
>over the Internet without extra charge. I expect those to be as free
>as they were on paper years ago...except they don't have to be
>requested over the phone but are available over the Internet...to
>anyone knowing the URL.

Well cool! When some guy wants to impress his intended "squeeze", he'll whip out the old spread sheets and WHAMMO!...She's butter in his hands!

Entertainment, on the otherhand, is expensive. Good entertainment, anyway.

>Do you want the entire Internet banned because of
>ONE pervert's actions in NY state?

It's not "ONE" pervert. My mailbox is spammed to the high heavens with crap. I can only imagine what other crap is out there. Of course YOU bring some of it in here.

>Where were all the glorious ham nets during a REAL emergency
>in 1994?

In Northridge while you were madly slathering at home trying to find ways to denigrate those who were helping.

Thankfully the world has a great many people who don't need smoke blown up thier skirts to know they did something worthwhile, as you seem to, Lennie.

>My nephew is an electric power broker in the state of Minnesota.
>Makes a fantastic income for an ex-USN sub nuke plant PO. Do you
>want to get into a family-oriented shouting match? I'd advise not to
>go there...you'd be walking into a minefield without a sweeper.

UH OH ! ! ! There goes Lennie with the "patriotic bunting" ! ! !.

AND...to top it off, he's gonna rat you out to his nephew!

OOOOH! Big bad Lennie...No offspring of his own to call on to do his dirty work, gotta call in the siblings kids to do it for him!

>I'm retired so I won't take such a dim, nihilistic view. I just don't see it
>around me...and I observe pretty good. So does my wife.

I don't think so. You constantly make mistakes in here that you SHOULD, as a "professional engineer", know better.

And your wife's married to a lying scumbag. How observant is that?

>Aren't you into some gross exaggeration there?

Pot/Kettle/Black

3233. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 06:37:47 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abah2c$4ku$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42500

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in part:

> How would a politically-oriented
> but conservative comic strip fare in today's media? Can anyone
> point to such a comic strip?

Mallard Fillmore runs right next to Doonesbury in the Huntsville (AL) Times.
They have a lot more in common than their creators think. Both are extremely
unfunny.

Corry
--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

I have sold more books about physics than Madonna has about sex.
- Stephen Hawking

3234. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 06:59:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508025920.20806.00007049@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 42502

>Subject: Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/08/02 00:36 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020508003637.20470.00001410@mb-ma.aol.com>

>Don't you just HATE it when you've NOT proved a damn thing,
>old woman?

He's shown you out so many times, Lennie, that if he didn't do it again for 10 years, he'd still have five years saved up.

>Hans, you are INCONSISTENT. You have only ONE position,
>that of your own opinion-of-the-moment.

You mean as opposed to your singleminded, one track mind that can't find any room for any compromise or consideration?

I'll take HIS kind of "inconsistent" over anything the alleged engineer has produced ANY day. At least he's shown a willingness to keep an open mind. You're just an open pit.

>Is designing and building a satellite some kind of marvelous techno-
>trip? Not really. It requires only common-sense restricted-power,
>unusual environment design rules. Those rules have ALREADY
>BEEN PROVEN before OSCAR-1 was even considered.

No...they just proved what could be done with minimal assets, Your Snippingness...That the Little LEO concept was not only viable, but potentially profitable.

>You need
>more contacts with NASA and JPL to confirm that...something I did
>back in the 1960s in Pasadena.

And let me tell ya they miss ya, Lennie. Why, just the other day I was talking to a friend of mine who said your name is still spoken with reverence in JPL...."Sure do miss that Anderson guy...No one could clean a commode or push a broom cart like him..Sorry he retired..."

>Have YOUR gloved hands ever been inside a space-borne payload?

Has YOURS?

In order for one's hands (gloved or otherwise) to be in a "space-borne" payload, one must also be in space. A quick review of NASA archives fails to produce any "Leonard H. Anderson" in the Astronaut Corps or as payload specialist on any Shuttle mission since it's inception.

PERHAPS you were reminiscing about days spent in the housekeeping staff at JPL when you would sneak into the clean rooms when no one was watching and dream of meeting E.T. as you saved Princess Leia from Darth Vader. No doubt while riding "the payload" into orbit ala Slim Pickins' nuke ride in "Dr. Strangelove"...???

>Go ahead, make everyone's day by calling others "liars."

Not "others"..Just you. Because you make it soooooo easy to do.

>That doesn't produce a good signal.

At least Hans has a license to produce a signal. I've heard it...Worked it...Sounded good here...Got the QSL card a couple time over.

3235. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 08:41:30 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abbjj93251g@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42513

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020507150021.19503.00001314@mb-cm.aol.com...
> In article <ab8flp5j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >I do however agree with statements made earlier, that the words amateur
> >radio is possibly a detriment to the hobby service.
>
> It's almost a psychological maxim that radio amateurs are wanting
> recognition on a "professional" level...hence the long-ago self-label
> of "HAM." Saying "ham radio" instead of "amateur radio" is much
> more self-satisfying and avoids carrying around all the emotional
> connotation of "amateurism" as being of "lesser value."

And the word HAM RADIO still has a negative connotation with some people
that I have run across in the past, trying to explain what all of those
antennas on my truck mean. WE as (as licensed hams that is) know what the
words HAM RADIO mean but the general public may not have the same....

>
> This seems to be very strong on the devotees who want to embrace
> amateur radio as a Lifestyle, assuming a personna of expertise or
> greatness through longevity and purely hobby activities of long tenure.
> The ARRL reinforces the Lifestyle image in its publications. To the
> League it is the Holy Grail of existance, as well it should be for an
> organization whose headquarters and officers must maintain a kind
> of "professional amateur" environment-existance for survival.

Amateur radio is not my "lifestyle" nor will it ever be. It is an integral
part of my life but does not consume it completely. I also am into
photography, scuba diving, heavily into the fire service where my energy has
been lately on public education to promote fire safety.

> >Most people who are not
> >as educated as some percieve the meaning of the word "amateur" to mean
> >non-professional. I wonder what word would be better though, at least
until
> >the general public becomes more educated. Even the words "ham radio"
holds
> >a certain connotation with the general non-licensed public.
>
> Ryan, the general public has had a chance to be "educated" for half a
> century of the existance of all kinds of media input. The Big Org up
> near Hartford just hasn't done its job in getting media attention in all
> that time. The Big Org fools its members into thinking that "the word

> is out to the public" when the most it does is to get the word to those
> already IN the hobby.
>

That may be true that the ARRL may have fallen back in some of the
responsibility, but the blame is not totally with them. Another large
percentage is held with other organizations, and local clubs and of course,
individual hams.

> The general public will perceive "ham radio" as a hobby, about on the
> same level as scanning listeners or CB users or those playing around
> with FRS handhelds. Take any formal or informal poll on that subject
> and the statement will be true.
>

And that is fine for the part of our hobby/service that we enjoy in exchange
for performing public service and emergency comms.... Also it is necessary
to put ourselves in the spotlight in a positive manner for every public
service/emergency communications too, to help dissipate the association with
CB.

> The general public doesn't see any "service" aspect as exemplified by
> the individual hams who NEED some "belonging" and excuse for
> doing their thing. Too many hams have gone the delusional route of
> adopting a virtual paramilitary "service" rationale for engaging in a
> HOBBY. That hobby is technologically-intensive but the "servicemen"
> are into the "service" aspects almost to the point of obsessive
> delusions replacing actual education in the technical arts.
>

Baloney.... if we are performing public service communications or emergency
communications we definitely need to have some level of order or consistency
or the whole thing falls apart. Ever heard of the Incident Command System
utilized primarily for fire departments, but also used elsewhere?

> An interesting sidelight to the "serviceman" type of hobbyist is the
> demographics of US amateur radio. Flip through any amateur radio
> publication collection spanning the last half century, observe the
> pictures of various hams and "profile" them. There are two very
> major profile aspects: Hams are male, hams are white.
>

If a black or latino or female (or any other minority) is not interested in
radio, then they aren't interested in radio. Nothing we can do will change
that. It is called aptitude.

> Yes, there are exceptions but those only "prove" that exceptions
> exist. The overwhelming majority of radio amateurs are male and
> white. Much more so than the general population of the USA.
>

Alrighty..... think I stated this one before, and also, have you promoted
the hobby to other non-caucasian and non-male persons?

> The above would have been understandable in the first half of the
> last century. White male predominance was common in all
> technological-trade fields of endeavor then. The white male
> predominance in ham radio continues throughout the last half of
> the last century and continues into the new millenium. That white
> predominance is diluted to include most races and ethnicities in
> other techno-trade activities. While females are getting more and
> more involved in everything outside of the home, ham radio
> continues its second-class status of females as objects in the
> "YL" and "XYL" labels (approved traditional abbreviations).
>

As far as females, I have seen submissive XYL's who from what I percieve are
limited to only communication with their husbands..... Not every licensed
female ham is this way, but you are right, there is somewhat of a
second-class female group.... Through overdominating husbands who control
every last aspect of their wive's lives instead of treating them as equals.

> Let's look at the international scene of radio in the last half of
> the past century. The state of the general radio art has vastly
> improved worldwide, spurred on primarily by business, trade and
> the ability to offer or promise a better quality of life for everyone.
> Focus on amateur radio. Outside of single-channel, single-user
> SSB on HF, the pioneering in new modes and methods has
> come from outside the USA...in "foreign" lands of mixed
> ethnicities. NB: G3PLX's surname of "Martinez" is not exactly
> in the Anglo-Saxon fashion. :-)
>
> Focus on amateur radio organizations. Who was the most
> resistant to change in amateur radio regulations in the last half
> of the past century? The ARRL...as the holdout on S25.5
> changes at the IARU meeting. The ARRL's latest "policy" on
> code test changes is a no-policy position, a null, a hands-off
> either-way position. The US administration's position on 1.7.1
> at WRC-03 will follow the IARU recommendation, not the non-
> policy of the ARRL.
>
> What seems to be the case is a predominently male, white
> organization essentially controlling the mindsets of a quarter of
> the licensed radio amateurs in the USA who also appear to be
> male and white. By many examples that Big Org is almost
> ultra-conservative and very resistant to change of any kind.
>
>
> >I guess in the meantime, I will continue to strive to positively change
> >peoples negative or ignorance of what this hobby really is about.
>
> That's a laudible effort and should be applauded by hams.

I beleive that is a component of the Amateur's Code, whether actually
included in it, or an "unwritten" component.

>
> I would caution some choices of words. Non-amateurs are able to
> observe what the ham radio hobby "is about." It is out in the open,
> nothing concealed, and well publicized in the ham radio area.

Oh really??? Other than ham radio publications like QST, 73 and the like, you have to hunt high and low to find activity around here. My activities as Public Relations/Promotions manager with my club hopefully are changing some of that.

>
> The general public is not stupid. It is simply not fully informed of
> certain hobby activities. Ignorance is not stupidity. Those two
> words are linked by the same emotional baggage as the link of
> "amateur" with "professional."

Of course they aren't stupid, but they may be ignorant of ham radio. Ignorant can have a different meaning depending on the user of the word. My definition of ignorance is "the lack of knowledge or information about something."

Ryan
KC8PMX

3236. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 08:54:33 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abbjjb4251g@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42514

That would be my opinion also, but some others have different ideres. For the record, I am *not* rushing out to buy a CB.... but may if others would be willing to try this experiment.......

Ryan

>
> I fully agree with this concept. BTW, there's no rule that states that you
> cannot use your callsign as your "handle" as long as you're using
equipment
> that's type-accepted for CB.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

3237. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 09:10:28 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <68FFDCD9ED7D7B61.084485E21765DD38.DD10F42232B1E5BC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42503

On 08 May 2002 04:36:35 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>Yes, just like 10 million folks in my neighborhood "always had their
>radios working" during the Northridge Earthquake and the subsequent
>cutoff of ALL electric power. Everyone did NOT have enough batteries.
>The no-charge-to-listener broadcast stations all had emergency
>generators.

>>"CW gets through when nothing else will?" Even without electric
>power? Of any kind? How much power output can you get out
>of a Baygen ham transceiver (if there was such a thing)?

You not knowing how to stock up on batteries is not my problem. I keep two days' worth of batteries to run *all* the receivers and a transceiver (assuming a normal transmit/receive duty cycle). Reducing that to one receiver gives me over a week of listening to anything from 150kHz to 500MHz, and reducing transmit time to emergencies gives me 3-5 days. That's all before I crank up the car that never goes below 1/3 of a tank (which will recharge the transceiver's batteries 3-4 times, and the other batteries 2-3 times) or put out a solar panel. Given time and encouragement, I could also scrounge parts for a wood-fired steam generator or a wind turbine to supplement the others. (actually, at last check, I have most of the parts available, but I could get pretty much everything that's needed from dumpsters in a matter of hours)

Now, why the hell would I be without electric power of any kind?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3238. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 11:13:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508071317.06141.00000468@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42506

In article <3CD7E208.8AA9748E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:

>> All I do is ask simple, direct questions ...
>
>Sure you do, Jim, simple-minded primrose path questions.

That's your method, Cecil, not mine.

You just don't like my questions because the answers disprove your
baseless assertions.

I am like the child who points out that the self-appointed emperors have no
logical clothes.
>
>> "Jumps on you with all four feet"? That's a different thing than being
>> against experimentation. Perhaps he is simply pointing out some facts you
>> don't like.
>
>It's pretty obvious to the most casual observer that the fact Dick doesn't
>like is digital experimentation by hams.

It is not obvious to me. You are presuming your conclusion - again.

>I suggest digital experimentation
>and he comes back with, "Well, there you have it", as if I had suggested
>slaying the sacred calf.

Youy are grasping at nonexistent straws, Cecil. "Well, there you have it"
only has a negative connotation to you..

> He wound up that posting with an admonition that
>if someone has enough time for digital experimentation, they should instead
>be practicing Morse code.

Where is that admonition? Produce the post.

You are avoiding the simple fact that you cannot produce any real proof
of your assertion that W0EX is against "digital" experimentation by hams.

>> That's why I'm asking you to provide some backup to your claims.
>
>I did below but you dismissed it as expected.

It is not substantive. It does not prove your point. It does not even support
your point.
>

>> Let's see what you've got:
>> All W0EX writes in this post is "there you have it"

You edited out the rest of what W0EX wrote. Bad, very bad.
>>
>> I don't see anything in that post to indicate that W0EX is against
>> experimentation of any kind by hams.
>
>Of course you don't, Jim.

Because it's not there.

>That's why it is a waste of time to go dig up
>posts to prove a point to you. You reject any and all points that don't
>match your agenda.

Not me. I cannot see what is not there.
>
>"Well, there you have it" is a negative response in virtually everyone's
>book except yours.

This must be one of those Texas/California language things. Maybe it comes
from too much sun.

>With your deny-everything attitude, it is a waste of
>time to go digging up old posts.

What you're really saying is that you can't come up with anything better than
"well, there you have it" as proof.

> If Ed can understand Dick's negativism
>toward digital experimentation, why do you try to deny it?

I disagree with Ed, that's all. Is it not acceptable to disagree with your
ideas?
Do you want to silence all opposition? Seems like it.

I realize that you are "not serious" about any of this, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3239. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 11:13:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508071318.06141.00000470@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42504

In article <5BZB8.10146$lx3.413934617@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020504180645.26630.00000214@mb-cs.aol.com...
>
>> 2) FCC got rid of the old Novice because there were very few of them
>issued for
>> many years. For more than 15 years the Tech has been the first license of
>most
>> new hams. This was going on even before the Tech lost its code test in
>1991.
>> Back then, most newcomers looked at the requirements for Tech vs. Novice,
>> compared them to the privileges, and went straight to Tech.
>
>I disagree. I think most failed at actual Morse Code use, then "upgraded"
>to a license that would allow them to actually communicate.

The numbers tell a different story.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3240. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 11:13:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508071318.06141.00000469@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42505

In article <gwZB8.10141$8o3.413718814@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0205030353.5bbcfa8f@posting.google.com...
>> FCC has been deemphasizing code testing since 1975, when they first
>> tried to implement a nocodetest license. Then came the end of sending
>> tests, multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank options, and medical
>> waivers.
>
>Perhaps not. It appears that 1991 is the first year that code was
>deemphasized.
>
You don't know the relevant history, then.

In 1975, the FCC proposed a restructuring that involved a "dual ladder" system and no less than 7 (seven) distinct license classes. One of those classes was a VHF/UHF entry-level license with no code test at all.

The whole idea was roundly rejected by the majority of those who expressed opinions to the FCC.

In 1983 the FCC again proposed a no code test VHF/UHF license, and again strong opposition from those who bothered to express an opinon ended the matter - for a time.

Both of the above were serious proposals by the FCC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3241. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 12:50:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD91F12.6E4D3FCF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42507

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> On 06 May 2002 20:12:47 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
> >Understood that only "wualified attornies" are acceptible.
>
> How does one wualify an attorney?

With a Wouff Hong?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3242. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 13:25:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD92765.5BF97AA2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42508

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> I am like the child who points out that the self-appointed emperors have no
> logical clothes.

You seem more like a vampire bat who bites the emperor.

> It is not obvious to me. You are presuming your conclusion - again.

Nope, concluding the presumption just like many others on this newsgroup.
I made that posting for the purpose of testing for a negative response from
Dick. He didn't disappoint me. Ed also picked up on Dick's dislike for
digital experimentation. No doubt, so did the majority of readers of
this newsgroup.

> Youy are grasping at nonexistent straws, Cecil. "Well, there you have it"
> only has a negative connotation to you..

How can you make such a blatantly false statement after I published Ed's
response to Dick's statements? Later on in this posting, you admit your
above statement is a lie.

> You are avoiding the simple fact that you cannot produce any real proof
> of your assertion that W0EX is against "digital" experimentation by hams.

I produced it, Jim, and you denied its reality just like I knew you would.
So why should I waste time on a blinder-equipped closed-minded person
emotionally driven by an agenda?

> It is not substantive. It does not prove your point. It does not even support
> your point.

Of course it does, Jim. Only an idiot with an agenda would conclude otherwise.

> You edited out the rest of what W0EX wrote. Bad, very bad.

That's a lie. I did NOT edit out the rest of what W0EX wrote. That was Ed's
posting that I re-posted, not mine.

> >> I don't see anything in that post to indicate that W0EX is against
> >> experimentation of any kind by hams.
> >
> >Of course you don't, Jim.
>
> Because it's not there.

Of course it's there. You just refuse to admit it. Why am I not surprised? You refuse to admit anything that doesn't match your agenda including what a large effect nocode techs have had on the population of the ARS.

> >"Well, there you have it" is a negative response in virtually everyone's
> >book except yours.
>
> This must be one of those Texas/California language things. Maybe it comes
> from too much sun.

Again, it was Ed's posting that I re-posted. Do you think Ed is from Texas/ California?

> >With your deny-everything attitude, it is a waste of
> >time to go digging up old posts.
>
> What you're really saying is that you can't come up with anything better than
> "well, there you have it" as proof.

No, what I am saying is that it doesn't pay to mud wrestle with a pig. I get dirty and the pig loves it. There are at least a dozen earlier postings in which Dick was negative about digital experimentation. Why the hell do you think Dick is arguing loud and long against Carl's and my suggestions that digital experimentation is a good thing for hams to do?

> > If Ed can understand Dick's negativism
> >toward digital experimentation, why do you try to deny it?
>
> I disagree with Ed, that's all.

So you admit to lying when you said I was the only person who considers, "Well, there you have it", to be a negative response? And you were lying when you said it was a Texas/California thing? That's not like you, Jim, to trip yourself up all within the same posting. You are usually much more careful than that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3243. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 13:28:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD92815.6901A68B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42509

N2EY wrote:
> Both of the above were serious proposals by the FCC.

Moral: Hams should listen when the FCC is serious. The
FCC is not going to allow the inmates to run the asylum.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3244. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 14:31:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <ZEaC8.561$r1.233@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42510

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> You have, as everyone has seen, almost taken up arms against
> anyone dissing the ARRL since YOU were some kind of official
> district person there once...then you pull out the following gem of
> a PAST posting in an attempt to "prove" your far-sighted noble
> views.
>

I've 'defended' ARRL since the early 60's, because I think we need an organization of that stature working for us.

But ARRL is not some religion that must be embraced, forsaking all others. Some competition is a healthy thing, and I'd also support other organizations whose aims were for the future good of Amateur Radio. Also, I'm pro-code-use but anti-code-test.

In your monochrome black/white world these things are 'inconsistent', but in the real world there is a glorious spectrum of colors. Sorry if your narrow view is unable to grasp that notion.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
"A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of narrow little minds."
-- Ralph Waldo Emerson

3245. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 14:37:12 UTC
From: Rick <kf7qz@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3CD93818.1DC213B3@yahoo.com>
Source record: 42511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Charles drop the act, The Headers point right back to you.

Gads your lame

Martin Cernech wrote:
>
> Had no trouble accessing the site with Netscape 6.2.
> His site does say "Optimized for IE 6" so if lesser browsers won't
> work then I guess it's just "tuff titty" untill those people upgrade
> to IE which now has over 97% of the broswer share...
>
> The URL agian for those that missed it is
>
> http://www.ab7sl.com
>
> It's the nicest ham site I have ever visited and it is 100% FREE!!!
>
> Martin

3246. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 15:36:13 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <NBbC8.11953$6T5.1114974@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42512

>> "K7JEB"
>> So... Who can be king now?

> "Kï¿½HB"
> King Colin The First?

How about H.R.H.John McCain III?

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3247. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 16:56:11 UTC
From: CJ <willy@irs.gov>
Message-ID: <udim5eqm8f7431@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 42516
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Hello Rick,
I have no idea what in the world you are talking about...what are
"headers" anyway?
Lord bless you and your family.....hope to catch you on the air one of
these days.
Here is the link you asked about Rick....

Cushcraft R7 / R7000 "black box" photo w/component values, schematic,
trap illustration, high SWR fix tips,
and R7 / R7000 assembly -and- installation manuals all downloadable at
this link.....

http://www.ab7sl.com/index.html?row1col2=r7.html
---

73 / DX de Charles
AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
www.ab7sl.com

3248. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 17:29:32 UTC
From: Rick <kf7qz@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3CD9607C.CEBC98D8@yahoo.com>
Source record: 42518
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

> Here is the link you asked about Rick....

I Didnt ask about no $#*($#() Link

Gezzz you need professional help.

3249. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 17:31:19 UTC
From: Rick <kf7qz@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3CD960E7.E1420238@yahoo.com>
Source record: 42517
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

> I have no idea what in the world you are talking about...what are
> "headers" anyway

Headers are messag indicators or addresses that point to message origination. All the martin cernech messages "YOU" are creating point right back to you.

Lame

3250. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 18:10:16 UTC
From: CJ <willy@irs.gov>
Message-ID: <udiqgera3j3r6c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 42519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Hello Rick,
Sorry if I got you confused with someone else...I get so many
messages. My apologies...

--

73 / DX de Charles
AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
www.ab7sl.com

3251. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 18:11:45 UTC
From: CJ <willy@irs.gov>
Message-ID: <udiqj3jql5tc97@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 42520
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Hello Rick,
I think you may have me mixed up with somebody else. I don't know any "Martin" character and I'm sure nothing about him could "point back" to me. Sorry..you have me a bit confused....

--

73 / DX de Charles
AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
www.ab7sl.com

3252. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 18:11:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508141147.27628.00001164@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42522

>>It's almost a psychological maxim that radio amateurs are wanting
>>recognition on a "professional" level...hence the long-ago self-label
>>of "HAM." Saying "ham radio" instead of "amateur radio" is much
>>more self-satisfying and avoids carrying around all the emotional
>>connotation of "amateurism" as being of "lesser value."
>
> Now you are a psychologist, Lennie?

The statement still holds. Radio amateurs insist on dropping the
"amateur" description because of its emotional baggage of
negative connotation.

> Having BEEN an "Amateur" for 29 years, I can say with informed certainty
>that this is nothing but foolishness on your part.

QED. That sentence is a very personal objection to a perceived
personal negativism. It has no bearing on anything but one out
of over 600 thousand other radio amateurs' opinions.

The attempt to equate "professionalism" to an avocational
recreation is common among many amateurs.

> The term "Ham" was applied to Amateurs before there was any significant
>difference between "Amateurs" and what you term professionals.

See the ARRL definitions. The original term was coined BY
professional telegraphers as a negative description of amateur's
manual telegraphy skills...or lack of skills.

>>This seems to be very strong on the devotees who want to embrace
>>amateur radio as a Lifestyle, assuming a personna of expertise or
>>greatness through longevity and purely hobby activities of long tenure.
>
> If by this you mean that we take pride in what we do as both hobbyists
>or volunteers, then you'd be correct.

The self-description of personal activities is often glorified to obsessive
proportions...along with the imprecations that all "must" be as good
as the claimants or be thought "lesser." In other words, bragging.

The obsessive side is often glorified in the description of activities
of radio amateurs reported by the ARRL in its publications.

>Amateur Radio does take on a life of it's
>own...Of course we know this eats at you because you cannot, by your own
>inhibitions, ba a part of that life.

Obsession is a psychological disorder. It is not good for mental
health.

> Sucks to be you.

?

> And such similar "lifestyles" are not enjoyed by the devotee's of other
>pasttimes?

Yes. All activities, professional as well as non-professional have
cases of obsession. That other activities have such conditions
is not an excuse or a rationale for continuation.

>>Ryan, the general public has had a chance to be "educated" for half a
>>century of the existance of all kinds of media input. The Big Org up
>>near Hartford just hasn't done its job in getting media attention in all
>>that time.
>
> Lennie, Lennie, Lennie...lying agian.

Not a "lie." Despite the spin used in the ARRL's descriptions of
what it "does" to publicize amateur radio, the fact remains that
the ARRL has NOT succeeded in achieving any significant impact
in the public mind about amateur radio in a half century.

Denial of a clearly-observable fact is not an excuse/rationale.

>>The Big Org fools its members into thinking that "the word
>>is out to the public" when the most it does is to get the word to those
>>already IN the hobby.
>
> The only one you are fooling is yourself, Your Ineptness. Especially
>when we see evidence of this to the contrary in our everyday lives.

Those already IN a hobby get "evidence." Those NOT in a hobby
see very little, if any at all.

Those obsessed by an activity often presume to think for a very
large group of citizens (ego over-ride of thinking) and this disallows
their ability to properly publicize their hobby activities. That is a
negative, non-productive attitude in public relations.

> IE: Chattanooga Free Press, March 31st 2002, Page E1(Lifestyle
>Section), lead item. "In Internet Age, ham radio still attracts hobbyists".

Newspapers, local or regional, carry a great deal of diverse activity
articles with every edition. That ONE article out of a hundreds is
spotlighted is only proof of ONE activity. Newspaper readers are
not suddenly awed or interested just because an article covers an
activity that a claimant thinks is "important."

An examination of any newspaper will turn up many different articles
in each edition, covering a great variety of subjects and activities.

It is a common mistake to over-identify some activity published in real ink on real paper as "important." Editors and publishers select what activities, what news is considered "important to readers." It is really a selective activity by a very small group as to what a rather larger group will get to read. The heart of good public relations work is the convincing of that very small group of the "importance" of the PR target and that it should be published. That's been a fact of life in journalism since day one of newspapers and other periodicals.

What appears in all periodicals is what the editors think is "important." It is their choice, not the readers. This is true in all journalism. In an objective analysis, it can rightly be called a form of dictatorship since there MUST be preselection of reporting to fit finite budgets of news-print or air time.

> Notable in it's absence was any reference to a need for a degree in
>night-school engineering.

There is no such thing as "night-school engineering." College-credit courses in engineering requisites are the same whether formal classes are held in daylight hours or night-time hours. If formal classes are accredited, those credits are transferrable to other accredited schools.

This was not in the subject thread, but some individuals are obsessed with trying to put down others for succeeding in something. Again, obsession with an activity is not mentally healthy.

>>The general public will perceive "ham radio" as a hobby, about on the
>>same level as scanning listeners or CB users or those playing around
>>with FRS handhelds. Take any formal or informal poll on that subject
>>and the statement will be true.
>
> And I can also take a poll that asks what they think about the moon
>landings and many think it was staged and never happened. Do I believe
>them...???

Everyone has a free choice on "what to believe."

Any general public poll on the Apollo project will show that the general public believes the moon landings were accomplished fact. That subject is not under discussion.

>>An interesting sidelight to the "serviceman" type of hobbyist is the
>>demographics of US amateur radio. Flip through any amateur radio
>>publication collection spanning the last half century, observe the
>>pictures of various hams and "profile" them. There are two very
>>major profile aspects: Hams are male, hams are white.
>
> OK...and what does this prove?

The proof should be obvious. By clear and present proof in the form of photographs in amateur radio periodicals, the overwhelming majority of hams are male white men. By appearance and text

description, the majority are over thirtysomething at the time of
the photograph.

That sexual-racial bias belies the repeated statements that "amateur
radio is for 'all'."

>>NB: G3PLX's surname of "Martinez" is not exactly
>>in the Anglo-Saxon fashion.
>
> Another racist reference? Of what importance is this fellow's heritage
>other than a pitiful newsgroup travesty perpetrated by a lonely old man with
>no meaningful lifestyle of his own?

Peter Martinez is a clever, informed innovator in the radio arts and
has been active in such for over a quarter century in the UK. His
work has been published by the RSGB in their "Radio
Communications" periodical for a quarter century, most notably
in Pat Hawker's "Technical Topics" column.

The ethnic origin of the surname "Martinez" is Spanish, possibly
Portuguese. That surname is not common to the British Isles.
Surnames are a relatively recent (in terms of written human history)
to the general western European societies.

> More putziness by someone who should know better. This is how you
>generate respect for "professional engineers"...???
>
> You KNOW our opinion on that......

That quote is simply personal opinion which is not in the subject
thread. The style of the quote is common to obsessed, ignorant
individuals who cannot coherently argue on a subject but must
resort to any manner of personal insults.

The pity (to amateur radio) is that the individual quoted is a public
example of claimed longevity in a recreational radio activity and
claims to "speak for the amateur radio community."

3253. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 18:11:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508141148.27628.00001165@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 42521

In article <nM%B8.10266$Xh6.418671956@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.gvrgmn4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>> On Mon, 06 May 2002 21:51:21 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>> >> >I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently the
>> >rules
>> >> >state we cannot use our identifying callsigns,
>> >>
>> >> Where do you see that?
>> >
>> >Phil, it was decide on here a couple of years ago.
>>
>> But you said "the rules state". Where in the Rules does it so state?
>
>I didn't say anything about the rules, just that "we" decided. Look, if an
>ad hoc group can decide to administer code exams via Farnsworth rather than
>Morse as specified in the "rules," certainly r.r.a.p. can decide not to
>permit Part 97 callsigns on Part 95 radio. Its called anarchy. Its OK,
>that's how things are done now.

Part 97 Title 47 CFR does NOT state "word rate" for test element 1 nor does the old CCITT document state any "word rate." The only thing about International Morse Code insofar as code formation is the ratio of length to dots and dashes and spacing between characters. The word rate can be ANYTHING.

Phil admitted to such in a past exchange but is unwilling to bring it up again. He implied that it was "small potatoes" and "didn't matter." It was an oversight on the part of the rule-makers.

>> Citations to r.r.a.p. postings are not acceptable in most legal
>> proceedings, although I've seen citations to sources that were
>> even weirder...
>
>Phil, what is your most recent Novice subband experience?

I think it was right after he learned to type on a keyboard.

See "wualified" as the cite.

3254. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 18:36:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gvst1p6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42523

On Wed, 08 May 2002 02:08:19 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>> >> >I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently the
>> >rules
>> >> >state we cannot use our identifying callsigns,
>> >>
>> >> Where do you see that?
>> >
>> >Phil, it was decide on here a couple of years ago.
>>
>> But you said "the rules state". Where in the Rules does it so state?
>
>I didn't say anything about the rules, just that "we" decided.

The statement quoted above plainly says: "Although apparently
the rules state we cannot use our identifying callsigns..."

I asked WHERE in the rules you find this. Are you purposely
avoiding this or just plain dense?

Put up or shut up time.

>Look, if an
>ad hoc group can decide to administer code exams via Farnsworth rather than
>Morse as specified in the "rules," certainly r.r.a.p. can decide not to
>permit Part 97 callsigns on Part 95 radio.

Voluntarily deciding not to use his/her amateur call sign as an
ID during CB operation is an individual choice of the licensed
amateur and is perfectly acceptable ynder CB rules.

Only the FCC has the authority to change that by either forbidding
the use of an amateur call sign during CB operations by persons who
also are amateur licensees or by mandating some other format of ID.
The FCC has done neither.

>Its called anarchy. Its OK, that's how things are done now.

Not on my watch.....

>Phil, what is your most recent Novice subband experience?

Fifty years ago when I was KN2ASP. "Novice subbands" has nothing to
do with use of amateur call signs by licensed amateurs when they
operate CB radios in accordance with CB rules.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3255. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 18:36:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gvst657.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42524

On Wed, 08 May 2002 07:50:26 -0500, CAM wrote:

>> How does one wualify an attorney?
>
>With a Wouff Hong?

With the business end of a 250 watt soldering iron..... <ggg>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

(Who has wualified in that manner in the past).

3256. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 18:52:42 UTC
From: Rick <kf7qz@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3CD973FA.C20A049@yahoo.com>
Source record: 42525
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Nope nice try

You see Martin Chernech never appears anywhere else he is brand new.

Coincidently He only posts about your web page.

He also posts from Cable one with an IP almost exactly the same as yours which is a dial up which assigns a new IP everytime you come on.

If you think Im buying your Nieve routine Im not. You see google saves all your postings with your IPs. Your now trying with your recent messages to cover your tracks. But the tracks are all over the place.

Your trying to use this Martin routine to avoid killfiles because your not getting attention.

What you need is professional help.

3257. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 19:20:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD97A98.C9F654AA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42526

K7JEB wrote:
>
> "Kï¿½HB"
> > King Colin The First?
>
> How about H.R.H.John McCain III?

Is that the same guy who was brainwashed by the communists?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3258. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 20:31:29 UTC
From: CJ <willy@irs.gov>
Message-ID: <udj2p3p8arod14@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 42527
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Rick said...
>He also posts from Cable one with an IP almost exactly the same as
yours
>which is a dial up which assigns a new IP everytime you come on.

Hello Rick,
Sorry Rick....I am not on dialup. I use cable modem. Obviously Rick if
this guy doesn't have the - exact same -IP as me (cable modem IP's are
static) then it sure as hell couldn't be me.
Besides Mr Magoo..Cableone has ISP service in 16 states and over 60
different cities...
Nice try but you stink as a detective. Keep your day job!!!

--

73 / DX de Charles
AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
www.ab7sl.com

3259. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 20:35:47 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <VQfC8.53349$tT1.55960225@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 42528

Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:_kZB8.10130$wd3.413437173@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:f7d9a152.0205071219.2aab53a0@posting.google.com...
> > This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
> > But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
> > hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.
> >
> > If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
> > be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
> > astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
> >
> > Just think:
> > 1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community
> > knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
> > 2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be
> > introduced to it for the first time ever.
> > 3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for
> > old men.
> > 4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of
> > kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be
> > immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important,
> > as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at
> > a young age.
> > 5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the
> > first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts.
> > If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .
> >
> > Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> > usenet@@@jasonhsu.com
> > http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html
>
> Jason, the "Old Hands" on this group don't necessarily want young people
or
> even more people in amateur radio.
<<snip>>

Whoa!

I guess you could call me an old hand, but I welcome new people. It is a
neccesity to get new people into the hobby. I relish the chance to talk to
young hams and hear their
enthusiasm. My CW contacts with 10 year old Extras are highlighted in the
log. I may

be "old" (54), but I don't THINK old and I have no patience with old
buzzards who are
stuck in 1960, wear fedora hats, and go around grumping about how the young
hams will
ruin the hobby. I say, BRING 'EM ON!

Jerry
K4KWH
>
> Anyway, I think its a great idea.
>
>

3260. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 20:44:15 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <IYfC8.53393$tT1.56002076@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 42529

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:473F952AE708F8E3.9CE06B3DBDC9CDEA.337D16E861A1246C@lp.airnews.net...
> On 7 May 2002 13:19:12 -0700, jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote:
>
> >If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
> >be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
> >astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
>
> Hopefully they won't let him use the good radio, but will send him
> outside to try it with an HT.
>
> Better still, make him walk home afterward.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

Joe, why do you say that? Every generation has its pop idols that were
grumped about
by old buzzards with their lips run out: Elvis in the 50s, the Beach Boys,
the Beatles in the
60s, and so on. My dear old Dad frumped and grumped about the Beatles
saying that
those mop-headed deviates (this was in 1965) would ruin the youth and
destroy the country in 25 years. Well, they didn't, and the music was mild
compared to some of to-
day's explicit lyrics, but, like the pop stars of the past, these will grow
old as well.

I think having pop "heros" and singers, or whatever, use and endorse ham
radio is a
very good idea. Let's get the kids involved, let's lead the way, or get OUT
of the way.

Jerry
K4KWH

3261. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 20:56:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <0igC8.11590$kN1.442539323@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42530

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020508141148.27628.00001165@mb-bj.aol.com...
> In article <nM%B8.10266$Xh6.418671956@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.gvrgmn4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> >> On Mon, 06 May 2002 21:51:21 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
> >>
> >> >> >I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently
the
> >> >rules
> >> >> >state we cannot use our identifying callsigns,
> >> >>
> >> >> Where do you see that?
> >> >
> >> >Phil, it was decide on here a couple of years ago.
> >>
> >> But you said "the rules state". Where in the Rules does it so state?
> >
> >I didn't say anything about the rules, just that "we" decided. Look, if
an
> >ad hoc group can decide to administer code exams via Farnsworth rather
than
> >Morse as specified in the "rules," certainly r.r.a.p. can decide not to
> >permit Part 97 callsigns on Part 95 radio. Its called anarchy. Its OK,
> >that's how things are done now.
>
> Part 97 Title 47 CFR does NOT state "word rate" for test element
> 1 nor does the old CCITT document state any "word rate." The
> only thing about International Morse Code insofar as code
> formation is the ratio of length to dots and dashes and spacing
> between characters. The word rate can be ANYTHING.

Actually, it can't unless all other parameters of "the international Morse
code" are violated.

§97.503 Element standards.
(a) A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that the examinee
has the ability to send correctly by hand and to receive correctly by ear
texts in the international Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed,
using all the letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma, question
mark, slant mark and prosigns AR, BT and SK.
Element 1: 5 words per minute.

> Phil admitted to such in a past exchange but is unwilling to bring
> it up again. He implied that it was "small potatoes" and "didn't
> matter." It was an oversight on the part of the rule-makers.

Why don't these guys be honest with themselves and just get the rules
changed?

> >> Citations to r.r.a.p. postings are not acceptable in most legal
> >> proceedings, although I've seen citations to sources that were
> >> even weirder...
> >
> >Phil, what is your most recent Novice subband experience?
>
> I think it was right after he learned to type on a keyboard.
>
> See "wualified" as the cite.

3262. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 21:07:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <fsgC8.11600$812.442938638@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42531

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gvst1p6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 08 May 2002 02:08:19 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >> >> >I still think we need to take back that band. Although apparently
the
> >> >rules
> >> >> >state we cannot use our identifying callsigns,
> >> >>
> >> >> Where do you see that?
> >> >
> >> >Phil, it was decide on here a couple of years ago.
> >>
> >> But you said "the rules state". Where in the Rules does it so state?
> >
> >I didn't say anything about the rules, just that "we" decided.
>
> The statement quoted above plainly says: "Although apparently
> the rules state we cannot use our identifying callsigns..."
>
> I asked WHERE in the rules you find this. Are you purposely
> avoiding this or just plain dense?
>
> Put up or shut up time.

I didn't make that statement. I said we just decided. Just like the VEC's
decided to violate the Morse code standard, whatever it might be. That's
how things are being done today.

Phil, you're getting testy. Time to take a break from whatever is stressing
you.

> >Look, if an
> >ad hoc group can decide to administer code exams via Farnsworth rather
than
> >Morse as specified in the "rules," certainly r.r.a.p. can decide not to
> >permit Part 97 callsigns on Part 95 radio.
>
> Voluntarily deciding not to use his/her amateur call sign as an
> ID during CB operation is an individual choice of the licensed
> amateur and is perfectly acceptable ynder CB rules.

Only if you do so phonetically; non-standard phonetics preferred. Saying
your callsign as it appears on your license isn't allowed.

> Only the FCC has the authority to change that by either forbidding
> the use of an amateur call sign during CB operations by persons who
> also are amateur licensees or by mandating some other format of ID.
> The FCC has done neither.
>
> >Its called anarchy. Its OK, that's how things are done now.
>
> Not on my watch.....

Your watch is over. We decided that, too.

> >Phil, what is your most recent Novice subband experience?
>
> Fifty years ago when I was KN2ASP. "Novice subbands" has nothing to
> do with use of amateur call signs by licensed amateurs when they
> operate CB radios in accordance with CB rules.

You're right, it doesn't. And it has nothing to do with anyone's
credibility to comment on the ARRL Novice subband refarming. You might want
to let Crony Jim in on that nasty little secret.

73, Brian/N0iMD

3263. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 21:09:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qugC8.11602$I22.442967240@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42532

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020508071317.06141.00000468@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3CD7E208.8AA9748E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
>
> >> All I do is ask simple, direct questions ...
> >
> >Sure you do, Jim, simple-minded primrose path questions.
>
> That's your method, Cecil, not mine.
>
> You just don't like my questions because the answers disprove your
> baseless assertions.
>
> I am like the child who points out that the self-appointed emperors have
no
> logical clothes.

If you are like a child, then "If" shouldn't be a problem for you. Unless
Brian uses it.

3264. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 21:11:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xwgC8.11605$x72.443077814@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42533

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD92765.5BF97AA2@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > I am like the child who points out that the self-appointed emperors have
no
> > logical clothes.
>
> You seem more like a vampire bat who bites the emperor.
>
> > It is not obvious to me. You are presuming your conclusion - again.
>
> Nope, concluding the presumption just like many others on this newsgroup.
> I made that posting for the purpose of testing for a negative response
from
> Dick. He didn't disappoint me. Ed also picked up on Dick's dislike for
> digital experimentation. No doubt, so did the majority of readers of
> this newsgroup.

Null Hypothesis: Show me a positive response from Dick.

Case closed.

3265. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 21:15:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hAgC8.11607$vK1.442476675@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42534

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CD8ABBD.8E36385B@earthlink.net...
>
> Did I misstate something? Are you a radio amateur? Are you an ARRL
> member? Do you have any connection whatever with amateur radio?

You forgot to ask what his most recent Novice subband experience was.

3266. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 21:20:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <uEgC8.11609$Ha2.443137292@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42535

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:VQfC8.53349$tT1.55960225@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
>
> Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:_kZB8.10130$wd3.413437173@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > Jason, the "Old Hands" on this group don't necessarily want young people
> > or even more people in amateur radio.
> <<snip>>
>
> Whoa!
>
> I guess you could call me an old hand, but I welcome new people. It is a
> neccesity to get new people into the hobby. I relish the chance to talk
to
> young hams and hear their
> enthusiasm. My CW contacts with 10 year old Extras are highlighted in the
> log. I may
> be "old" (54), but I don't THINK old and I have no patience with old
> buzzards who are
> stuck in 1960, wear fedora hats, and go around grumping about how the
young
> hams will
> ruin the hobby. I say, BRING 'EM ON!
>
> Jerry
> K4KWH

Agreed.

Jerry, just one question to determine your credibility: When was your last
Novice subband experience?

Thanks, Brian/N0iMD

3267. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 21:24:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QHgC8.11615$Ch2.443303056@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42536

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020508071318.06141.00000470@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <5BZB8.10146$lx3.413934617@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> Back then, most newcomers looked at the requirements for Tech vs.
Novice,
> >> compared them to the privileges, and went straight to Tech.
> >
> >I disagree. I think most failed at actual Morse Code use, then
"upgraded"
> >to a license that would allow them to actually communicate.
>
> The numbers tell a different story.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Show the numbers.

3268. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 21:30:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CNgC8.11621$qs2.443548784@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42537

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020508071318.06141.00000469@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <gwZB8.10141$8o3.413718814@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:9f4bfe89.0205030353.5bbcfa8f@posting.google.com...
> >> FCC has been deemphasizing code testing since 1975, when they first
> >> tried to implement a nocodetest license. Then came the end of sending
> >> tests, multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank options, and medical
> >> waivers.
> >
> >Perhaps not. It appears that 1991 is the first year that code was
> >deemphasized.
> >
> You don't know the relevant history, then.

I know that 1991 the code exam was removed from Technician licensing. I
know of no other period in time that the FCC issued licenses without a code
examination, unless it was prior to WW ONE.

> In 1975, the FCC proposed a restructuring that involved a "dual ladder"
system
> and no less than 7 (seven) distinct license classes. One of those classes
was a
> VHF/UHF entry-level license with no code test at all.

Proposed? How does this deemphasize anything?

"I propose that those without recent Novice subband experience be restricted
from commenting on the ARRL Novice subband refarming proposal."

See, it doesn't work.

> The whole idea was roundly rejected by the majority of those who expressed
> opinions to the FCC.

OK?

> In 1983 the FCC again proposed a no code test VHF/UHF license, and again
strong
> opposition from those who bothered to express an opinon ended the matter -
for
> a time.

OK?

> Both of the above were serious proposals by the FCC.

OK Jim, I think I'm beginning to get it. Intent = Action.

"I seriously propose that those without recent Novice subband experience be restricted from commenting on the ARRL Novice subband refarming proposal."

There, that should work.

73, Brian/N0iMD

3269. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 21:31:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <wOgC8.11622$3u2.443573513@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42538

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CD92815.6901A68B@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Both of the above were serious proposals by the FCC.
>
> Moral: Hams should listen when the FCC is serious. The
> FCC is not going to allow the inmates to run the asylum.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Oh stop it, Cecil. I seriously propose you stop it.

3270. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 21:53:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508175314.07451.00007731@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42539

>Subject: Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/08/02 14:11 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020508141147.27628.00001164@mb-bj.aol.com

>QED. That sentence is a very personal objection to a perceived
>personal negativism. It has no bearing on anything but one out
>of over 600 thousand other radio amateurs' opinions.
>
>The attempt to equate "professionalism" to an avocational
>recreation is common among many amateurs.

And the attempt to equate "professionalism" to a misspent career is common among certain non-licensed antagonists on RRAP.

>> If by this you mean that we take pride in what we do as both hobbyists
>>or volunteers, then you'd be correct.
>
>The self-description of personal activities is often glorified to obsessive
>proportions...along with the imprecations that all "must" be as good
>as the claimants or be thought "lesser." In other words, bragging.

Oh...I see...You mean kinda like your claims to having passed over 1.2 million messages as a communications center clerk in the Army, Lennie?

>The obsessive side is often glorified in the description of activities
>of radio amateurs reported by the ARRL in its publication.

Can you, Leonard H. Anderson, DISPROVE anything that is in ANY ARRL publication, from inception to today?

If not, we must assume you have nothing to say but to be abusive and denigrating.

>>Amateur Radio does take on a life of it's
>>own...Of course we know this eats at you because you cannot, by your own
>>inhibitions, ba a part of that life.
>
>Obsession is a psychological disorder. It is not good for mental
>health.

For a guy with over 30,000 posts to various newsgroups for an "avocation" in which he has asserted no interest in being a part of, this is funny...Waaaaaaaaay funny!

>> Sucks to be you.
>

>?

Do I need to say it slower? S u c k s t o b e y o u.

>> Lennie, Lennie, Lennie...lying agian.
>
>Not a "lie." Despite the spin used in the ARRL's descriptions...

Lennie, there is no "spin" in any ARRL publications. Period. Not once in 80 years has anyone been able to "prove" as unsubstantiated or "obsessive" anything that has ever been published in an ARRL book or periodical.

This is, again, a lie by you. A KNOWN pathological liar with his own obsessive-compulsive disorder to denigrate all those who show you to be what you really are....A loser.

>An examination of any newspaper will turn up many different articles
>in each edition, covering a great variety of subjects and activities.

THAT was "spin", Lennie. At first you decry the lack of any "coverage" by the general media, then when presented with an unmitigable reference, you try to nay-say it.

Again...sucks to be you.

>It is a common mistake to over-identify some activity published in
>real ink on real paper as "important."

Well Golly Gee Whiz, Your Lyingship, YOU have been the one saying that if it isn't reported in some media OTHER than an ARRL publication, it's not important!

The article I cited went to over 250,000 homes in paper, and who knows how many ohers that see it on line?

>There is no such thing as "night-school engineering."

There should be. You spent 1/4 of your "career" trying to get a degree. Still didn't add up to much in the electronics field.

>The proof should be obvious. By clear and present proof in the form
>of photographs in amateur radio periodicals, the overwhelming
>majority of hams are male white men.

You still have done nothing except try to inflame some non-existant argument over why any one man or woman takes an interest in Amatuer Radio, other than to try and detour the concersation from your pathological lying and denigration of Amateur Radio in general and some Hams in particular.

>That sexual-racial bias belies the repeated statements that "amateur
>radio is for 'all'."

Still haven't provided me any "evidence" that anyone who desires to participate in Amateur Radio is denied the opportunity to do so.

Shall we, by your logic, NOT put ANY pictures of ANY Amateurs in the periodicals that show a person's ace or gender? Shall we edit ALL texts that express any gender at all? All texts will refer to any person discussed by initials only? Shall all pictures be strictly of hardware? No people?

THAT'S your vision of Amateur Radio? A cold, barren wasteland of faceless digital pulses?..

WHY am I not surprised?

>The ethnic origin of the surname "Martinez" is....

Irrelevant. As is gender, age or race. Only YOU have brought it to the table, Lennie, and rather poorly I migh add.

>The pity (to amateur radio) is that the individual quoted is a public
>example of claimed longevity in a recreational radio activity and
>claims to "speak for the amateur radio community."

As opposed to Lennie, who speaks for no one except himself, and poorly at that..

The REAL pity is that you CLAIM all this knowledge...all this skill...and all this expertise, yet with almost every post you make you only further lay yourself prostrate to your own ignorance.

Why is that?

3271. Scientology Takes Control of Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 22:10:17 UTC
From: Phil <Phil_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <abc7o9028ja@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42542
Cross-posted to: alt.religion.scientology,rec.radio.amateur.policy

From the ARRL.org web site

Ham radio could have role in Phenomenon sequel: Amateur Radio is poised to hit the big screen yet again in a movie tentatively titled Phenomenon II. Phenomenon debuted in 1996 and featured John Travolta and his ham operator friend Forest Whitaker. In one scene, Travolta's character appears to be able to copy RTTY transmissions by ear. For the original Phenomenon movie, ARRL provided several props for the ham radio shack. The sequel is still in the very early stages of development. A researcher working on checking facts in the script contacted ARRL to ask if operators actually used the term "CQ" when initiating contacts. She also told ARRL Media Relations Manager Jennifer Hagy, N1TDY, that the possibility exists for the creation of a television series based on the Phenomenon movies. Hagy offered further assistance if needed. No further details were immediately available.

3272. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 22:17:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gvt45e8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42540

On Wed, 08 May 2002 21:07:23 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>> I asked WHERE in the rules you find this. Are you purposely
>> avoiding this or just plain dense?

>I didn't make that statement.

>> Voluntarily deciding not to use his/her amateur call sign as an
>> ID during CB operation is an individual choice of the licensed
>> amateur and is perfectly acceptable ynder CB rules.
>
>Only if you do so phonetically; non-standard phonetics preferred. Saying
>your callsign as it appears on your license isn't allowed.

OK, my statement above applies: Show us where in the rules that
is not allowed.

>> >Its called anarchy. Its OK, that's how things are done now.
>>
>> Not on my watch.....
>
>Your watch is over. We decided that, too.

As an active attorney pursuing my clients' interests, my watch is
far from over.

Decide that where you will.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3273. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 22:31:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abc95p$5u7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42541

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gvt45e8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 08 May 2002 21:07:23 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >> I asked WHERE in the rules you find this. Are you purposely
> >> avoiding this or just plain dense?
>
> >I didn't make that statement.
>
> >> Voluntarily deciding not to use his/her amateur call sign as an
> >> ID during CB operation is an individual choice of the licensed
> >> amateur and is perfectly acceptable ynder CB rules.
> >
> >Only if you do so phonetically; non-standard phonetics preferred. Saying
> >your callsign as it appears on your license isn't allowed.
>
> OK, my statement above applies: Show us where in the rules that
> is not allowed.

I agree with Phil on this. There is NO prohibition as to using
ANY name/ID/call sign on CB. Ditto that on FRS too.

If anyone thinks otherwise, you'll need to show the rule that
clearly prohibits such use.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3274. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 23:02:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD9AE92.1D4D2D7F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42543

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> Can you, Leonard H. Anderson, DISPROVE anything that is in ANY ARRL
> publication, from inception to today?

Hopefully, many many April articles.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3275. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 23:10:38 UTC
From: kf7qz@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3cd9b03d.2135351@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 42544
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

> Nice try but you stink as a detective. Keep your day job!!!

> Nice try but you stink as a detective. Keep your day job!!!

Actually using Google Ive got you nailed, Cable modem can and do
change IPs. I have one and mine changes if I wish. Release renew all
sound familiar.

Nice try, what a lame attempt at not using your own mail address.

Truely pathedic. Signs of a spammer. Whats next, relay attempts

If you didnt reside on Verio and Cable one two of the biggest
Spamhouses in the net.

Oh well, watch yourself

Oh and using a Reply to of wily@irs.gov. You know using a false
email like that and causing problems with the IRS.GOV mail servers
could land you in jail.

Try a different EMAIL addy. Proves my point 100%

Loser

3276. Re: W9INN Antennas Page now ONLINE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-08 23:44:53 UTC
From: CJ <rick@commspeed.net>
Message-ID: <udje42jrp7atb3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 42545
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Hello Rick,
I have a static IP. Go take a nap Sherlock....
Geesh...what is wrong with the teenagers these days!!!

--

73 / DX de Charles
AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
www.ab7sl.com

3277. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 01:50:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020508215036.24943.00001379@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 42547

In article <5BZB8.10146$lx3.413934617@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Back then, most newcomers looked at the requirements for Tech vs. Novice,
>> compared them to the privileges, and went straight to Tech.
>
>I disagree. I think most failed at actual Morse Code use, then "upgraded"
>to a license that would allow them to actually communicate.

Brian:

What do you mean by that? When I was a Novice back in '81, I "actually communicated" with plenty of my fellow hams, utilizing my Novice CW privileges. In fact, I was trying for a Novice WAS, but my problem was I kept working all kinds of DX! Are you saying that it was impossible for Novices to communicate, or that it was just impossible for YOU to communicate *as* a Novice (assuming you were one)?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3278. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 01:50:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020508215037.24943.00001380@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 42546

In article <f7d9a152.0205071219.2aab53a0@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
>But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
>hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.
>
>If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
>be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
>astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
>
>Just think:
>1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community
>knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
>2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be
>introduced to it for the first time ever.
>3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for
>old men.
>4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of
>kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be
>immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important,
>as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at
>a young age.
>5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the
>first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts.
>If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .

Jason:

I'm assuming Mr. Bass is a licensed amateur radio operator. If so,
what is his call sign?

Assuming he *is* a licensed ham, considering his vast celebrity,
particularly among young people, what has he done to advance
the cause of amateur radio recruitment so far? Shirley, he must
know that he is in a uniquely favorable position to make ham
radio known to the young people whom constitute his audience,
and are making him wealthy. If he is not aware of this, I would
hope that the ARRL would approach him and request his help
in amateur radio recruitment efforts aimed at young people.

It would appear that there is a whole lot Lance Bass can and
should be doing for ham radio before he ever gets a ride into
space.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3279. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 02:07:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020508220715.13101.00001468@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 42548

In article <3CD92765.5BF97AA2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> I am like the child who points out that the self-appointed emperors have no
>> logical clothes.
>
>You seem more like a vampire bat who bites the emperor.

How? All I do is point out facts and ask simple questions. Of course you
may find that Truth stings.
>
>> It is not obvious to me. You are presuming your conclusion - again.
>
>Nope, concluding the presumption just like many others on this newsgroup.

So you admit it.

>I made that posting for the purpose of testing for a negative response from
>Dick. He didn't disappoint me. Ed also picked up on Dick's dislike for
>digital experimentation. No doubt, so did the majority of readers of
>this newsgroup.

In other words, you trolled. And you took W0EX's response in a negative
way because you were prejudiced to do so.
>
>> Youy are grasping at nonexistent straws, Cecil. "Well, there you have it"
>> only has a negative connotation to you..
>
>How can you make such a blatantly false statement after I published Ed's
>response to Dick's statements?

I don't see Ed backing you up.

>Later on in this posting, you admit your above statement is a lie.

Nope. My statement is not a lie. Perhaps it's a mistake.
>
>> You are avoiding the simple fact that you cannot produce any real proof
>> of your assertion that W0EX is against "digital" experimentation by hams.
>
>I produced it, Jim, and you denied its reality just like I knew you would.

You produced a single post, and your prejudiced impression of a single
statement.

>So why should I waste time on a blinder-equipped closed-minded person
>emotionally driven by an agenda?

In other words, you don't have proof, so you attack the messenger.

>> It is not substantive. It does not prove your point. It does not even
>support
>> your point.
>
>Of course it does, Jim.

Not to me, it doesn't.

>Only an idiot with an agenda would conclude otherwise.

More nonproof.

>> You edited out the rest of what W0EX wrote. Bad, very bad.
>
>That's a lie. I did NOT edit out the rest of what W0EX wrote. That was Ed's
>posting that I re-posted, not mine.

You edited out the part about the lack of ROI.
>
>> >> I don't see anything in that post to indicate that W0EX is against
>> >> experimentation of any kind by hams.
>> >
>> >Of course you don't, Jim.
>>
>> Because it's not there.
>
>Of course it's there. You just refuse to admit it.

It's not there. You imagine it.

>> >"Well, there you have it" is a negative response in virtually everyone's
>> >book except yours.
>>
>> This must be one of those Texas/California language things. Maybe it comes
>> from too much sun.
>
>Again, it was Ed's posting that I re-posted. Do you think Ed is from Texas/
>California?

I don't know where Ed is from originally. I do know that he is not backing you
up on this.
>
>> >With your deny-everything attitude, it is a waste of
>> >time to go digging up old posts.
>>
>> What you're really saying is that you can't come up with anything better
>than
>> "well, there you have it" as proof.
>

>No, what I am saying is that it doesn't pay to mud wrestle with a pig. I get
>dirty and the pig loves it. There are at least a dozen earlier postings in
>which Dick was negative about digital experimentation.

So dig them up and repost them. If there are so many, it should be easy for
you.
You have already spent more time trying to intimidate me with "well, there you
have it"
than it would take to dig up a dozen posts. That tells me you know I'm right,
but you
cannot admit it publicly.

> Why the

[expletive deleted]

>do you
>think Dick is arguing loud and long against Carl's and my suggestions that
>digital experimentation is a good thing for hams to do?

I don't see him arguing that at all. What I DO see is W0EX pointing out that
most hams
have neither the time, the training nor the inclination to do serious
development work.
And the ROI (that's one of YOUR pet reasons, btw) just isn't there for most
hams.

>> > If Ed can understand Dick's negativism
>> >toward digital experimentation, why do you try to deny it?
>>
>> I disagree with Ed, that's all.
>
>So you admit to lying when you said I was the only person who considers,
>"Well, there you have it", to be a negative response?

Nope. It wasn't a lie.

Might be a mistake.

But I don't see Ed backing you up on that little phrase being universally
negative.

> And you were lying
>when you said it was a Texas/California thing?

Nope. I wrote:

"This must be one of those Texas/California language things. Maybe it comes
from too much sun."

Again, that might be a mistake. But considering some of the weird word-usage I
see from Texas and California residents, it seems like a good possibility.

What's really interesting is how you resort to name calling when someone
disagrees with you. Let's see, in just this one post, you call me:

"vampire bat"

"blinder-equipped closed-minded person emotionally driven by an agenda"

"idiot"

"pig"

Is this supposed to convince me of the correctness of your arguments?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3280. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 02:08:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aSkC8.11430$8u7.523990473@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42549

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gvt45e8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 08 May 2002 21:07:23 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >> I asked WHERE in the rules you find this. Are you purposely
> >> avoiding this or just plain dense?
>
> >I didn't make that statement.
>
> >> Voluntarily deciding not to use his/her amateur call sign as an
> >> ID during CB operation is an individual choice of the licensed
> >> amateur and is perfectly acceptable ynder CB rules.
> >
> >Only if you do so phonetically; non-standard phonetics preferred. Saying
> >your callsign as it appears on your license isn't allowed.
>
> OK, my statement above applies: Show us where in the rules that
> is not allowed.
>
> >> >Its called anarchy. Its OK, that's how things are done now.
> >>
> >> Not on my watch.....
> >
> >Your watch is over. We decided that, too.
>
> As an active attorney pursuing my clients' interests, my watch is
> far from over.
>
> Decide that where you will.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil, relax. Its not in the rules, and you can keep practicing law. You
just can't use code on CB.

73, Brian

3281. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 02:10:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%TkC8.11434$DM6.522608993@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42550

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:abc95p$5u7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.gvt45e8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On Wed, 08 May 2002 21:07:23 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > >> I asked WHERE in the rules you find this. Are you purposely
> > >> avoiding this or just plain dense?
> >
> > >I didn't make that statement.
> >
> > >> Voluntarily deciding not to use his/her amateur call sign as an
> > >> ID during CB operation is an individual choice of the licensed
> > >> amateur and is perfectly acceptable ynder CB rules.
> > >
> > >Only if you do so phonetically; non-standard phonetics preferred.
Saying
> > >your callsign as it appears on your license isn't allowed.
> >
> > OK, my statement above applies: Show us where in the rules that
> > is not allowed.
>
> I agree with Phil on this. There is NO prohibition as to using
> ANY name/ID/call sign on CB. Ditto that on FRS too.
>
> If anyone thinks otherwise, you'll need to show the rule that
> clearly prohibits such use.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I'll have to agree with Phil as well. Anarchy doesn't work without guns.

3282. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 02:15:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qZkC8.11444$do7.523772345@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42551

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020508215037.24943.00001380@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <f7d9a152.0205071219.2aab53a0@posting.google.com>,
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>
> >This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
> >But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
> >hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.
> >
> >If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
> >be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
> >astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
> >
> >Just think:
> >1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community
> >knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
> >2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be
> >introduced to it for the first time ever.
> >3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for
> >old men.
> >4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of
> >kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be
> >immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important,
> >as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at
> >a young age.
> >5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the
> >first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts.
> >If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .
>
> Jason:
>
> I'm assuming Mr. Bass is a licensed amateur radio operator. If so,
> what is his call sign?
>
> Assuming he *is* a licensed ham, considering his vast celebrity,
> particularly among young people, what has he done to advance
> the cause of amateur radio recruitment so far? Shirley, he must
> know that he is in a uniquely favorable position to make ham
> radio known to the young people whom constitute his audience,
> and are making him wealthy. If he is not aware of this, I would
> hope that the ARRL would approach him and request his help
> in amateur radio recruitment efforts aimed at young people.
>
> It would appear that there is a whole lot Lance Bass can and

> should be doing for ham radio before he ever gets a ride into
> space.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, Lance has no obligation to do anything for amateur radio. Why do you say he could and should...?

Brian

3283. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 02:20:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <22IC8.11449$LV6.522889542@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42552

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020508215036.24943.00001379@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <5BZB8.10146$lx3.413934617@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Back then, most newcomers looked at the requirements for Tech vs.
Novice,
> >> compared them to the privileges, and went straight to Tech.
> >
> >I disagree. I think most failed at actual Morse Code use, then
"upgraded"
> >to a license that would allow them to actually communicate.
>
> Brian:
>
> What do you mean by that? When I was a Novice back in '81, I
> "actually communicated" with plenty of my fellow hams, utilizing
> my Novice CW privileges. In fact, I was trying for a Novice WAS,
> but my problem was I kept working all kinds of DX! Are you saying
> that it was impossible for Novices to communicate, or that it was
> just impossible for YOU to communicate *as* a Novice (assuming
> you were one)?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I think what I said was clear enough for persons of average intelligence to
understand. If you require further clarification, we can discuss my
consultation fees.

3284. Re: Scientology Takes Control of Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 03:25:13 UTC
From: max1919@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <aa2a3f47.0205081925.1b174b8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42553
Cross-posted to: alt.religion.scientology,rec.radio.amateur.policy

So here's what I see happening:

1. Kobrinagrams go out to anyone who uses any Scientology trademark in a ham radio discussion.

2. Scientology attempts to force the FCC to turn over all of the ham radio spectrum to itself on the grounds that it's being misused.

3. All anybody talks about on ham radio for a month is what assholes the Church of Scientology are.

3285. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 03:34:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CD9EE4A.DCC4C0B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42554

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Nope, concluding the presumption just like many others on this newsgroup.
>
> So you admit it.

Concluding the presumption is the last step in the scientific process. You
should try it sometime.

> In other words, you trolled. And you took W0EX's response in a negative
> way because you were prejudiced to do so.

It *was* negative. Virtually every time Dick responds to one of my postings,
it is a negative response.

> So dig them up and repost them.

I did, Jim. You responded exactly as I knew you would. What good
does it do to repost anything if you are just going to deny reality?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3286. Re: Scientology Takes Control of Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 04:38:23 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abcudpequ1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42555
Cross-posted to: alt.religion.scientology,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Max Nineteennineteen" <max1919@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:aa2a3f47.0205081925.1b174b8e@posting.google.com...
> So here's what I see happening:
>
> 1. Kobrinagrams go out to anyone who uses any Scientology trademark in
> a ham radio discussion.
>
> 2. Scientology attempts to force the FCC to turn over all of the ham
> radio spectrum to itself on the grounds that it's being misused.
>
> 3. All anybody talks about on ham radio for a month is what assholes
> the Church of Scientology are.

Nonsense. This sounds like a BIG WIN, chock-full of SYNERGY. In fact, here is a link that shows LL Cool Ron adjusting a tomato-based product detector during his early radio experiments which led to his invention of single sideband transmission:

http://www.geocities.com/xenu2000/tomato.jpg

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.

3287. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 04:50:26 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abdo0a31r59@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42560

In addition... they could utilize sports figures. "Be Like Mike..... And
Call C.Q.!"

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site
please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:abbjj72251g@enews4.newsguy.com...
> And it would not necessarily have to be him (Lance), as well as there are
a
> variety of people in the public eye respected by youth, that would also be
a
> good influence.
>
> Rednecks had that country singer/ ham!! :)
>
> Ryan
>
>
>
>
>
> "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:f7d9a152.0205071219.2aab53a0@posting.google.com...
> > This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
> > But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
> > hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.
> >
> > If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
> > be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
> > astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
> >
> > Just think:
> > 1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community
> > knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
> > 2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be
> > introduced to it for the first time ever.
> > 3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for
> > old men.

> > 4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of
> > kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be
> > immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important,
> > as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at
> > a young age.
> > 5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the
> > first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts.
> > If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .
> >
> > Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> > usenet@@@jasonhsu.com
> > http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html
>
>

3288. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 06:06:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020509020606.29664.00001178@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 42556

In article <20020508025920.20806.00007049@mb-mw.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>You need
>>more contacts with NASA and JPL to confirm that...something I did
>>back in the 1960s in Pasadena.
>
> And let me tell ya they miss ya, Lennie. Why, just the other day I was
>talking to a friend of mine who said your name is still spoken with reverence
>in JPL...."Sure do miss that Anderson guy...No one could clean a commode or
>push a broom cart like him..Sorry he retired..."

I have never been in the employ of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory,
a NASA facility.

>>Have YOUR gloved hands ever been inside a space-borne payload?
>
> Has YOURS?

Yes. The entire power system for the Mars Mariner 1967 flight.
The Apollo Lunar Surface Experiment Package Solar Wind
Spectrometer. A quadrupole mass spectrometer. Several
others (perhaps two dozen different programs) which include a
variety of instrumentation for unmanned payloads.

> In order for one's hands (gloved or otherwise) to be in a "space-borne"
>payload, one must also be in space. A quick review of NASA archives fails to
>produce any "Leonard H. Anderson" in the Astronaut Corps or as payload
>specialist on any Shuttle mission since it's inception.

The word "payload" is used (within the space program) as a "cargo"
component that leaves its carrier (a rocket to boost it into some
trajectory). A "payload" is what is delivered to space for a mission.

No human being is actively involved in the final separation of an
unmanned instrument payload into space. That is why they
call it "unmanned."

Full gloves or finger cots are always used on handling spacecraft
components, payload or integral to a space capsule of rocket
assembly. That is standard procedure everywhere, including
such things as the Space Shuttle Main Engines (SSMEs). That
keeps contamination to a minimum.

You may wish to understand "clean room" environments. The
NASA websites may yield some information but more is found
with companies that manufacture clean room equipment. Such

clean room classes can range from minimal to full "bunny suit"
clothing, all with air filtration in the clean room and specific
rules of cleanliness that can exceed medical surgical areas.

The information is out there. Please try learning something
before writing.

3289. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 06:06:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020509020609.29664.00001179@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 42558

In article <abbjj93251g@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020507150021.19503.00001314@mb-cm.aol.com...
>> In article <ab8flp5j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
>> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>>
>> >I do however agree with statements made earlier, that the words amateur
>> >radio is possibly a detriment to the hobby service.
>>
>> It's almost a psychological maxim that radio amateurs are wanting
>> recognition on a "professional" level...hence the long-ago self-label
>> of "HAM." Saying "ham radio" instead of "amateur radio" is much
>> more self-satisfying and avoids carrying around all the emotional
>> connotation of "amateurism" as being of "lesser value."
>
>And the word HAM RADIO still has a negative connotation with some people
>that I have run across in the past, trying to explain what all of those
>antennas on my truck mean. WE as (as licensed hams that is) know what the
>words HAM RADIO mean but the general public may not have the same....

Some in the general public will confuse amateur radio with CB, but
I'd venture to say that most in the general public are simply
ignorant of any aspect of ham radio.

In some neighborhoods there is a negative connotation to a ham
household bearing a forest of antennas. Those are generally
not esthetically pleasing in a residential neighborhood. In that
case it is up to the individual ham to get along with his
neighbors.

>Amateur radio is not my "lifestyle" nor will it ever be. It is an integral
>part of my life but does not consume it completely. I also am into
>photography, scuba diving, heavily into the fire service where my energy has
>been lately on public education to promote fire safety.

Okay, that's the "balance" in The Amateur's Code.

I've known a few who are simply obsessed with one activity.
Those are the seed of my statement.

>That may be true that the ARRL may have fallen back in some of the
>responsibility, but the blame is not totally with them. Another large
>percentage is held with other organizations, and local clubs and of course,
>individual hams.

I've been told that the ARRL has produced, or had procured some
professional videotape presentations. If so, those would be ideal
for TV in some "local feature" programming at a station. The
necessary selling job is to make sure such things don't fall into
the dead zone of 1 AM to 5 AM time slots where stations
typically air "community service" programs. There's no advantage
to airing something when so few are watching.

>And that is fine for the part of our hobby/service that we enjoy in exchange
>for performing public service and emergency comms.... Also it is necessary
>to put ourselves in the spotlight in a positive manner for every public
>service/emergency communications too, to help dissipate the association with
>CB.

That's part of the "selling" job and may be the most difficult.
Station managers and program managers get all kinds of
requests from different organizations, all of whom think they
"deserve" near-prime time. Anyone selling anything cannot
demand time for whatever noble reason...they must convince
the manager (the customer).

I'm not a salesman and have little experience there, but I've
listened to those who CAN sell and those are the words I've
put up. ARRL President Haynie has a sales background
and should be better able to talk about such things.

>> The general public doesn't see any "service" aspect as exemplified by
>> the individual hams who NEED some "belonging" and excuse for
>> doing their thing. Too many hams have gone the delusional route of
>> adopting a virtual paramilitary "service" rationale for engaging in a
>> HOBBY. That hobby is technologically-intensive but the "servicemen"
>> are into the "service" aspects almost to the point of obsessive
>> delusions replacing actual education in the technical arts.
>
>Baloney.... if we are performing public service communications or emergency
>communications we definitely need to have some level of order or consistency
>or the whole thing falls apart. Ever heard of the Incident Command System
>utilized primarily for fire departments, but also used elsewhere?

I didn't write what I wrote lightly. I've seen the emotionally-driven
"servicemen" who still think they are in a "command" mode well
after their military service days. Too many of those are only able
to function where all the equipment and procedures have been
worked out ahead of time. Real emergency situations require an
ability to handle anything. Feel-good bravado statements of "we
can handle anything!" aren't proof of anything except being able to
speak bravado.

Preparedness for emergencies requires planning ahead with the
possibility of unusual situations, the unexpected, but being able to
tie into the emergency preparedness groups of the local
infrastructure. There must be INTEGRATION. There must be
drilling for emergencies. Amateur communications groups must

be able to work with others that already exist, have planned, have drilled, are equipped, are integrated.

I have some knowledge of local emergency planning with the Los Angeles disaster facility and the integration of every group. I know that works because they've been tested and have performed well. I don't know fire department procedures well in detail.

>If a black or latino or female (or any other minority) is not interested in
>radio, then they aren't interested in radio. Nothing we can do will change
>that. It is called aptitude.

From what I've seen over a fifty year period ham radio seems more like a white male activity. I disagree with "aptitude" and can only conclude that exclusivity has played a greater role in keeping amateur radio for white males.

I'm not going to argue something that should be apparent on picking up random issues of ham periodicals from the last 50 years and profiling those amateurs who have their photographs in them. The overwhelming majority are white males.

>Alrighty..... think I stated this one before, and also, have you promoted
>the hobby to other non-caucasian and non-male persons?

I've not promoted anything. If anyone asks me what amateur radio IS, I will give them an honest answer based on my experience and observation. I won't try to "promote" something I am not IN, nor will I be any sort of proselyte mouthing jingoism as prescribed in the publications of a CT organization.

I look upon amateur radio as an interesting hobby that can be recreational. I don't look upon it as some military service surrogate. I don't look upon it as some noble, righteous cause for self-sacrifice to my community...or to be a vehicle for painting myself in patriotic colors for false braggadoccio.

>> >I guess in the meantime, I will continue to strive to positively change
>> >peoples negative or ignorance of what this hobby really is about.
>>
>> That's a laudible effort and should be applauded by hams.
>
>I beleive that is a component of the Amateur's Code, whether actually
>included in it, or an "unwritten" component.

The Amateur's Code can always be rewritten or modified. The original dates from 1928. It has already had a few changes in three-quarters of a century.

A problem with "unwritten codes" is that too many can do some "unwriting" to fit their own particular desires or opinions. It is better to have it all out in the open for ALL to see. Such a thing will work with non-hams to show the sincerity of hams.

>> I would caution some choices of words. Non-amateurs are able to
>> observe what the ham radio hobby "is about." It is out in the open,
>> nothing concealed, and well publicized in the ham radio area.
>
>Oh really??? Other than ham radio publications like QST, 73 and the like,
>you have to hunt high and low to find activity around here. My activities
>as Public Relations/Promotions manager with my club hopefully are changing
>some of that.

I should have written "unlicensed-in-the-amateur-radio-service" rather
than "non-amateurs." On the other hand, I've had more than a half
century to observe US amateur radio and individuals within it,
therefore I know where to look for information that a non-radio-
interested person might not know about. I will agree that general
information on US amateur radio is NOT well-publicized to the
general public.

>Of course they aren't stupid, but they may be ignorant of ham radio.
>Ignorant can have a different meaning depending on the user of the word. My
>definition of ignorance is "the lack of knowledge or information about
>something."

We are in agreement on that, certainly.

3290. Re: Uncle Sam wants you!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 06:06:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020509020610.29664.00001180@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 42557

In article <3CD91F12.6E4D3FCF@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>>
>> On 06 May 2002 20:12:47 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>
>> >Understood that only "wualified attornies" are acceptible.
>>
>> How does one wualify an attorney?
>
>With a Wouff Hong?

Weally? :-)

3291. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 11:22:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020509072230.13101.00001480@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 42559

In article <CNgC8.11621$qs2.443548784@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020508071318.06141.00000469@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <gwZB8.10141$8o3.413718814@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
>P
>> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:9f4bfe89.0205030353.5bbcfa8f@posting.google.com...
>> >> FCC has been deemphasizing code testing since 1975, when they first
>> >> tried to implement a nocodetest license. Then came the end of sending
>> >> tests, multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank options, and medical
>> >> waivers.
>> >
>> >Perhaps not. It appears that 1991 is the first year that code was
>> >deemphasized.
>> >
>> You don't know the relevant history, then.
>
>I know that 1991 the code exam was removed from Technician licensing.

That's correct.

>I know of no other period in time that the FCC issued licenses without a code
>examination, unless it was prior to WW ONE.

FCC did not exist back then.
>
>> In 1975, the FCC proposed a restructuring that involved a "dual ladder"
>system
>> and no less than 7 (seven) distinct license classes. One of those classes
>was a
>> VHF/UHF entry-level license with no code test at all.
>
>Proposed? How does this deemphasize anything?

The fact that the FCC proposed a nocodetest license means they put less
emphasis on it.
It indicates where FCC thinking was back then.

In addition, the FCC ended code sending tests (less emphasis), allowed
multiple-choice
and fill-in-the-blank options for the code test (more ways to pass means less
emphasis)

and medical waivers. (much less emphasis). All BEFORE 1991.

The invention of CSCEs also reduced emphasis on code testing.

>"I propose that those without recent Novice subband experience be restricted
>from commenting on the ARRL Novice subband refarming proposal."
>
Is that a formal proposal?

Your proposals do not have the same credibility as the FCC's.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3292. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 14:57:52 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0205090657.311e7554@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42561

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020508215037.24943.00001380@mb-fo.aol.com>...
>
> I'm assuming Mr. Bass is a licensed amateur radio operator. If so,
> what is his call sign?
>
> Assuming he *is* a licensed ham, considering his vast celebrity,
> particularly among young people, what has he done to advance
> the cause of amateur radio recruitment so far? Shirley, he must
> know that he is in a uniquely favorable position to make ham
> radio known to the young people whom constitute his audience,
> and are making him wealthy. If he is not aware of this, I would
> hope that the ARRL would approach him and request his help
> in amateur radio recruitment efforts aimed at young people.
>
> It would appear that there is a whole lot Lance Bass can and
> should be doing for ham radio before he ever gets a ride into
> space.
>
I did a qrz.com database search, and there is no Lance Bass. He would
probably operate as a third party, just like the students who have
talked to astronauts in the past.

Even if Lance Bass himself never earns his ham radio license, the
experience would be a celebrity endorsement of ham radio. The grade
school and high school students he talks to would learn that ham radio
is what makes such conversations possible. Talking to Lance Bass
would be MUCH more exciting to the students than talking to other
astronauts. News coverage of this would be widespread, while news
coverage of other astronaut conversations with students is usually
spotty. The students would excitedly talk about this with their
friends. They would log onto N'Sync, Backstreet Boys, Britney Spears,
and Mandy Moore message boards and talk about this.

Our numbers would jump. Many people would be put off by the effort
needed to study for the exams, others would be put off by the upfront
cost of equipment, and others would be put off by the antennas needed,
but when you consider that no more than about .5% of people in the USA
are ham radio operators, it doesn't take much to produce a big impact.
I hope the ARRL, AES, HRO, and MFJ have thought about all this.

Think of the benefits to the hobby AND society of having so many more
hams:
1. More people for SKYWARN, RACES, ARES, and other emergency
operations

2. More demand for equipment would make it worthwhile for Yaesu, Icom, Kenwood, and other vendors to take advantage of more economies of scale. This means lower production costs and lower prices for all of us.
3. We would have better motivated students, as ham radio would give them more concrete motivation to learn subjects like math, science, and geography. Ham radio may even indirectly lead to better reading and communication skills.
4. There would be more people to talk to on the air.
5. More students would later become GOOD engineers.
6. Antenna restrictions would be subject to much-needed scrutiny if we had more hams AND a greater awareness of ham radio.
7. Manufacturers would do a better job of fighting RFI when designing equipment.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet@@@@jasonhsu.com
http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html

3293. Leland C. Scott, KC8LDO has molestation of children on his mind..AGAIN!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 15:20:36 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.com
Message-ID: <7a11da4a.0205090720.13f2e271@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.space

>From: no-spam@junk-mail.net (Lelandï¿½C.ï¿½Scott)
"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <sdspecialdeliveryjones@stalag13.com> wrote in message
news:e1665b4c.0205071322.b5d524a@posting.google.com...
"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<ab95ts$hh2$1@news.bignet.net>...
"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:8308-3CD8021D-211@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net... <<

(sigh) Yea, I know it's illegal to sell an amp, Lelnad, and your
half-assed attempt at
snipping a post to make it appear as something else is old hat and
everyone is on to it.

>Just fess up Twisted that you got your tail caught in the door jam so
to speak, and it hurts. 8-))<<

More like YOUR tail, seeing as even the hammies are now calling you on
your poor technique of intentional snipping of posts to change the
context.

>It's fun to see to what ridiculous lengths Twsited with go to in
support of his half baked ideas.<<

There was no idea, just you being shown that your sorry and callous
attempts at causing trouble have the same effect you do in the rest of
your troubled life.....impotency.

> Besides all the time he wastes looking for back posts of mine in the archives>>

Oh, I don't look in archives, Lelnad, but I understand your attempt at
self-flattery at this stage in your anger-filled life...I merely save
your junk that is directed toward myself, such as the death threat
that got you dropped from supernews, your forge (the one that caused
your recent loss of UUnet), your multiple forges (ynn and newsranger)
and several others that were responsible for your lost access sites no
less than a dozen times last year.

>in the vain hope he find something to embarrass me with, or
responding to evey post I make, <<

Everything you say is BS. Tell you what, if it bothers you so much
that I reply to everything you post, try an injection of non-insultive
self-control, topic related, pertinent informative post that doesn't
illustrate your ignorance, instability, personal problems, or anger.

>keeps him inside and away from molesting the neighborhood kids.
--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0<<

You really must take a vacation, Lelnad. Such thoughts have an origination point, you may want to seek professional input, as the molestation of children is no joking matter, but anyone that is familiar with you is aware that such ideas from you are nothing new. Hell of an image you present to the public masses for amateur radio..as has been pointed out to you several times by cbers and amateurs alike...you are a part of the cancer that plagues amateur radio...it's a blight to the service that you even post a call next to your demented thoughts concerning children and sex. Couple that with your repeated calls for violence and the emerging image of you is crystal clear....perhaps a long rest is in order.
Now do what you do best, post a forge or 2 (I like the one where you have me talking to little green men) change the topic, and try to save what little face you have left, as your self-respect has left you long ago. Don't bother replying, you have shown your lack of communication skills,, I just wanted to share your unique elmering ways with the real amateur community. Have a good day.

3294. Re: Scientology Takes Control of Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 15:34:08 UTC
From: Creepy Klown <deweeeehufratu@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <QFwC8.767$9a.66423@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42563
Cross-posted to: alt.religion.scientology,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I certanly HOPE that this is
another "urban legend", else if
I find any cozy-connections whatsoever
between ham radio and Scientology
I will cancel my ARRL membership
in that same hour. Scientology is
a dangerous mind control cult founded
by the late L. Ron Hubbard. John Travolta
is a screwball half-baked actor who needs a Prozac regimine real bad

Peter N4---

"Phil" <Phil_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:abc7o9028ja@drn.newsguy.com...
> From the ARRL.org web site
>
> Ham radio could have role in Phenomenon sequel: Amateur Radio is poised to
hit
> the big screen yet again in a movie tentatively titled Phenomenon II.
Phenomenon
> debuted in 1996 and featured John Travolta and his ham operator friend
Forest
> Whitaker. In one scene, Travolta's character appears to be able to copy
RTTY
> transmissions by ear. For the original Phenomenon movie, ARRL provided
several
> props for the ham radio shack. The sequel is still in the very early
stages of
> development. A researcher working on checking facts in the script
contacted ARRL
> to ask if operators actually used the term "CQ" when initiating contacts.
She
> also told ARRL Media Relations Manager Jennifer Hagy, N1TDY, that the
> possibility exists for the creation of a television series based on the
> Phenomenon movies. Hagy offered further assistance if needed. No further
details
> were immediately available.
>
>

3295. Re: Leland C. Scott, KC8LDO has molestation of children on his mind..AGAIN!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 16:03:59 UTC
From: VOOBUSCH <voobusch@comcast.com>
Message-ID: <P5xC8.120489$n7.10415598@bin8.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 42564
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.cb

Excue this guy fellas he is mentaly disturbed
he wandered in from rec.radio.cb as if you couldnt tell

"Twistedhed" <Twistedhed@webtv.com> wrote in message
news:7a11da4a.0205090720.13f2e271@posting.google.com...
> >From: no-spam@junk-mail.net (Leland C. Scott)
> "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <sdspecialdeliveryjones@stalag13.com> wrote in
message news:e1665b4c.0205071322.b5d524a@posting.google.com...
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
> news:<ab95ts$hh2$1@news.bignet.net>...
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:8308-3CD8021D-211@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net... <<
>
> (sigh) Yea, I know it's illegal to sell an amp, Lelnad, and your
> half-assed attempt at
> snipping a post to make it appear as something else is old hat and
> everyone is on to it.
>
>
> >Just fess up Twisted that you got your tail caught in the door jam so
> to speak, and it hurts. 8-))<<
>
> More like YOUR tail, seeing as even the hammies are now calling you on
> your poor technique of intentional snipping of posts to change the
> context.
>
>
> >It's fun to see to what ridiculous lengths Twsited with go to in
> support of his half baked ideas.<<
>
>
> There was no idea, just you being shown that your sorry and callous
> attempts at causing trouble have the same effect you do in the rest of
> your troubled life.....impotency.
>
> > Besides all the time he wastes looking for back posts of mine in the
archives>>
>
>
> Oh, I don't look in archives, Lelnad, but I understand your attempt at
> self-flattery at this stage in your anger-filled life...I merely save
> your junk that is directed toward myself, such as the death threat

> that got you dropped from supernews, your forge (the one that caused
> your recent loss of UUnet), your multiple forges (ynn and newsranger)
> and several others that were responsible for your lost access sites no
> less than a dozen times last year.
>
>
> >in the vain hope he find something to embarrass me with, or
> responding to evey post I make, <<
>
>
>
>
> Everything you say is BS. Tell you what, if it bothers you so much
> that I reply to everything you post, try an injection of non-insultive
> self-control, topic related, pertinent informative post that doesn't
> illustrate your ignorance, instability, personal problems, or anger.
>
>
> >keeps him inside and away from molesting the neighborhood kids.
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0<<
>
>
>
> You really must take a vacation, Lelnad. Such thoughts have an
> origination point, you may want to seek professional input, as the
> molestation of children is no joking matter, but anyone that is
> familiar with you is aware that such ideas from you are nothing new.
> Hell of an image you present to the public masses for amateur
> radio..as has been pointed out to you several times by cbers and
> amateurs alike...you are a part of the cancer that plagues amateur
> radio...it's a blight to the service that you even post a call next to
> your demented thoughts concerning children and sex. Couple that with
> your repeated calls for violence and the emerging image of you is
> crystal clear....perhaps a long rest is in order.
> Now do what you do best, post a forge or 2 (I like the one where you
> have me talking to little green men) change the topic, and try to save
> what little face you have left, as your self-respect has left you long
> ago. Don't bother replying, you have shown your lack of communication
> skills,, I just wanted to share your unique elmering ways with the
> real amateur community. Have a good day.

3296. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 16:05:38 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <j5xC8.184236$tt4.12791961@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 42565

Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:uEgC8.11609$Ha2.443137292@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:VQfC8.53349$tT1.55960225@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> >
> > Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> > news:_kZB8.10130$wd3.413437173@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > Jason, the "Old Hands" on this group don't necessarily want young
people
> > > or even more people in amateur radio.
> > <<snip>>
> >
> > Whoa!
> >
> > I guess you could call me an old hand, but I welcome new people. It is
a
> > neccesity to get new people into the hobby. I relish the chance to talk
> to
> > young hams and hear their
> > enthusiasm. My CW contacts with 10 year old Extras are highlighted in
the
> > log. I may
> > be "old" (54), but I don't THINK old and I have no patience with old
> > buzzards who are
> > stuck in 1960, wear fedora hats, and go around grumping about how the
> young
> > hams will
> > ruin the hobby. I say, BRING 'EM ON!
> >
> > Jerry
> > K4KWH
>
> Agreed.
>
> Jerry, just one question to determine your credibility: When was your
last
> Novice subband experience?
>
> Thanks, Brian/N0iMD

I tried 75 and 40 within the last six months, but there was a noticable lack
(at that time)

of operators on the air. I haven't been on CW since, but it doesn't mean I
don't like it.
I need to "brush up" myself admittedly.

Jerry
>
>

3297. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 20:15:23 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <F4ED065881357818.81F9A87498DDAD34.33DA25F7FDD208D2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42566

On 09 May 2002 06:06:09 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>I've been told that the ARRL has produced, or had procured some
>professional videotape presentations. If so, those would be ideal
>for TV in some "local feature" programming at a station. The
>necessary selling job is to make sure such things don't fall into
>the dead zone of 1 AM to 5 AM time slots where stations
>typically air "community service" programs. There's no advantage
>to airing something when so few are watching.

Why not? Those are the same bored people with too much disposable
income that keep the psychic hotlines and 'not sold in stores'
companies in business.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3298. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 20:47:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020509164716.27510.00006577@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 42567

>Subject: Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/09/02 02:06 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020509020606.29664.00001178@mb-bk.aol.com>

>> In order for one's hands (gloved or otherwise) to be in a "space-borne"
>>payload, one must also be in space. A quick review of NASA archives fails
>to
>>produce any "Leonard H. Anderson" in the Astronaut Corps or as payload
>>specialist on any Shuttle mission since it's inception.
>
>The word "payload" is used (within the space program) as a "cargo"
>component that leaves its carrier (a rocket to boost it into some
>trajectory). A "payload" is what is delivered to space for a mission.

Lennie, Lennie, LENNIE! Snipped the CONTEXT, which was your ERROR is
stating that you had your hands in a "space-borne" payload.

That WAS the phrase I quotation marked, Lennie. I know what a payload is,
Lennie. Too bad YOU don't seem to know what a SPACE-BORNE payload is.

>Full gloves or finger cots are always used on handling spacecraft
>components...(SNIP)

I imagine that's not all you use finger cots for, Lennie. Lotsa other
"small" components you have to deal with, no doubt. No doubt smaller than
usually expected.

>You may wish to understand "clean room" environments.

Why? Just so you can ramble on about a non-germane subject and hide your
once-again humiliating self-flagellation on RRAP?

>The information is out there. Please try learning something
>before writing.

Well, Lennie, perhaps YOU can learn something...I doubt it, but you should
read what YOU write before you send it, and make sure it addresses the post you
are responding to.

Not one thing you posted here was germane.

You ARE such an idiot. A PUTZ idiot, at that.

Steve

3299. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-09 23:31:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020509193117.22569.00001685@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 42568

In article <F4ED065881357818.81F9A87498DDAD34.33DA25F7FDD208D2@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On 09 May 2002 06:06:09 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>I've been told that the ARRL has produced, or had procured some
>>professional videotape presentations. If so, those would be ideal
>>for TV in some "local feature" programming at a station. The
>>necessary selling job is to make sure such things don't fall into
>>the dead zone of 1 AM to 5 AM time slots where stations
>>typically air "community service" programs. There's no advantage
>>to airing something when so few are watching.
>
>Why not? Those are the same bored people with too much disposable
>income that keep the psychic hotlines and 'not sold in stores'
>companies in business.

Okay. If that's your target audience for promoting amateur radio, no
problem to me. I think you would be doing ham radio a disservice
by that.

3300. Re: The Truth About Most Hams [from rec.radio.cb]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 00:38:51 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <abf4qrejg1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 42569
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

tarquinlinbin <cr7000@hotmail.com> wrote:
>I really can't understand the rivalry between various factions.

It stems from your next comment:

>I started as a straight40 am illegal cb'er,i progressed to illegal ssb

You summed up the basis of most amateurs' dislike towards many CBers
quite nicely in that statement.

Negative 73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist | Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard | University of Hawaii System
jherman@d14.uscg.mil | jeffreyh@hawaii.edu

3301. Re: This kid is headed to rrap!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 00:59:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020509205937.01774.00002952@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42570

In article <abah2c$4ku$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Unclaimed Mysteries"
<k4doh@mindspring.com> writes:

>Mallard Fillmore runs right next to Doonesbury in the Huntsville (AL) Times.
>They have a lot more in common than their creators think. Both are extremely
>unfunny.
>
>Corry

Corry:

Doonesbury hasn't been funny since the end of the Vietnam War.
I've never seen Mallard Fillmore, so I'll reserve my judgment on it
until I have. I'll do a search for it on the web later.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3302. Re: No Comment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 00:59:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020509205937.01774.00002951@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 42571

In article <hE%B8.10259$wa6.418471300@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>This
>> could motivate him to get off the Geritol Net and start doing something
>> interesting and useful in amateur radio! You won't get any complaints
>from me!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Remember Larry, you're the guy on the mountain with the compound fracture
>and a screaming wife, and you saviour is asking, "Da..... what's a 559?"

Brian:

Uh unh. Not me. I didn't give myself no steenking compound fracture
and screaming XYL in that scenario. I was the one who was going to
save the day with my QRP CW rig, remember?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3303. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 01:00:18 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CDB1BA2.C61065A9@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42572

Jason Hsu wrote:

>
> >
> I did a qrz.com database search, and there is no Lance Bass. He would
> probably operate as a third party, just like the students who have
> talked to astronauts in the past.

"Bass" is likely just a stage name, not his real name.

>Our numbers would jump. Many people would be put off by the effort
needed to study for the exams, others would be put off by the upfront
cost of equipment

RS has 2m/440 HTs for about $100 now. Which a tech licensee would
first get anyway.

3304. Re: The Truth About Most Hams [from rec.radio.cb]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 01:03:00 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.com>
Message-ID: <8%EC8.69888$9F5.3684628@typhoon.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 42573
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message
news:abf4qrejg1@news.hawaii.edu...
> tarquinlinbin <cr7000@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >I really can't understand the rivalry between various factions.
>
> It stems from your next comment:
>
> >I started as a straight40 am illegal cb'er,i progressed to illegal ssb
>
> You summed up the basis of most amateurs' dislike towards many CBers
> quite nicely in that statement.
>
> Negative 73, Jeff KH6O
>
> --
> Operations Specialist | Mathematics Lecturer
> U.S. Coast Guard | University of Hawaii System
> jherman@d14.uscg.mil | jeffreyh@hawaii.edu

Putz!

3305. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 03:08:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CDB397A.D2C5C128@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42574

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >>It's almost a psychological maxim that radio amateurs are wanting
> >>recognition on a "professional" level...hence the long-ago self-label
> >>of "HAM." Saying "ham radio" instead of "amateur radio" is much
> >>more self-satisfying and avoids carrying around all the emotional
> >>connotation of "amateurism" as being of "lesser value."
> >
> > Now you are a psychologist, Lennie?
>
> The statement still holds. Radio amateurs insist on dropping the
> "amateur" description because of its emotional baggage of
> negative connotation.

In your vast experiences in amateur radio, which particular group of
radio amateurs insist on dropping the term "amateur", Len?

> > Having BEEN an "Amateur" for 29 years, I can say with informed certainty
> >that this is nothing but foolishness on your part.
>
> QED. That sentence is a very personal objection to a perceived
> personal negativism. It has no bearing on anything but one out
> of over 600 thousand other radio amateurs' opinions.

...of which you know how many?

> The attempt to equate "professionalism" to an avocational
> recreation is common among many amateurs.

Really? On what knowledge do you base your sweeping generality?

> > The term "Ham" was applied to Amateurs before there was any significant
> >difference between "Amateurs" and what you term professionals.
>
> See the ARRL definitions. The original term was coined BY
> professional telegraphers as a negative description of amateur's
> manual telegraphy skills...or lack of skills.

The truth is, we don't actually know for certain how the term "ham" came
to be applied to radio amateurs.

> Yes. All activities, professional as well as non-professional have
> cases of obsession. That other activities have such conditions
> is not an excuse or a rationale for continuation.

I've seen examples of such cases. There is, for example, a guy who
posts here on a regular basis who is not a radio amateur, has no

intention of becoming a radio amateur but is quick to point out to radio amateurs how insignificant they are. He actually believes that both radio amateurs and those interested in becoming radio amateurs should heed his view of something of which he has never been a part. Can you imagine such a guy? It would be impossible to fathom his obsession with ham radio.

> >>Ryan, the general public has had a chance to be "educated" for half a
> >>century of the existance of all kinds of media input. The Big Org up
> >>near Hartford just hasn't done its job in getting media attention in all
> >>that time.
> >
> > Lennie, Lennie, Lennie...lying agian.
>
> Not a "lie." Despite the spin used in the ARRL's descriptions of
> what it "does" to publicize amateur radio, the fact remains that
> the ARRL has NOT succeeded in achieving any significant impact
> in the public mind about amateur radio in a half century.
>
> Denial of a clearly-observable fact is not an excuse/rationale.

To whom is this "fact" clearly observable?

> Those obsessed by an activity often presume to think for a very
> large group of citizens (ego over-ride of thinking) and this disallows
> their ability to properly publicize their hobby activities. That is a
> negative, non-productive attitude in public relations.
>
> > IE: Chattanooga Free Press, March 31st 2002, Page E1(Lifestyle
> >Section), lead item. "In Internet Age, ham radio still attracts hobbyists".
>
> Newspapers, local or regional, carry a great deal of diverse activity
> articles with every edition. That ONE article out of a hundreds is
> spotlighted is only proof of ONE activity. Newspaper readers are
> not suddenly awed or interested just because an article covers an
> activity that a claimant thinks is "important."

I know there must be a point buried in your comment somewhere. I don't believe the public needs to be awed, only enlightened. To your puzzling statement about something being "proof of ONE activity", I can only write, "So?"
>
> An examination of any newspaper will turn up many different articles
> in each edition, covering a great variety of subjects and activities.

Still masterfully stating the obvious, eh Len?

> It is a common mistake to over-identify some activity published in
> real ink on real paper as "important." Editors and publishers select
> what activities, what news is considered "important to readers." It
> is really a selective activity by a very small group as to what a rather
> larger group will get to read. The heart of good public relations work

> is the convincing of that very small group of the "importance" of the
> PR target and that it should be published. That's been a fact of
> life in journalism since day one of newspapers and other periodicals.

So you're telling us that we need hundred of articles about amateur
radio in order to make an impact. Or maybe you're telling us that a
small group of evil editors is force-feeding the public stories which
are not really newsworthy.

> What appears in all periodicals is what the editors think is "important."
> It is their choice, not the readers. This is true in all journalism. In an
> objective analysis, it can rightly be called a form of dictatorship since
> there MUST be preselection of reporting to fit finite budgets of news-
> print or air time.

> This was not in the subject thread, but some individuals are obsessed
> with trying to put down others for succeeding in something. Again,
> obsession with an activity is not mentally healthy.

You've done that. Often.

> >>An interesting sidelight to the "serviceman" type of hobbyist is the
> >>demographics of US amateur radio. Flip through any amateur radio
> >>publication collection spanning the last half century, observe the
> >>pictures of various hams and "profile" them. There are two very
> >>major profile aspects: Hams are male, hams are white.
> >
> > OK...and what does this prove?
>
> The proof should be obvious. By clear and present proof in the form
> of photographs in amateur radio periodicals, the overwhelming
> majority of hams are male white men. By appearance and text
> description, the majority are over thirtysomething at the time of
> the photograph.
>
> That sexual-racial bias belies the repeated statements that "amateur
> radio is for 'all'."

No it does not. There are Asian, black, and Hispanic radio amateurs.
There are male and female radio amateurs. There are very young radio
amateurs. There are very old radio amateurs. Would it make you happy
if those of us who happen to be white, male and over a certain age wear
hair shirts as part of our penance?

If this newsgroup did not exist, Len, what outlet would you have found
for your periodic, lengthy rants?

Dave K8MN

3306. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 03:22:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020509232204.20470.00001493@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 42575

In article <20020509164716.27510.00006577@mb-mr.aol.com>,
HuntsvilleChief@aol.com (Wormser von Brown) writes:

>>The word "payload" is used (within the space program) as a "cargo"
>>component that leaves its carrier (a rocket to boost it into some
>>trajectory). A "payload" is what is delivered to space for a mission.
>
> Lennie, Lennie, LENNIE! Snipped the CONTEXT, which was your ERROR is
>stating that you had your hands in a "space-borne" payload.

No error. There are space-borne and engineering and test versions
of the same payload. In the manned space programs there are
"man-rated" payloads which may be handled by any gender.

There are also airborne electronics which are not handled by pilots
or aircrew.

Does the hyphen bother you? Hyphens may be removed without
any medical licensing requirements.

> That WAS the phrase I quotation marked, Lennie. I know what a payload
>is, Lennie.

That's not apparent.

>Too bad YOU don't seem to know what a SPACE-BORNE payload is.

Sorry, I do. Having handled enough, gone throught the MRBs,
the project meetings, I'm acquainted enough.

Just how many has Wormser von Brown been through?
Other than in his imagination, that is...

Or did he read only the ARRL news page to get his "space
education?"

>>Full gloves or finger cots are always used on handling spacecraft
>>components...(SNIP)
>
> I imagine that's not all you use finger cots for, Lennie. Lotsa other
>"small" components you have to deal with, no doubt. No doubt smaller than
>usually expected.

Lots of electronics is handled with various forms of body clothing
and contamination prevention...semiconductor wafers, hard-drive
assemblies, and quite a few RF transistor die. That includes
amateur satellite assemblies...those that are space-borne in
particular.

>>You may wish to understand "clean room" environments.
>
> Why? Just so you can ramble on about a non-germane subject and hide your
>once-again humiliating self-flagellation on RRAP?

What is "non-germane" about amateur satellite construction,
cleanliness in handling unpackaged semiconductor die and
wafers?

How are short circuits prevented in electronics required to work
in micro-gravity? Be specific in details of your response. That
applies to amateur radio satellites.

>>The information is out there. Please try learning something
>>before writing.
>
> Well, Lennie, perhaps YOU can learn something...I doubt it, but you
should
>read what YOU write before you send it, and make sure it addresses the post
you
>are responding to.
>
> Not one thing you posted here was germane.

In a way that is true. Most, if not all responses to von Brown should
be directed to the alt.mental-health.psychoses.chronic newsgroup.

Cleanliness in handling any small electronics is essential, especially
in surface mount technology, amateur radio satellites, and semi-
conductor wafers and die before they are packaged.

> You ARE such an idiot. A PUTZ idiot, at that.

This seems to be a standard "reply" by Wormser von Brown...neither
civil, gentlemanly, nor according to The Amateur's Code.

>Steve (Wormser von Brown, guru of AMSAT, ARISS, and AMISS)

3307. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 03:25:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CDB3D7C.BEEDFBB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42576

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <abbjj93251g@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020507150021.19503.00001314@mb-cm.aol.com...
> >> In article <ab8flp5j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> >> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

> In some neighborhoods there is a negative connotation to a ham
> household bearing a forest of antennas. Those are generally
> not esthetically pleasing in a residential neighborhood. In that
> case it is up to the individual ham to get along with his
> neighbors.

Not any more so than its being up to the neighbors to get along with the ham living in their midst. My few neighbors don't paint their homes or landscape their yards in order to please me. I'm FCC licensed and my towers and antennas were put up in accordance with local zoning regulations. The neighbors don't get a vote. I know of two cases where neighbors moved into a neighborhood where active hams already lived. In both cases, the late comers attempted to whip other neighbors into a frenzy in attempts to have the radio amateurs remove towers. Those attempts failed in both instances.

Dave K8MN

3308. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 03:58:22 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abgg1k214i7@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42581

Larry..... I think the idea this guy had was to GET him to become a ham....

Ryan

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020508215037.24943.00001380@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <f7d9a152.0205071219.2aab53a0@posting.google.com>,
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>
> >This post may be jumping the gun, because it's not a done deal yet.
> >But I smell an opportunity for a MAJOR CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENT!!! I
> >hope that many ARRL officers have thought of this as well.
> >
> >If Lance Bass of bubblegum pop group N'Sync goes into space, this will
> >be the best promotional opportunity EVER for ham radio. Like other
> >astronauts, Lance can use ham radio to talk to schoolchildren.
> >
> >Just think:
> >1. When most astronauts talk to students, only the local community
> >knows. If Lance Bass talks to students, the buzz will be EVERYWHERE.
> >2. Millions of young people who never heard of ham radio will be
> >introduced to it for the first time ever.
> >3. Lance Bass will break down the image of ham radio as a hobby for
> >old men.
> >4. 99%+ of kids have never heard of ham radio. Even if a scant 1% of
> >kids become ham radio operators, the impact on our hobby will be
> >immense. Recruiting young people into our hobby is quite important,
> >as a large percentage of today's experienced hams joined our hobby at
> >a young age.
> >5. For that matter, many adults will hear about ham radio for the
> >first time ever and see how it enables people to talk to astronauts.
> >If 1% of nonham adults join our hobby . . . . .
>
> Jason:
>
> I'm assuming Mr. Bass is a licensed amateur radio operator. If so,
> what is his call sign?
>
> Assuming he *is* a licensed ham, considering his vast celebrity,
> particularly among young people, what has he done to advance
> the cause of amateur radio recruitment so far? Shirley, he must
> know that he is in a uniquely favorable position to make ham
> radio known to the young people whom constitute his audience,
> and are making him wealthy. If he is not aware of this, I would
> hope that the ARRL would approach him and request his help

> in amateur radio recruitment efforts aimed at young people.
>
> It would appear that there is a whole lot Lance Bass can and
> should be doing for ham radio before he ever gets a ride into
> space.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

3309. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 04:06:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020510000654.27399.00001387@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 42577

In article <3CD9EE4A.DCC4C0B7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Nope, concluding the presumption just like many others on this newsgroup.
>>
>> So you admit it.
>
>Concluding the presumption is the last step in the scientific process.

Your "scientific process" obviously only consists of two steps:

1) Formulate a presumption based on your feelings about something
2) Conclude that this presumption is fact.

>You should try it sometime.

I'll stick with the scientific method that involves things like formulating a
hypothesis,
making observations, conducting experiments, and developing rigorous proofs and
definitions, thank you very much.
>
>> In other words, you trolled. And you took W0EX's response in a negative
>> way because you were prejudiced to do so.
>
>It *was* negative. Virtually every time Dick responds to one of my postings,
>it is a negative response.

Ah, I see. You label all disagreement with you "negative", so obviously anyone
who points out errors in your thinking is "negative".
>
>> So dig them up and repost them.
>
>I did, Jim.

No, you did not. You reposted exactly one post. It did not prove your point.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3310. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 12:36:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020510083608.15244.00007826@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 42578

>Subject: Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/09/02 23:22 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020509232204.20470.00001493@mb-ma.aol.com>

>No error. There are space-borne and engineering and test versions
>of the same payload.

If you insist on perpetuating your error, Lennie, then you are free to do so.

You stated you had YOUR hands in a SPACE-BORNE payload.

"Space-borne" means it was IN space at the time.

>There are also airborne electronics which are not handled by pilots
>or aircrew.

Relevence to your error, Lennie?

>Does the hyphen bother you? Hyphens may be removed without
>any medical licensing requirements.

Nope. Doesn't bother me at all.

Your pathological lying and failure to demonstate sufficient ownership of testosterone to admit an error does, however.

>> That WAS the phrase I quotation marked, Lennie. I know what a payload
>>is, Lennie.
>
>That's not apparent.

Only not apparent to someone with poor command of grammatical skills.

>>Too bad YOU don't seem to know what a SPACE-BORNE payload is.
>
>Sorry, I do. Having handled enough, gone throught the MRBs,
>the project meetings, I'm acquainted enough.

Then on WHICH mission did you fly in order to have your hands in a SPACE-BORNE "payload", Lennie?

>Just how many has Wormser von Brown been through?

None. But then I didn't need to be to catch yet another Lenniesque faux pas in the newsgroup, now did I?

>> You ARE such an idiot. A PUTZ idiot, at that.
>
>This seems to be a standard "reply" by Wormser von Brown...neither
>civil, gentlemanly, nor according to The Amateur's Code.

Perhaps neither, however most appropriate when addressing a putz-like idiot such as yourself.

And as pointed out before, this forum is NOT "Amateur Radio", nor is it regulated by 47CFR Part 97, now is it, Lennie?

Stop lying.

Get your "facts" right.

Those two steps MIGHT get you some respect in this forum.

MIGHT.

3311. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 12:42:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDBC02B.B04DC78A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42580

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Concluding the presumption is the last step in the scientific process.
>
> Your "scientific process" obviously only consists of two steps:
>
> 1) Formulate a presumption based on your feelings about something
> 2) Conclude that this presumption is fact.

Nope, you are obviously confused. You left out: Test the presumption against the evidence and if it doesn't fit, change the presumption and iterate.

Does Dick virtually always respond negatively to my postings? *Yes*
Is it probable that, "Well, there you have it", is a negative response rather than a positive response? *Yes*

> Ah, I see. You label all disagreement with you "negative", so obviously anyone
> who points out errors in your thinking is "negative".

I said I thought digital experimentation by hams is a good idea. Dick was negative about my statement indicating that he disagrees with digital experimentation by hams. This is not rocket science, Jim. Don't you think if that was a positive response, Dick would have said so?

I've had my say and I'm tired of trying to communicate with someone who is not making a good faith effort. Good luck on trying to convince anyone that, "Well, there you have it", is a positive response from someone who virtually never responds positively to any of my postings. Have a nice day.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3312. TS-950S

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 12:42:21 UTC
From: Eduardo Hernandez <EdH@HernandezCommsx.net>
Message-ID: <abgf4o$7n4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 42579
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

A buddy here in Dallas needs cash fast and is offering me a Kenwood TS-950S with 4 filters for $1,000. I took my test gear over, checked out the rig, and it is in great shape, clean, nonsmoker. Is this a good price? I am not familiar with the market prices on this rig.

I am going to donate it to a totally handicapped ham who was my mentor in computer programming. He is a retired professor. I owe the guy a lot, as I came here not speaking English and now have a very secure job with a high-tech firm.

Thanks,

Ed "Beans" Hernandez

3313. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 16:45:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020510124524.23265.00001616@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 42582

In article <3CDB397A.D2C5C128@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>In your vast experiences in amateur radio, which particular group of
>radio amateurs insist on dropping the term "amateur", Len?

Nearly all of them, based on both friendships and acquaintences
with those who have amateur radio licenses...and based on reading
a number of amateur radio publications over a 50+ year period.

>> The attempt to equate "professionalism" to an avocational
>> recreation is common among many amateurs.
>
>Really? On what knowledge do you base your sweeping generality?

The same as the first...although friends and acquaintences who are
ham licensees were already professionals in a profession.

>> See the ARRL definitions. The original term was coined BY
>> professional telegraphers as a negative description of amateur's
>> manual telegraphy skills...or lack of skills.
>
>The truth is, we don't actually know for certain how the term "ham" came
>to be applied to radio amateurs.

You can't find it on the ARRL website? If the ARRL states it, it must
be so...

>I've seen examples of such cases. There is, for example, a guy who
>posts here on a regular basis who is not a radio amateur, has no
>intention of becoming a radio amateur but is quick to point out to radio
>amateurs how insignificant they are.

If you are referring to me, then note that I point out things to
INDIVIDUALS WHO POST IN HERE.

You have a very thin skin, are prideful to a large degree, and cannot
stand to be corrected in anything. As a result you attempt
misdirection by claiming that I say "insignificance to all amateurs."

That isn't true.

Dave Heil does not represent all radio amateurs. He only represents
himself. He hides behind the association with amateur radio and
attempts to bully others who don't share his views. He implies his
views "represent the views of other amateurs" when that cannot be
proven.

Further, Dave Heil implies superior knowledge of amateur radio on
the basis of being licensed a relatively long time. That has no
basis on "knowing what is best for amateur radio," simply a claim
of long tenure...and has as its probable basis that whatever Heil
desires "should be that of amateur radio." Personal desire is not a
valid attribute for regulation that applies to all citizens...it is merely
an attempt at personal control for personal desires.

>> Not a "lie." Despite the spin used in the ARRL's descriptions of
>> what it "does" to publicize amateur radio, the fact remains that
>> the ARRL has NOT succeeded in achieving any significant impact
>> in the public mind about amateur radio in a half century.
>>
>> Denial of a clearly-observable fact is not an excuse/rationale.
>
>To whom is this "fact" clearly observable?

Obviously not yourself...but then Dave Heil is too locked into a
subjective, I-never-make-mistakes attitude that precludes any
hope of being objective.

The discussion within this thread concerned making amateur
radio activities known to the GENERAL PUBLIC.

The ARRL does well informing hams WITHIN amateur radio.
It does poorly on informing the GENERAL PUBLIC. They
are in a very good position to be influential about amateur
radio to the general public yet they cannot get into media any
better than the Academy of Model Aeronautics.

>I know there must be a point buried in your comment somewhere. I don't
>believe the public needs to be awed, only enlightened. To your puzzling
>statement about something being "proof of ONE activity", I can only
>write, "So?"

So stuff it, Dave, or try participating in a discussion. You haven't
done that in here in years. You get your jollies by bullying others
who don't share your views or admire your accomplishments.

>So you're telling us that we need hundred of articles about amateur
>radio in order to make an impact.

I've never stated a number. HOW you get amateur radio exposure
before the GENERAL PUBLIC is not a concern. ANY way is always
better than none.

The general public is simply not that aware of amateur radio
activities.

>Or maybe you're telling us that a
>small group of evil editors is force-feeding the public stories which
>are not really newsworthy.

In real-life journalism, every day, all over the world, the items in a
newscast or set in type and printed on paper is the result of

selection by a very few individuals who work under the title of "editor." That's not an "evil" thing, it is common practice in the free world, normal, SOP.

Every news item that you hear, see, read is SELECTED. By a very small minority in all of journalism.

One purpose of public relations is to convince editors that a PR item should be SELECTED. That's a "selling" task.

If a PR piece is selected, the PR item becomes a part of the news. If not selected, the readers-viewers-listeners will never find out about it. "News" does not appear out of thin air. It is SELECTED.

>No it does not. There are Asian, black, and Hispanic radio amateurs.
>There are male and female radio amateurs. There are very young radio
>amateurs. There are very old radio amateurs. Would it make you happy
>if those of us who happen to be white, male and over a certain age wear
>hair shirts as part of our penance?

I wrote that any observation of photographs of radio amateurs in any amateur radio periodical of the past half century will show that the OVERWHELMING MAJORITY are male and white. I added that they TEND to appear as middle-aged in their appearance.

There ARE exceptions. Exceptions' existance only proves that exceptions exist.

The OVERWHELMING MAJORITY are male and white. That cannot be denied on the basis of photographic evidence.

There are NO requirements for fashions in clothing. Heil has the option to wear anything he wants. One problem is that he puts on "emperor's new clothes" and cannot realize he is naked.

3314. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 17:06:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205100906.6db45bbd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42583

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CDBC02B.B04DC78A@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Concluding the presumption is the last step in the scientific process.
> >
> > Your "scientific process" obviously only consists of two steps:
> >
> > 1) Formulate a presumption based on your feelings about something
> > 2) Conclude that this presumption is fact.
>
> Nope, you are obviously confused.

Not me. It's clear to any objective observer that the above is what
you
do. Cecil.

> You left out: Test the presumption against
> the evidence and if it doesn't fit, change the presumption and iterate.

I didn't leave it out.

> Does Dick virtually always respond negatively to my postings? *Yes*

Whoa, hold it right there. What do you mean by "respond negatively"?

> Is it probable that, "Well, there you have it", is a negative response
> rather than a positive response? *Yes*

Depends on how you define "negative response", which you have
carefully avoided.
Most important of all, "probable" does not equal "proof". Particularly
in this case.
>
> > Ah, I see. You label all disagreement with you "negative", so obviously anyone
> > who points out errors in your thinking is "negative".
>
> I said I thought digital experimentation by hams is a good idea.

Of course it's a good idea. That's a "mom and apple pie" sort of
thing. All
sorts of experimentation by hams is a good thing.

> Dick was negative
> about my statement

Where? How? You presume that because W0EX disagrees with you much of
the time,
he must disagree with you all of the time. Even when he makes
statements
like "well, there you have it", you label those statements as
"negative"
based on YOUR prejudice.

> indicating that he disagrees with digital experimentation by
> hams.

Only to you.

> This is not rocket science, Jim.

Then why are you having such a tough time with it, Cecil? You say that
there's
lots of evidence in W0EX's posts, but when challenged to actually
provide
some, you dig up a single ambiguous statement and refuse to provide
anything
substantial.

> Don't you think if that was a positive
> response, Dick would have said so?

All depends on whether he is reading this exchange and whether he is
able
to reply. I have not seen ANY rrap posts by W0EX in the past several
days. He
could be away from his computer.

> I've had my say and I'm tired of trying to communicate with someone who is not
> making a good faith effort.

That would be you, not me.

> Good luck on trying to convince anyone that, "Well,
> there you have it", is a positive response from someone who virtually never
> responds positively to any of my postings.

You are the one who has something to prove, not me. So far you have
not
proven anything, except perhaps that you are not serious about the
subject
at all.

It is interesting to read the comments to RM-10413. The only denizens
of rrap
who have actually filed comments are K0HB, W3GEO and myself. W0EX said
he
would "sign on" to the ideas presented by Hans and myself, supporting
the idea of refarming the Novice bands to experimental use.

Perhaps there are others who have filed comments, but so far they have not shown up in searches of the ECFS system.

>Have a nice day.

I plan to.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3315. Re: TS-950S

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 18:09:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CDC0CC8.FEB06461@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Check ebay.com for what that rig fetches in auctions.
But being able to inspect the rig in person removes
some risk and would be worth a somewhat higher price.
I paid about $700 for a TS440SAT a few years ago, but
that one is less desirable because of a flaky keyboard.

3316. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 18:23:54 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <cfc3b239de14066631309e913b7a2cb1.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42585

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020508003635.20470.00001409@mb-ma.aol.com

> Ever listen to ball games on a broadcast receiver?

Yes. I happen to like to watch Atlanta. Not carried up here in New York. I paid $130.00 one year for the baseball pass on Direct Tv, but managed only to watch 3 extra games. 3 games at $130.00 is not, IMHO, a very good deal. Living in the city, external antennas worth much at AM broadcast frequencies is not going to cut it - and I don't feel like pulling that old boat anchor SP-600 down from the attic either.

> I have two CDs of about 1.1 GB total capacity storing nothing but
> device datasheets and application notes. Those were obtained
> over the Internet without extra charge. I expect those to be as free
> as they were on paper years ago...except they don't have to be
> requested over the phone but are available over the Internet...to
> anyone knowing the URL.

Sure, been there, done that. Good source of updated drivers too ..

> The "Reverend" Jim Jones used ham transceivers to keep his
> South American cult in "Jamestown" in contact with a San
> Francisco "church." Maybe it was to keep the Kool-Aid coming?
> Shall we hold amateur radio to the same standards you are trying
> to establish for the Internet?

Well, I was not aware of that. Amateur radio is SUPPOSED to have high standards (key word, supposed).

> According to the US Census Bureau, one out of five households in
> the US in the year 2001 had some form of Internet connection.
> In a nation of about 300 million citizens, that is a LOT of
> households. Do you want the entire Internet banned because of
> ONE pervert's actions in NY state?

Ok, so where did I say the Internet should be banned? Gimme a break!

> Yes, just like 10 million folks in my neighborhood "always had their
> radios working" during the Northridge Earthquake and the subsequent
> cutoff of ALL electric power. Everyone did NOT have enough batteries.
> The no-charge-to-listener broadcast stations all had emergency
> generators.

Glad they did. They mostly didn't here in NY during the great Northeast blackout in 1966. I remember. I was in college. Only could pick up WKBW in Buffalo, and they had to talk. The emergency generators were

not holding speed and the turntables sounded terrible. That was the
ONLY station we could pick up. Please understand, this is the new age.
I worked for WOKR TV here in Rochester back in 1971. I'm glad I left.
They let most of the engineering staff go. They are fed from Syracuse.
Only the news is live, so much of the staff went. Of course, in an
emergency, they could likely call in their staff - assuming they could
get there. The Syracuse station feeds all of the stations that are
owned by whatever corporate entity owns them.

> "CW gets through when nothing else will?" Even without electric
> power? Of any kind? How much power output can you get out
> of a Baygen ham transceiver (if there was such a thing)?
>
> Where were all the glorious ham nets during a REAL emergency
> in 1994?

Now, we try this old CW bit again? The big ice storm Northeast of here
sure was interesting a few years back. One of the police departments
was temporarily hooking into an amateur repeater. Their tower was
taken down by ice. Truckloads of batteries, medical supplies, etc. was
being shipped up there. My grandmother's sister's daughter (gosh, what
does that make her to me?) was without heat, electricity, and telephone
for over a week in Gouverneur. It isn't that the amateur stations are
better, it is a case of a lot more hams than commercial communications
towers and the amateur towers are invariably much smaller may well
withstand winds and ice that the huge arrays won't

> "Junior" will probably do all right. He's already been exposed to
> computers and they aren't evil, expensive things to him.

Did I say they were evil and expensive?

> Are you talking about a new "Enron" of that future where "everyone
> has a BA degree and doing 'manipulating?'" Keep up with the latest
> news. Good old Enron has been uncovered to do some dirty tricks
> in the state of California about electric power rate hiking and suchlike.
>
> Oh, and on that subject of electricity in California, my local neighborhood
> NEVER had any brownouts or blackouts that were supposed to be
> everywhere here (according to the easterners). No problem. Our local
> electricity provider was producing enough e-power to SELL it to part of
> the state.
>
> My nephew is an electric power broker in the state of Minnesota.
> Makes a fantastic income for an ex-USN sub nuke plant PO. Do you
> want to get into a family-oriented shouting match? I'd advise not to
> go there...you'd be walking into a minefield without a sweeper.

Good for him. Myself, I've got 11 days and I'm 55 and can retire. I'll
keep plugging for a couple of years, then I'm looking to Florida. Power
and taxes are too high here. The power brokers can fight over what's
left. I'm gone.

> I'm retired so I won't take such a dim, nihilistic view. I just don't see it
> around me...and I observe pretty good. So does my wife. We've
> worked all our lives and just enjoy the heck out of the Internet in
> retirement.

Fantastic. I enjoy the Internet quite a bit myself. I will admit to overstating a bit, but am a little apprehensive about some of the goings-on. I always have the firewall and anti-virus running. Other than that, for one of my age, the Internet is reasonably safe (although I've used the Internet for paying bills, I'm starting to revert to snail mail. Something about my mother receiving a dunning letter demanding $12,000.00. A bit disquieting, although an attourney is getting things straightened out).

> Aren't you into some gross exaggeration there? Yes, four out of five
> households in the USA do NOT have Internet access. Three out of
> four citizens do NOT have a cell phone subscription in 2002. The
> numbers keep growing FOR these new services. If they are
> deemed desireable by the public, they will be purchased.

I have been overstating (as I mentioned) a bit. I do hope I am wrong here. Ummmm ... do you remember in the 50s, 60s, and early 70s, one working member of the family could support the family? Now, everyone is concerned about the cost of day care. I wonder why? Real wages have been slipping. While the feds have been cutting income tax (mostly at the top end), they have been grabbing revenue from cigaretts. Funny, a lot of counties around here spend NONE of that money on anti-smoking ads nor health care. Our county (Monroe) got a grade of 'C' because they spent all of $500,000.00 out of $11,000,000.00 on health care. I wish I could get a 'C' for classes when I scored 5% on a test!!! Of course, we have that fantastic lottery .... the state simply cuts back on its' education budget by whatever the lottery takes in. A couple of years back, the board of education found out that children had to leave textbooks in class for others to use. There wern't enough to go around. I wonder why we have a problem in this city? Now, they have a $65 MILLION dollar deficit. Nice. Glad to see this state joining other states in the Powerball! More money, which will be shuttled elsewhere. Let's see ... a new ball stadium, now they want to build another ball stadium for the Rhinos (soccer). They want to build a high-speed ferry between here and Toronto. School books? You've got to be kidding; besides, in the words of the commisioner of education, 'we didn't promise how good the education will be'. So, yes, perhaps my view is a bit different than yours.

> You can delude yourself all you want on demanding folks "work"
> for everything...just like you did when younger? Sounds like an
> old whine uncorked every generation by forty- and fiftysomethings
> crying in their drinks. That sort of whining was something done in
> the ancient city of Pompeii, too.

You misunderstand. I consider as work, anything which produces value. This would include engineering, doctors, and lawyers. Problem is, if everyone wants to be a lawyer, what are we going to do? Sue each other?

Everyone seems to want to buy and resell something and not actually produce anything. THAT is my concern.

> You stay on the thought that amateur radio is all about "work"
> and manual-everything. You can add generating your own
> electricity, too, since the electric power is from a dreaded infra-
> structure utility. That isn't free.

No, as I explained, not 'manual everything'. It is about producing something of value. We depend largely on that infrastructure since it is MUCH more efficient than we can be as individuals. It does help to be prepared if that infrastructure should fail for whatever reason. I was on AT&T and lost internet access for a week due to 9/11. NYC has a LOT of that infrastructure there and AT&T got hurt a bit. We've had telephone, power, and cable fail during the ice storm of 91. Myself, I'm not a proponent of CW, but do believe in having some kind of backup. When we moved our work location some 4 miles, we had problems in the new building. The public phones didn't work, and then we lost the business phone. People were scrambling to borrow other folks' cell phones. Myself, I simply went to my locker, pulled out the HT, punched the appropriate buttons, and was on the telephone. Obviously, I can skip the telephone part if I wish. BTW, as I type this, I've got two computers on the desk, one HT, and 40 (forty) brand-new aa alkalines sitting in front of the one PC. There are 6 fresh batteries in the HT. Oh yes, the NiCad is also sitting here, fully charged.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3317. FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 19:03:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <3QUC8.590$xI6.451@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42586

From ARRL bulletin ARLB028

Good news for ham radio this week! FCC has proposed going along with ARRL's request for a new domestic (US-only), secondary HF allocation at 5.25 to 5.4 MHz. The FCC also is ready to permit operation on a 136-kHz ''sliver band'' in the low-frequency (LF) region. And, in response to a third ARRL request, the FCC has proposed elevating Amateur Radio to primary status at 2400 to 2402 MHz.

''I'm just as tickled as I can be,'' ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, said upon hearing the news. ''This is a classic example of our ARRL at work.''

The FCC voted unanimously May 2 to adopt the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in ET Docket 02-98. The Commission released a Public Notice May 9, and the NPRM is expected to be released soon. A comment deadline will be announced as soon as it's available.

The FCC said the new 5-MHz band would help amateurs ''better match their choice of frequency to existing propagation conditions.'' The band, if approved, would be the first new amateur HF allocation since World Administrative Radio Conference 1979 gave amateurs 30, 17 and 12 meters--the so-called ''WARC Bands.'' Assuming the 5-MHz band eventually is authorized, it could be a few years before it actually becomes available.

The League said its successful WA2XSY experiments demonstrated that amateurs can coexist with current users and that the band is very suitable for US-to-Caribbean paths. In comparisons with 80 and 40 meters, the WA2XSY operation also showed the 60-meter band to be the most reliable of the three. The ARRL also argued that a new 150-kHz allocation at 5 MHz could relieve periodic overcrowding on 80 and 40.

If allocated to amateurs on a secondary basis, hams would have to avoid interfering with--and accept interference from--current occupants of the spectrum, as they already do on 30 meters. The band 5.250 to 5.450 MHz now is allocated to Fixed and Mobile services on a co-primary basis in all three ITU regions.

The ARRL asked the FCC for two LF allocations in October 1998--135.7 to 137.8 kHz and 160 to 190 kHz. The FCC said its action on one part of that LF request proposes changes that would enhance the ability of amateur radio operators to conduct technical experiments, including propagation and antenna design experiments, in the 'low frequency' (LF) range of the radio spectrum.''

Several countries in Europe and elsewhere already have 136-kHz amateur allocations. The first amateur transatlantic contact on the band was recorded in February 2001.

Hams would be secondary to the Fixed and Maritime Mobile services in the 136-kHz allocation. The League said its engineering surveys suggest that hams could operate without causing problems to power line carrier (PLC) systems already active in that vicinity or to government assignments. Unallocated Part 15 PLC systems are used by electric utilities to send control signals, data and voice.

The FCC said its proposal to upgrade the Amateur Service allocation at 2400 to 2402 MHz to primary ''seeks to protect current amateur use of this band.'' Hams have shared their other 2.4 GHz spectrum on a secondary basis with government users.

Amateurs already are primary at 2390 to 2400 and from 2402 to 2417 MHz. The ARRL has said primary status in the intervening spectrum slice was needed ''to provide some assurances of future occupancy of the band segments for the next generation of amateur satellites.''

The ARRL has expressed its belief that hams can continue to accommodate Part 15 and Part 18 devices at 2.4 GHz.

3318. FISTs on 20m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 21:33:07 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CDC3C93.6040802@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 42587

I had not been using code for the last 4-5 years so I tuned into 14057 today and heard a lot of "CQ FISTs". I remember this NG back about 7 years ago and the Morse Code wars and how we ultimately lost the battle to a 5 wpm slow (no) code requirement. It seems that back then, FISTs was a very small organization and by the end of the code war I had assumed they would ultimately disband (so to speak). Not so! They are still here, stronger than ever. It must be a much larger organization now.

Way to go FISTs!

I remember the somewhat humorous "fighting" call of we coders:

"No code, no code rah rah rah. dididit dididididit ditdit dah"

Good to see all that code activity on 20m. I think I'll dig out my good ole' straight key and get back to real HAM radio again. I just want to get away from all those CBer qrmers and other low lifes, at least once in a while, on the voice bands where a few fortuitous hams the FCC are trying to save this declining resource.

I think that, ultimately, FISTs will be the one to save real HAM radio. No decadent CBer qrmers on the code sub-bands!

GO FISTs!

73,

de KR4AJ

3319. Re: TS-950S

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 21:42:39 UTC
From: "Alexander S. Wood" <alec_wood@dont_spam_me.ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <L9XC8.3356$p56.172786@newsfep1-win.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 42591
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Here in UK such a rig would probably fetch around the equivalent of US$1000,
but we pay too much for rigs here.....

Alec M1BNK

"Eduardo Hernandez" <EdH@HernandezCommsx.net> wrote in message
news:abgf4o$7n4$0@pita.alt.net...
> A buddy here in Dallas needs cash fast and is offering me a
> Kenwood TS-950S with 4 filters for $1,000. I took my test
> gear over, checked out the rig, and it is in great shape, clean,
> nonsmoker. Is this a good price? I am not familiar with the
> market prices on this rig.
>
> I am going to donate it to a totally handicapped ham who was
> my mentor in computer programming. He is a retired professor.
> I owe the guy a lot, as I came here not speaking English and now
> have a very secure job with a high-tech firm.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Ed "Beans" Hernandez
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3320. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 22:03:11 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <zsXC8.816$xI6.101@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42588

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> The only denizens of rrap who have actually filed comments are
> K0HB, W3GEO and myself.

Not so. I also see comments from K7JEB, WA2ISE, K0CKB, K6JQ, and KT4ST.

All of these have also recently posted on rrap.

73, Hans, K0HB

3321. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 22:06:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020510180630.08742.00001262@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 42590

In article <C4wA8.2687$vT1.248559@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>>>> I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
>
>>> It doesn't really matter, Jim. I think Brian not
>>> only believes that Jim has cronies, he probably
>>> has cohorts too.
>
>> Possibly even a few mechanics, minions, and lackeys.
>
>Not to mention the sycophants and stooges.
>
>And then there are opportunities for leadership in the
>positions of lead crony, stooge supervisor, consulting
>sycophant, mechanic vice president, etc. One has to
>work one's way up the hierarchy, though, by starting
>out as lackey associate.
>
All of which must be approved by the Grand Poobah, of course.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3322. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 22:06:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020510180632.08742.00001263@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 42589

In article <ab8flr7j0s@enews2.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>> The Amateur's Code
>> The Radio Amateur is
>>
>> CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the
>> pleasure of others.
>
>Except on 80 and 40 meters.
>
Ryan,

40 is my favorite band, followed closely by 80. (CW) I find the hams operating there to be very considerate and courteous. YMMV, of course.

Just wondering why you singled out those bands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3323. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 22:18:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <eHXC8.861$xl6.249@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42592

"You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote

> My point is this: The No-Code Techs on 2M (I look up their licenses
> on QRZ) more fit my definition of HAMS than MOST Generals and Extra's
> I hear on HF SSB. In short - I pray they stay where the hell they are
> and never come up and infect 2M or 440.
>
> Your proposal is yet another way of forcing code on folks who frankly
> appear to share my opinion and want nothing to do with HF and the
> plethora of cranks, freaks, and goof-offs that use phone there.

Couple of points in response to your broad-brush rant about HF
operators.......

FCC (Riley) has lately been citing more 2m FM operators for interference,
lack of manners, and other assorted mischief than he has HF operators.

Your HF receiver hears the whole world, your 2m receiver hears maybe a
couple of counties.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
Licensed for 40 years, and Ham Radio just keeps getting better and better.

3324. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 22:51:32 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <U9YC8.11580$Ru2.190889@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42593

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020510180630.08742.00001262@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <C4wA8.2687$vT1.248559@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"K7JEB"
> <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:
>
> >>>> I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
> >
> >>> It doesn't really matter, Jim. I think Brian not
> >>> only believes that Jim has cronies, he probably
> >>> has cohorts too.
> >
> >> Possibly even a few mechanics, minions, and lackeys.
> >
> >Not to mention the sycophants and stooges.
> >
> >And then there are opportunities for leadership in the
> >positions of lead crony, stooge supervisor, consulting
> >sycophant, mechanic vice president, etc. One has to
> >work one's way up the hierarchy, though, by starting
> >out as lackey associate.
> >
> All of which must be approved by the Grand Poobah, of course.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

And countersigned by the Eminent Bahphooie

3325. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 22:52:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDC4F48.96D1E65A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42594

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Your "scientific process" obviously only consists of two steps:
> > >
> > > 1) Formulate a presumption based on your feelings about something
> > > 2) Conclude that this presumption is fact.

> > You left out: Test the presumption against
> > the evidence and if it doesn't fit, change the presumption and iterate.

> I didn't leave it out.

Of course you did. The proof is just above. In which step, 1 or 2, did you
include a test and iteration? Forgive me for asking but I just don't see it.
The fact that you alluded to it later in the posting doesn't matter. I was
talking about your steps 1 and 2 above.

> > I said I thought digital experimentation by hams is a good idea.
>
> Of course it's a good idea. That's a "mom and apple pie" sort of
> thing. All sorts of experimentation by hams is a good thing.

But Dick responded, "Well, there you have it", exactly as I knew he
would. That's why I posted the troll - to provoke Dick into showing
his true colors. You are defending an indefensible position, Jim,
and losing respect in the process. Please forgive me because I didn't
plan for that to happen. I had no idea your agenda ran so deep. You
appeared to have adopted a rational stance since the restructuring
but now that appears to just have been posturing.

> > Don't you think if that was a positive response, Dick would have said so?
>
> All depends on whether he is reading this exchange and whether he is
> able to reply.

Awwwhhhhhh Bull$hit, Jim! Dick could have simply said, "I agree", instead
of, "Well, there you have it". Dick is obviously against digital experimentation.
Your support of Dick's position means that you are against digital
experimentation. I am extremely surprised by your support of such a position.
Is this part of the hidden agenda of the PCTA or did you have a mental lapse?

> > I've had my say and I'm tired of trying to communicate with someone who is not
> > making a good faith effort.
>
> That would be you, not me.

You are entitled to your obfuscations. Everyone who has been following this thread knows differently although obviously members of the anti-digital crowd won't admit it.

> You are the one who has something to prove, not me. So far you have not
> proven anything, except perhaps that you are not serious about the subject
> at all.

Let me leave you with this parting thought, Jim. When you defend someone who is a known and well-defined problem within the ARS, you become part of that same problem. I am really disappointed with your defense of an anti-digital position.

> Perhaps there are others who have filed comments, but so far they have
> not shown up in searches of the ECFS system.

What does it matter? The FCC is going to do what they consider best for the ARS. The individual opinions of individual hams doesn't matter a whit. The FCC is not going to allow the inmates to run the asylum. The Novice band restructuring will not be an experimental band. More probable is allowing broad band digital signals in the phone bands. Try a top-down approach instead of a bottom-up approach next time. That's what the FCC does.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3326. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 22:55:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020510185532.15179.00008301@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 42595

>Subject: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz
>From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 05/10/02 15:03 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3QUC8.590$xI6.451@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Good news for ham radio this week! FCC has proposed going along with
>ARRL's request for a new domestic (US-only), secondary HF allocation
>at 5.25 to 5.4 MHz.

And I bet they had the temerity to do it without consulting Lennie.

Who wudda thunk it.

73 de K4YZ

3327. Re: FISTs on 20m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 22:55:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDC4FF5.E27E4438@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42596

Dan Finn wrote:
> I had not been using code for the last 4-5 years so I tuned into 14057
> today and heard a lot of "CQ FISTs". I remember this NG back about 7
> years ago and the Morse Code wars and how we ultimately lost the battle
> to a 5 wpm slow (no) code requirement.

Sorry to disappoint you, but many members of FISTS support the present
5wpm requirement. Hams can always learn to beep faster.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3328. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-10 23:01:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020510190142.15179.00008303@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 42597

>Subject: Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/10/02 12:45 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020510124524.23265.00001616@mb-ck.aol.com>

>>In your vast experiences in amateur radio, which particular group of
>>radio amateurs insist on dropping the term "amateur", Len?
>
>Nearly all of them, based on both friendships and acquaintences
>with those who have amateur radio licenses...and based on reading
>a number of amateur radio publications over a 50+ year period.

I have subscribed to and read three different periodicals on a nearly
continuous basis for almost 30 years and have NEVER witnessed the likes that
Lennie the Liar purports.

Lying bastard. As if I expected different...?!?!

And I no doubt expect his "Amateur acquaintences" were like
him...ner'-do-well "engineers" for whom being one of the masses was
unthinkable. heaven forbid they might be....COMMON!

Putz

3329. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 00:06:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020510200652.06600.00001774@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 42598

In article <zsXC8.816$xI6.101@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> The only denizens of rrap who have actually filed comments are
>> K0HB, W3GEO and myself.
>
>Not so. I also see comments from K7JEB, WA2ISE, K0CKB, K6JQ, and KT4ST.

That's great! Thanks for the correction, Hans.
>
>All of these have also recently posted on rrap.

I won't argue whether or not that makes them "denizens of rrap". It's a good
thing that they commented.

I think comments close May 16, 2002.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3330. Re: TS-950S

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 00:17:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205101617.7dc82b9f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42599
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Eduardo Hernandez" <EdH@HernandezCommsx.net> wrote in message
news:<abgf4o$7n4$0@pita.alt.net>...
> A buddy here in Dallas needs cash fast and is offering me a
> Kenwood TS-950S with 4 filters for $1,000. I took my test
> gear over, checked out the rig, and it is in great shape, clean,
> nonsmoker. Is this a good price? I am not familiar with the
> market prices on this rig.
>
> I am going to donate it to a totally handicapped ham who was
> my mentor in computer programming. He is a retired professor.
> I owe the guy a lot, as I came here not speaking English and now
> have a very secure job with a high-tech firm.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Ed "Beans" Hernandez
>
>
I have a maxed-out TS-940SAT which is the predecessor of the 950. And
before the 940 there was the TS-930 which first hit the shelves in the
late 1970s. The whole family of TS-9x0 HF xcvrs all defined the high
end of competition-grade HF xcvrs in their times and to this day will
still hold their own *very* well in the contests and pileups.
>
>
My ancient 940 is currently worth around $900. $1,000 for a 950 is a
bloody steal, the things were in production until about four years
ago.
>
>
Grab it Beans, you're the kinda immigrant who understnds what's up,
God bless ya.
>
>
Brian Kelly w3rv

3331. Re: FISTs on 20m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 02:00:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <6X_C8.1277$xI6.497@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42600

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote

>
> No decadent CBer qrmers on the code sub-bands!
>
> GO FISTs!
>

Repetitive and unoriginal. No strong invective, and completely lacking in
any
style. However, it IS at least a coherent thought, and the lack of
exclamation points or excessive capitalization makes this troll refreshingly
restrained. I give it a 2.4

Troll-O-Meter

S1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 +10 +20
----+----+----+----+----+----+----+----+----+-----+------
||||||||||||
----+----+----+----+----+----+----+----+----+-----+------

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3332. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 02:08:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020510220816.02334.00000539@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 42651

In article <qZkC8.11444$do7.523772345@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Larry, Lance has no obligation to do anything for amateur radio. Why do you
>say he could and should...?
>
>Brian

Brian:

If he is/was a ham (which he appears *not* to be), why shouldn't he do something for amateur radio? Aren't we all supposed to be "giving something back to the hobby?"

73 de Larry, K3LT

3333. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 02:08:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020510220816.02334.00000538@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 42652

In article <22lC8.11449$LV6.522889542@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> What do you mean by that? When I was a Novice back in '81, I
>> "actually communicated" with plenty of my fellow hams, utilizing
>> my Novice CW privileges. In fact, I was trying for a Novice WAS,
>> but my problem was I kept working all kinds of DX! Are you saying
>> that it was impossible for Novices to communicate, or that it was
>> just impossible for YOU to communicate *as* a Novice (assuming
>> you were one)?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>I think what I said was clear enough for persons of average intelligence to
>understand.

Brian:

Which is why people of above average intelligence, like myself, didn't understand.

>If you require further clarification, we can discuss my
>consultation fees.

No consultation required, thanks. However, I think you should at least ask for a fee equivalent to the minimum wage. That way, you could "consult" on hamburger flipping at Mc Donalds!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3334. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 02:08:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020510220818.02334.00000540@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 42653

In article <f7d9a152.0205090657.311e7554@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>> It would appear that there is a whole lot Lance Bass can and
>> should be doing for ham radio before he ever gets a ride into
>> space.
>>
>I did a qrz.com database search, and there is no Lance Bass. He would
>probably operate as a third party, just like the students who have
>talked to astronauts in the past.

Jason:

Same here, couldn't find him on QRZ. I don't think that Lance's operation
as a third party aboard the ISS would have quite the same positive impact
on the hobby as if he were to go and get his own Tech license before
making the trip. If he *IS* being considered for a trip to the ISS, then I
would hope that the ARRL would get a hold of him and attempt to give him
a fast education on ham radio and a Tech ticket before the countdown
reaches "zero."

>Even if Lance Bass himself never earns his ham radio license, the
>experience would be a celebrity endorsement of ham radio.

I disagree, it would merely be a celebrity talking to kids on the
ground, using *A* radio. May as well be Verizon Wireless for all they
would know or care -- unless Mr. Bass himself became a licensed
amateur and his fans knew that he did this so he could talk to them
from the space station.

>The grade
>school and high school students he talks to would learn that ham radio
>is what makes such conversations possible.

Only if Mr. Bass spent the majority of his "airtime" slamming that point
home, which I'm sure wouldn't happen. However, his actually BEING a
licensed ham, and the pre-spaceflight publicity of his licensing process
would have some of the desired effect you speak of.

>Talking to Lance Bass
>would be MUCH more exciting to the students than talking to other
>astronauts.

No doubt about that, but ask them HOW they were able to talk to
Lance the next day, and you'd probably get something like "on a radio"
or "on the phone," or, at worst, "on the CB radio."

>News coverage of this would be widespread, while news
>coverage of other astronaut conversations with students is usually
>spotty.

You mean there was actually news coverage of the students talking to
astronauts? Where? When?

>The students would excitedly talk about this with their
>friends. They would log onto N'Sync, Backstreet Boys, Britney Spears,
>and Mandy Moore message boards and talk about this.

Sure they would, but I have my doubts that the main topic of the
discussion would be the METHOD of the conversation with Lance Bass,
just THAT they were able to talk to him while he was in space. The
medium would definitely NOT be the message in this instance.

>Our numbers would jump.

Such blind optimism -- you really should run for ARRL Division Director.

>Many people would be put off by the effort
>needed to study for the exams, others would be put off by the upfront
>cost of equipment, and others would be put off by the antennas needed,

And after three "put offs," they would be "put out," as usual.

>but when you consider that no more than about .5% of people in the USA
>are ham radio operators, it doesn't take much to produce a big impact.

Jason, we'd need 10% growth in the next few years just to cover our
losses from the Old Timers timing out on us. My small club has had
about a half dozen SK's in the last two years -- our budget is becoming
depleted from buying flower arrangements! Two of the SK's were No-Code
Techs who became hams within the last five years.

> I hope the ARRL, AES, HRO, and MFJ have thought about all this.

I'm sure they think of it a lot. However, they're not doing anything
about it other than impose the responsibility for recruitment of new
hams directly on the shoulders of existing hams. Where is MY
motivation to secure the financial future of the ARRL and the equipment
manufacturers/retailers?

>
>Think of the benefits to the hobby AND society of having so many more
>hams:
>1. More people for SKYWARN, RACES, ARES, and other emergency
>operations

Ahhhh, the "Ham Hero(ine)™" motivator. Unfortunately, most of those
who get sucked in by this already have their Tech license, a belt full
of HT's, an International Orange jumpsuit full of patches, and a 4-wheel
drive vehicle with a yellow light bar on the roof.

>2. More demand for equipment would make it worthwhile for Yaesu,
>Icom, Kenwood, and other vendors to take advantage of more economies

>of scale. This means lower production costs and lower prices for all
>of us.

I'm pretty sure we'd have to just about double our numbers for this
to actually happen. The more likely scenario is that a scarcity of
ham gear would cause prices to go UP.

>3. We would have better motivated students, as ham radio would give
>them more concrete motivation to learn subjects like math, science,
>and geography. Ham radio may even indirectly lead to better reading
>and communication skills.

Ever listen to a bunch of teen-aged "hams" having a "homework net"
on a local repeater? Kept me on my toes as a control operator, since
I'd end up shutting the machine down after the third "f" word that slipped
out, and then issuing a verbal warning through the UHF control link
audio path. Communication skills. Right.

>4. There would be more people to talk to on the air.

Talk? What about this "digital revolution" we were promised with the
No-code Tech ticket and Restructuring? Wouldn't they all be on
high-speed packet, PSK-31, PACTOR, etc?

>5. More students would later become GOOD engineers.
>6. Antenna restrictions would be subject to much-needed scrutiny if
>we had more hams AND a greater awareness of ham radio.
>7. Manufacturers would do a better job of fighting RFI when designing
>equipment.

Man, I don't know how much more of this sunshine I can stand! All
of this because some pop-culture punk has a few QSO's with some
screaming teenagers from a space station?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3335. Giving something back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 03:16:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <_10D8.1413$xI6.796@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42654

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> Aren't we all supposed to be "giving
> something back to the hobby?"

Larry,

I see that phrase a lot, usually when someone wants me to donate some money, or run for club office, or 'guilt' me into some other action which I might not have otherwise engaged on my own volition.

OK, here comes a serious question, for which I'm not sure that I know the answer. Now you can flame me to a crisp, or we can have a discussion.

I see a lot of hams, having a great time at the hobby, enjoying themselves, maybe getting smarter by virtue of their curiosity in areas like technology, propagation, or simply engineering a better station to win in a radiosport contest, but not necessarily "giving something back".

Are they good hams?

73, Hans, K0HB

3336. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 05:15:44 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <A10428F66CD7FE02.9418AA259F68B1C3.3953656A364AD1AD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42655

On 11 May 2002 02:08:18 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>My small club has had
>about a half dozen SK's in the last two years -- our budget is becoming
>depleted from buying flower arrangements! Two of the SK's were No-Code
>Techs who became hams within the last five years.

They got licensed just to have flowers at their funerals? Maybe you
should have a 10-15yr minimum membership requirement before you send
them anything.

;)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3337. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 05:55:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CDCB260.AC3A7AA1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42656

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> From ARRL bulletin ARLB028
>
> Good news for ham radio this week! FCC has proposed going along with
> ARRL's request for a new domestic (US-only), secondary HF allocation
> at 5.25 to 5.4 MHz.
>
> The FCC said the new 5-MHz band would help amateurs ''better match
> their choice of frequency to existing propagation conditions.'' The
> band, if approved, would be the first new amateur HF allocation
> since World Administrative Radio Conference 1979 gave amateurs 30,
> 17 and 12 meters--the so-called ''WARC Bands.'' Assuming the 5-MHz
> band eventually is authorized, it could be a few years before it
> actually becomes available.

Any idea of what the band plan would look like? Tuning around there
now (late night) I find what sounds like FSK between 5.33 and 5.4MHz.
And some SSB (in some foreign language) near the low end of this band
earlier.
We wouldn't talk with these users, but would it be better to put our
digital modes up with theirs (less interference?) and our voice down with
theirs, maybe the other sideband to minimize QRM? Or would that
make it worse?

3338. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 06:15:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CDCB6F4.F2DB8972@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42657

Maybe Mr Bass can get his ticket and apply for the vanity call
N5YNC. No go, someone already has it..... :-(
NS1NC is not assigned, but he would have to get his extra
for that.

> I don't think that Lance's operation
> as a third party aboard the ISS would have quite the same positive impact
> on the hobby as if he were to go and get his own Tech license before
> making the trip. If he *IS* being considered for a trip to the ISS, then I
> would hope that the ARRL would get a hold of him and attempt to give him
> a fast education on ham radio and a Tech ticket before the countdown
> reaches "zero."

3339. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 08:18:31 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CDCD3D7.9010103@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 42658

Kï¿½HB wrote:

And, in
> response to a third ARRL request, the FCC has proposed elevating
> Amateur Radio to primary status at 2400 to 2402 MHz.

Comment...I hadn't thought of this before (and sorry to change the subject) but I think this means we can add amplifiers to some of our common household 2.4 GHz devices such as cordless phones and wireless notebook adapters and transmitters as long as we have a ham license, provided we ensure that the transmitting frequency falls within the allocation. Sorry Hans, not a troll so you cannot use your fantasy toy, the troll o meter with the stingy "S-meter". Guess it doesn't work at 2.4GHz.

Interesting concept. Seems to open up several legal avenues for creative UHF hobbyists. Just be a bit careful with the m-wave radiation keeping in mind the well-known safety limits.

de
KR4AJ

3340. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 08:56:05 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <746B0001A5C6D093.60B74C3E536BCCDD.CA1E8625D64B535F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42659

On Sat, 11 May 2002 04:18:31 -0400, Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
wrote:

>Comment...I hadn't thought of this before (and sorry to change the
>subject) but I think this means we can add amplifiers to some of our
>common household 2.4 GHz devices such as cordless phones

Oh boy; 1.5kW cordless phones and baby monitors...

;)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3341. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 12:18:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205110418.2e35b09b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42660

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20020510185532.15179.00008301@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>
>
> >Good news for ham radio this week! FCC has proposed going along with
> >ARRL's request for a new domestic (US-only), secondary HF allocation
> >at 5.25 to 5.4 MHz.
>
> And I bet they had the temerity to do it without consulting Lennie.
>
> Who wudda thunk it.
>
> 73 de K4YZ
>
>
He beasted upon and dissed the whole thing back when he (very
belatedly) discovered the 60m band was in the works and how it was
being "tested". Clueless No-Counter Lenny.
>
>
w3rv

3342. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 12:33:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CDC1F5C.C1DBEE1F@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42661

CAM wrote:

> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > What it does mean is that those of us with some experience if we are not
> > to lose these guys thru a process not of their making are going to have to
> > get over green-as-grass Extras and get them going just as Novices were got
> > going back in antiquity.
>
> You and I were once "green-as-grass" amateur radio operators. We were not
> born with our present knowledge. I had all amateur frequency/power privileges
> in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras. Nothing
> has changed.

Oh... You didn't know how to get on HF?

3343. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 12:33:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CDD0F83.E7C91C5A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42662

CAM wrote:

> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > What it does mean is that those of us with some experience if we are not
> > to lose these guys thru a process not of their making are going to have to
> > get over green-as-grass Extras and get them going just as Novices were got
> > going back in antiquity.
>
> You and I were once "green-as-grass" amateur radio operators. We were not
> born with our present knowledge. I had all amateur frequency/power privileges
> in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras. Nothing
> has changed.

Oh... You didn't know how to get on HF?

3344. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 12:34:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020511083403.06635.00006136@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 42663

>Subject: Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz
>From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
>Date: 05/11/02 04:56 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id:
><746B0001A5C6D093.60B74C3E536BCCDD.CA1E8625D64B535F@lp.airnews.net>

>
>Oh boy; 1.5kW cordless phones and baby monitors...

Great...now you leave the monitor on next to Junior's bed and come back to
find him medium rare!

That will be one for JAMA to cover!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3345. Re: Entry Level Temporary License and Program!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 13:44:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CDD200D.8B2DA903@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42664

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CDB397A.D2C5C128@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >In your vast experiences in amateur radio, which particular group of
> >radio amateurs insist on dropping the term "amateur", Len?
>
> Nearly all of them, based on both friendships and acquaintences
> with those who have amateur radio licenses...and based on reading
> a number of amateur radio publications over a 50+ year period.

I've been reading most national and several regional amateur radio
periodicals for over 40 years and I'll wager I know more hams than you
do. I've not read or heard anything like you've described.

> >> The attempt to equate "professionalism" to an avocational
> >> recreation is common among many amateurs.
> >
> >Really? On what knowledge do you base your sweeping generality?
>
> The same as the first...although friends and acquaintences who are
> ham licensees were already professionals in a profession.

Your lenses are fogged. Your statement is a sweeping generality,
unsupported by fact.

> >> See the ARRL definitions. The original term was coined BY
> >> professional telegraphers as a negative description of amateur's
> >> manual telegraphy skills...or lack of skills.
> >
> >The truth is, we don't actually know for certain how the term "ham" came
> >to be applied to radio amateurs.
>
> You can't find it on the ARRL website? If the ARRL states it, it must
> be so...

I'm basing my statement on my reading over the past forty or so years.
There are several ideas on how the term came to be used but there is no
definitive answer.

> >I've seen examples of such cases. There is, for example, a guy who
> >posts here on a regular basis who is not a radio amateur, has no
> >intention of becoming a radio amateur but is quick to point out to radio
> >amateurs how insignificant they are.
>

> If you are referring to me, then note that I point out things to
> INDIVIDUALS WHO POST IN HERE.

I've noted a number of YOUR postings which take shots at radio amateurs IN GENERAL. Would you care for a sample from google or do you have enough CINC-as-Navy-only egg on your face?

> You have a very thin skin, are prideful to a large degree, and cannot
> stand to be corrected in anything. As a result you attempt
> misdirection by claiming that I say "insignificance to all amateurs."

Are you addressing me or yourself?

> That isn't true.
>
> Dave Heil does not represent all radio amateurs. He only represents
> himself. He hides behind the association with amateur radio and
> attempts to bully others who don't share his views. He implies his
> views "represent the views of other amateurs" when that cannot be
> proven.

I've never claimed to represent all radio amateurs. In fact, I've stated on a number of occasions that I speak only for myself. I don't hide behind anything at all. If you feel bullied, I suggest that you adopt a mechanism for coping with your feelings.

> Further, Dave Heil implies superior knowledge of amateur radio on
> the basis of being licensed a relatively long time. That has no
> basis on "knowing what is best for amateur radio," simply a claim
> of long tenure...and has as its probable basis that whatever Heil
> desires "should be that of amateur radio." Personal desire is not a
> valid attribute for regulation that applies to all citizens...it is
> merely an attempt at personal control for personal desires.

I've not implied knowledge of amateur radio superior to your own, Len. I've stated that my knowledge of amateur radio, attained over the course of four decades involvement is superior to yours. For you to claim that my statement isn't true would make you look like a complete boob.

> >> Not a "lie." Despite the spin used in the ARRL's descriptions of
> >> what it "does" to publicize amateur radio, the fact remains that
> >> the ARRL has NOT succeeded in achieving any significant impact
> >> in the public mind about amateur radio in a half century.
> >>
> >> Denial of a clearly-observable fact is not an excuse/rationale.
> >
> >To whom is this "fact" clearly observable?
>
> Obviously not yourself...but then Dave Heil is too locked into a
> subjective, I-never-make-mistakes attitude that precludes any
> hope of being objective.

I know that it has not been observed by me. I asked you a question. It seems that you cannot or will not answer it.

> The discussion within this thread concerned making amateur
> radio activities known to the GENERAL PUBLIC.
>
> The ARRL does well informing hams WITHIN amateur radio.
> It does poorly on informing the GENERAL PUBLIC. They
> are in a very good position to be influential about amateur
> radio to the general public yet they cannot get into media any
> better than the Academy of Model Aeronautics.

I've read a number of pieces on amateur radio in newspapers and magazines. I can't recall ever seeing such a piece on model aeronautics. Could it be that you made up your "facts" based on your own lack of knowledge?

> >I know there must be a point buried in your comment somewhere. I don't
> >believe the public needs to be awed, only enlightened. To your puzzling
> >statement about something being "proof of ONE activity", I can only
> >write, "So?"
>
> So stuff it, Dave, or try participating in a discussion. You haven't
> done that in here in years. You get your jollies by bullying others
> who don't share your views or admire your accomplishments.

I don't require admiration from you, Len.

> >So you're telling us that we need hundred of articles about amateur
> >radio in order to make an impact.
>
> I've never stated a number. HOW you get amateur radio exposure
> before the GENERAL PUBLIC is not a concern. ANY way is always
> better than none.

We agree on that. It wasn't too clear from your statement.

> The general public is simply not that aware of amateur radio
> activities.

We disagree on this one. Some percentage of the public doesn't know much or anything about amateur radio.

> >Or maybe you're telling us that a
> >small group of evil editors is force-feeding the public stories which
> >are not really newsworthy.
>
> In real-life journalism, every day, all over the world, the items in a
> newscast or set in type and printed on paper is the result of
> selection by a very few individuals who work under the title of
> "editor." That's not an "evil" thing, it is common practice in the
> free world, normal, SOP.
>
> Every news item that you hear, see, read is SELECTED. By a

> very small minority in all of journalism.
>
> One purpose of public relations is to convince editors that a PR
> item should be SELECTED. That's a "selling" task.
>
> If a PR piece is selected, the PR item becomes a part of the news.
> If not selected, the readers-viewers-listeners will never find out
> about it. "News" does not appear out of thin air. It is SELECTED.

As the son of a fellow who spent twenty years in the newspaper game, I'm aware of how things work in a newsroom. Perhaps you've stumbled on a new avocation. In addition to being an uninvited advocate for change in amateur radio, you could play a role in fighting for the right for the public to vote on what is seen in magazines and newspapers.

> >No it does not. There are Asian, black, and Hispanic radio amateurs.
> >There are male and female radio amateurs. There are very young radio
> >amateurs. There are very old radio amateurs. Would it make you happy
> >if those of us who happen to be white, male and over a certain age wear
> >hair shirts as part of our penance?
>
> I wrote that any observation of photographs of radio amateurs in any
> amateur radio periodical of the past half century will show that the
> OVERWHELMING MAJORITY are male and white. I added that they
> TEND to appear as middle-aged in their appearance.

> There ARE exceptions. Exceptions' existance only proves that
> exceptions exist.

The exceptions prove that anyone who chooses to become an amateur radio operater can do so. Quit acting as if there is a problem with someone being white and male.

> The OVERWHELMING MAJORITY are male and white. That cannot
> be denied on the basis of photographic evidence.

It isn't denied at all. It is simply that you state it as if there is a problem. Those drawn to amateur radio are drawn to amateur radio. Ham radio is no more expensive than many other interests. I'd wager that most flying model enthusiasts are also overwhelmingly white, male and middle aged. I'd say the same is true of golf. What are you, Len Anderson going to do about it?

> There are NO requirements for fashions in clothing. Heil has the
> option to wear anything he wants. One problem is that he puts on
> "emperor's new clothes" and cannot realize he is naked.

I'm not exactly sure what this is supposed to mean. Would you like me to start describing what I'm wearing when typing responses to your posts? I don't want to start feeding your fetishes. You, after all, are the one parading about the newsgroup as expert in amateur radio. Those clothes don't fit you.

Dave K8MN

3346. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 13:53:07 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <7n9D8.2926$Nt3.240830@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42665

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote

> Comment...I hadn't thought of this before (and sorry to change the
> subject) but I think this means we can add amplifiers to some of our
> common household 2.4 GHz devices such as cordless phones and wireless
> notebook adapters and transmitters as long as we have a ham license,
> provided we ensure that the transmitting frequency falls within the
> allocation.

As long as you remain in compliance with the general rules such ID every 10
minutes, no music, one-way transmissions, allowed modulation methods, etc.,
I don't think Reily would come looking for you.

73, Hans, K0HB

3347. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 14:03:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDD24A8.99A25462@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42666

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Aren't we all supposed to be "giving something back to the hobby?"

That "supposed to be" is purely voluntary. I bought a used pellet
gun from the local gun store owner. Turns out he is an inactive
Extra.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3348. Re: Giving something back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 14:09:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDD2605.66780DAE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42667

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> I see a lot of hams, having a great time at the hobby, enjoying themselves,
> maybe getting smarter by virtue of their curiosity in areas like technology,
> propagation, or simply engineering a better station to win in a radiosport
> contest, but not necessarily "giving something back".
>
> Are they good hams?

Not as good as Larry who absolutely hates being a ham but performs ham radio
services anyway for the good of mankind because he is just so very altruistic. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3349. Re: Giving something back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 14:22:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <%O9D8.2957$Nt3.246774@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42668

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> Not as good as Larry who absolutely hates being a ham but performs ham
radio
> services anyway for the good of mankind because he is just so very
altruistic. :-)

Go join Brian in the twit filter. Feel free to petition for reconsideration
when you feel like having a reasoned discussion.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
Go down to the machine room and tell them to empty the bit bucket,
and FAST, before this baby overflows.

3350. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 14:28:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDD2A73.BC2F9B91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42669

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You and I were once "green-as-grass" amateur radio operators. We were not
> > born with our present knowledge. I had all amateur frequency/power privileges
> > in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras. Nothing
> > has changed.
>
> Oh... You didn't know how to get on HF?

Yep, I didn't know how to get on HF. My Elmer, W5OLV, told me what transmitting equipment to buy and designed all my antennas for me. I bought 100 ft. of RG-11 and only needed about 60 ft. I didn't want to cut that 100 ft. run in the middle so I asked Shorty if rolling up the excess behind my ham desk would be OK. He said it would so I had a choke on my coax feedline and didn't realize it. He told me how long to make my 40m dipole. I put it up at ten feet and it didn't work very well. I told Shorty it wasn't working very well and he suggested I raise it to 20 feet at which height it worked very well. I had no clue as to why I raised the antenna.

There have always been totally ignorant people getting their ham licenses, at least ever since 1952 when I gained all amateur frequency/power privileges without knowing the first technical thing about ham radio. The brighter a potential ham is, the more of the material he/she is capable of rote-memorizing so don't sell him/her short. The more material a person is capable of rote-memorizing, the greater the brain power, and the greater potential that person has for the future.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3351. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 16:48:15 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CDD4B4F.5000304@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 42670

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>>Subject: Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz
>>From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
>>Date: 05/11/02 04:56 Eastern Daylight Time
>>Message-id:
>><746B0001A5C6D093.60B74C3E536BCCDD.CA1E8625D64B535F@lp.airnews.net>
>>
>
>>Oh boy; 1.5kW cordless phones and baby monitors...
>>
>
> Great...now you leave the monitor on next to Junior's bed and come back to
> find him medium rare!
>
> That will be one for JAMA to cover!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
Baby monitors at 2.4GHz? I haven't seen any. A slight interference problem when you turn on the microwave.

3352. Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 16:55:59 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CDD4D1F.5040904@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 42671

Can a person improve sending speed when using paddle type keys instead of a straight key? Or is there a type of straight ket more suited to higher speeds? My old straight key, which I have mounted on a block of wood, and for which I paid $10.00 new in 1993 has been fairly reliable but the mechanism has too much damping to allow much more than 18 wpm. Any advice from coders would be appreciated. Thanks in advance.

Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?

Will there be a CW sub-band in the new 60 meter band? Thanks,
de KR4AJ

3353. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 17:14:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <tjcD8.3348$Nt3.274454@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42672

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote

> Can a person improve sending speed when using paddle type keys instead
> of a straight key? Or is there a type of straight ket more suited to
> higher speeds?

My preferred Morse instrument is a Vibroplex bug, also called a "speed key"
for a reason. I can clip along much faster on that than I can on a straight
key, and with a lot less wrist fatigue. Paddles can be even faster, but
require an electronic keyer (most modern rigs have one built in).

> Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?

It isn't strictly against the rules, because Morse is allowed in virtually
all amateur allocations, but it is bad manners to ignore bandplans.

> Will there be a CW sub-band in the new 60 meter band?

I don't know (I haven't seen the NPRM) but I presume there will be.

73, Hans, K0HB

3354. ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 17:27:44 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020511132744.00568.00011697@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 42673

NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the Dayton Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able to post the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1291 - May 10th 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline™ report number 1291 with a release date of Friday, May 10th 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Mark Shuttleworth returns to Earth after his ham radio odyssey in space. This story is first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1291 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: MARK SHUTTLEWORTH RETURNS TO EARTH

South African space explorer Mark Shuttleworth was greeted with Easter eggs and cake as he returned to earth on Sunday May 5th, This, after a ten day stay on the International Space Station that he called unforgettable. And ham radio operators around the world will remember his trip for a long time as well. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Roy Neal, K6DUE, has the wrap-up on Mark Shuttleworth’s ham radio space odyssey:

--

"Every second will be imprinted and will be with me for the rest of my life.”

Those were the words of a happy Mark Shuttleworth as he was carried away from the Russian Soyuz capsule that brought him and two fellow passengers back down to earth in Kazakhstan on Sunday, May 5th at 7:51 a.m. Moscow time. Before his return to Earth, Shuttleworth delighted hams around the world when he showed up on the air and made numerous random contacts. In short order he was working them like a D-Xpedition pro. Listen:

--
contact audio here
--

That recording was supplied by Stan Vandiver, W4SV. We compressed it to give you a glimpse of the way Mark Shuttleworth took to ham radio and the way that ham radio welcomed him.

One ham lucky enough to record both sides of his contact with Shuttleworth was Al Lark, KD4SFF. Using the Experimenters Group Amateur Radio Club callsign N4ISS mobile, Lark spoke with Shuttleworth on May 1st at 9:20 A-M Eastern Daylight Time:

--
Contact audio here
--

According to Lark, that contact was made from his work van during coffee break in downtown Greenville, South Carolina.

Mark Shuttleworth's operation from the International Space Station was made possible by ARISS. Amateur Radio on the International Space Station. Amateurs from nine countries, in the USA, Russia, Japan, Europe and Canada, have set up ARISS, to design, build, maintain and supervise all operations of the amateur radio station aboard the ISS,

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Roy Neal, K6DUE.

--

Shuttleworth is the second person to pay Russia for a trip to the I-S-S. The first was U.S. businessman Dennis Tito, KG6FZX, who travelled to and operated from the space station a year ago. (ARNewsline™ with audio supplied by W4SV and KD4SFF)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: THE OTHER HAM IN THE CREW

Almost lost in the shadow of Mark Shuttleworth is Italian Astronaut Roberto Vittori, IZ6ERU. Vittori was a member of the crew that brought a new Russian built Soyuz escape vehicle and explorer Mark Shuttleworth to the ISS. And while on board the space station, Vittori also took to the air in his native Italian using the ARISS station:

--
Vittori audio here
--

That recording was made by IT9GSV as Vittori was flying over Rome. Among the other contacts Vittori made was one with a school in the town of Malignani on May the third. (Tnx: IT9GSV, IK1SLD via SAREX Remailer)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: TEEN IDOL MAY BE NEXT SPACE TOURIST

The next space tourist to visit the International Space Station could be a teen heart-throb. Lance Bass, one-fifth the teen pop group *NSYNC, says that he has passed his first battery of tests in his effort to fly into space on a Russian spacecraft later this year.

In a recent television interview, Bass said he is attempting to keep time free during the bands current tour so he can participate in additional medical tests

in the U.S.. If they go well, Bass says that he will be heading back to Russia to see if he can qualify for a fall mission to the ISS.

Bass was in Russia last March to undergo an initial series of physical tests. The 22-year-old pop singer's is attempting to qualify for a seat on the Russian mission that's set to launch on October 22nd and return to earth on November 1st. If Bass is approved to fly, it is not known if he would have time to study for a United States Amateur Radio license or if he would be interested in using the ham gear on board the ISS.

By the way, the same news report says that Bass' trip to the Star City Cosmonaut Training Center was paid for in part by Radio Shack. Last year Radio Shack filmed a television commercial aboard the international space station. (Published news reports)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Condor Connection serving the great American South-West.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: AMATEURS MUSTER FOR WEATHER EMERGENCIES

The ARRL Letter says that Amateur Radio Emergency Service teams activated or stood by to assist as severe weather struck several states in late April. The National Weather Service said storms over the weekend of the 27th and 28th left pockets of devastation from Kentucky to Maryland. Amateur Radio Newsline's David Black, KB4KCH, picks up the story from here:

--
La Plata, Maryland was hit hard April 28th when an F5 tornado roared through the town's business district. This time, the agencies that normally help during disasters were themselves hit. The local American Red Cross chapter office and a building housing the Charles County Emergency Operations Center were damaged.

Tom Abernethy, W3TOM is ARRL's Maryland Section Manager. He says Michelle Sack, N3YRZ, who was on duty at the LaPlata hospital broke into a SKYWARN net to report a tornado. Sack reported a the massive storm was only one-half mile away to the west and heading directly for her location.

Sack tracked and described the tornado until it struck and then continued to provide on-the-scene assessments. Other amateurs along the storm's track also provided reports on severity and damage.

Mike Tackish, KA3GRW is the county's ARES Emergency Coordinator and RACES officer. He activated the local ARES and RACES team's emergency operations. Hams set up a command and control net on UHF, and used VHF channels to supply

communications for the hospital which lost telephone service and internal communications. Hams also helped the Red Cross with communications.

Hams were also busy helping the National Weather Service as the agency conducted a follow-up investigation of the tornado which had winds of around 260 miles an hour.

Also on the same date, hams in Kentucky were busy when severe weather struck that state. Radio amateurs used a wide area repeater net to relay important information to help the Weather Service and the Meade County Emergency Management Agency.

Weather service forecasters wound up issuing a Tornado Warning based on reports from radio amateurs. One person died, with homes in the Irvington area being damaged or destroyed. Nearly a dozen hams assisted with communications.

In Erie, Pennsylvania, hams were providing communications for a March of Dimes 9-mile walk April 28th, when severe weather prompted them to activate a Skywarn Net. Buildings were damaged at Erie International Airport--trees and power lines were knocked down, but no injuries were reported.

For the Amateur Radio Nrewsline, I’m David Black, KB4KCH.

--

Thats not the end of it. On April 24th, tornadoes struck Butler, Carter and Madison counties in south-eastern Missouri. More than 100 homes were damaged or destroyed. ARRL Missouri Section Emergency Coordinator Patrick Boyle, K0JPB, said ARES teams and individual amateurs remained on standby to assist if needed during the recovery effort. (ARRL Letter)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAMS ASSIST IN NEW MEXICO FIRE COMMS

Amateur radio played a significant communications role in fighting the New Mexico wildfires. According to Jay Miller, WA5WHN, both Otero and Lincoln Counties were affected. Albuquerque was linked to Benson Ridge neat Alamogordo via the W5BI remote base with support from stations in Roswell and Ruidoso. This in support of the Red Cross and other agencies. Also, the 146.74 and 145.23 MHz repeaters plus 3.939 MHz Lower Sideband were in use.

The Red Cross had set up a shelter in the city of Cloudcroft. During the blaze several hams were forced to out of the area because they were in the path of the fire. They were located in a recreational vehicle in a near-by campground. (WA5WHN, ARNewsline™)

**

RESCUE RADIO: PHONES FAIL IN UK AND HAMS CALLED OUT

The United States is not the only place where radio amateurs have been busy. Ham radio operators who belong to the emergency service group Raynet were also called up after the telephone system failed in one area of the United Kingdom. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, in Nottingham has more.

--

A major failure of the telephone system in south-west Hampshire and part of Wiltshire occurred during the evening of the 25th of April. At 2030, Bob, G4VWP, received a call from the Duty Emergency Planning Officer for Hampshire, requesting that Raynet be put on standby, ready for callout should the need arise. Later another call was received asking that, if required, Raynet should set up a VHF communications link between the police Command and Control Center at Netley and police HQ in Winchester.

Thirty-four members from four groups indicated that they were available for callout. The Forward Control Land Rover and 60-foot mobile tower were collected from storage and a portable mast, radio, power supply and associated equipment were made ready to take to the police headquarters.

The callout was led by Clive McCloud, G4EFB, Roger Davies, G8SXC, John Witts, G6BBW, Ian Duffy, G7GMN, and Dave Minett, G6DJA.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH in Nottingham.
--

Eventually it was found that ham radio assistance would not be needed. Raynet members were dismissed at 23:10 UTC. (GB2RS)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC DOWNGRADES SIX TECHS

The FCC has notified six Technician class hams that they have been downgraded to no-code Technician status. This, as a result of an audit of a May 2000 ARRL V-E-C administered exam session in Statesboro Georgia. The FCC’s Riley Hollingsworth says that the problem was not the applicants but rather the test itself:

--
Hollingsworth: “We found that in that session the code exam had also been used in teaching the classes and in the practice exam. The same code exam -- that is. We called in eight for a code retest. Two appeared and passed but six did not show up.”
--

Hollingsworth said that the variances in the exam procedures were not the fault of any of the upgrade applicants and in no way reflect on them. However, they must first pass a valid Morse test before they can be granted the privileges of a Technician class license holder who has passed the code. (FCC, RAIN)

**

RADIO RULES: FCC CONSIDERS NEW SATELLITE INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE

The FCC says that it will consider rules for a new service capable of providing broadband Internet access via satellite. According to the CGC Communicator the FCC Commissioners will consider issuing a Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to implement sharing among multiple licensees in a new service capable of providing broadband access to the Internet using

non-geostationary satellites operating in the KU band. (CGC Communicator)

**

RADIO LAW: CALIFORNIA LAWMAKER SEEKS CELL PHONE BAN

A California lawmaker believes that two cellular telephone related car accidents may bring attention to his efforts to ban drivers use of cellular telephones and other hand held communications devices. Assemblyman Joe Simitian says it is time to ban these apparatus in the name of public safety.

New York State already has made it illegal to use a cellular telephone while driving unless it is attached to a hands free device. Other states are considering similar legislation. In California the idea has been defeated every time it has been brought to a vote, but Simitian believes that the recent series of accidents will bring a vote in favor of his proposed across the board ban. (Published news reports)

**

HAMVENTION 2002: APRS TAKES CENTER STAGE

APRS will be a feature at the upcoming Dayton Hamvention. Jack Parker, W8ISH, of Amateur News Weekly has the story.

--
Audio report only. The full newscast in MP3 can be downloaded at
http://www.arnewsline.org
--

The Hamventon is slated for May 17th, 18th and 19th at the HARA Arena in Dayton Ohio. APRS will be at booth 225. (ANW, W8ISH)

**

(RAIN PROMO HERE: WEDDING AT HAMVENTION 2002

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for todays radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

**

AWARDS: MC GAN NOMINATIONS DUE MAY 24

The ARRL says that nominations close May 24th for the Philip J. McGan Memorial Silver Antenna Award. The annual award honors an amateur who demonstrates outstanding public relations success at the local, state or national level on behalf of Amateur Radio, and who best exemplifies the volunteer spirit of the award's namesake.

The award is named for the late journalist Philip J. McGan, WA2MBQ, the first chairman of the ARRL's Public Relations Committee and an enthusiastic Amateur Radio booster. To obtain an entry form for the Philip J. McGan Silver Antenna Award, contact Jennifer Hagy, N1TDY by e-mail to jhagy@arrl.org (ARRL)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: KOLIBRI 2000 TO DE-ORBIT FOLO

Last week we reported that the Kolibri-2000 Russian and Australian School Scientific Research Microsatellite was slated to deorbit sometime between May 3rd to the 4th U-T-C time. WE also suggested that you might want to have a tape recorder on the satellites primary or secondary downlink channels.

Well if you did, and if you caught the last transmissions from the Kolibri we could like to get a copy and so would Miles Mann, WF1F, of MAREX. You can contact Miles for shipping instructions by e-mail to wf1f@attbi.com. Amateur Radio Newsline can be reached at the address you hear at the end of this weeks report. (WF1F, ARNewsline™)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT-NA SPACE SYMPOSIUM

The 20th Space Symposium and AMSAT North America Annual Meeting is scheduled for November 7th to the 11th in
Fort Worth, Texas. The meeting will chronicle recent and future Amateur Radio satellite technology developments and including an Electronic Surplus Stores tour on November 7th. Also slated is a Field Operations breakfast, a tour of the Lockheed Martin Aerospace Company and the all important actual AMSAT North America Board of Directors Meeting November 10th The 2002 event chairman is Keith Pugh, W5IU. (ANS)

**

INTERNATIONAL-UK: NEARLY 2300 FOUNDATION LICENSES ISSUED

According to the latest statistics from the United Kingdoms Radiocommunications Agency, as of the 18th of April, some 2283 of that nations Foundation Licences had been issued. This figure is made up of 1582 Full and Intermediate Class B’s taking the Morse Assessment and 701 individuals taking the Foundation Course.

Of those 701 completely new entrants to amateur radio, 226 - or 32 per cent - are under the age of 21. After only three-and-a-half months, these figures are being seen as a great success and thanks are due to the many radio clubs and individuals who are giving their time in order to provide Foundation Courses and Morse Assessments. (GB2RS)

**

DX

In D-X, word that Arliss Thompson, W7XU, and a few of his ham radio friends will be operating a 6 meter station from St. Paul Island in grid square FN97 from 29 June to 8 July. Thompson says that the group plant itself on 50.157

MHz and remain there for the duration of the DXpedition. Both CW and SSB operations will take place on that frequency although they may run split if they get a very good opening. The station will have a breakable beacon also on 50.157 MHz that will be running during slow times. QSL to W7XU. (W7XU)

Edisher Giorgadze, P5/4L4FN, has returned to North Korea. During a stop-over in Beijing, Edisher collected an Ameritron AL80A amplifier that was donated by Martti Laine, OH2BH, Bernie McClenny, W3UR and Al Baker, W5IZ. In his first contact using the increased power he contacted K4SSU who told him he was S-5 barefoot at 100 watts but an amazing 10 db over s 9 with the AL80A in line. He days that this basically guarantees more QSO's from the skylines of Pyongyang. Especially since he has extended his contract and will be in North Korea through June of 2003. Also, now that his operation is fully accredited by the ARRL a full-color QSLs has been released by his QSL manager, Bruce Paige, KK5DO. (KK5DO)

**

SUPPORT FUND REPORT WITH ANDY JAREMA N6TCQ

And finally this week, we hear once again to hear from our support fund administrator. Here's Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Yes, this is Andy Jarema, N6TCQ, Chief Financial Officer of the not-for-profit organization you know as the Amateur Radio Newsline. And once again, I am using the single word -- HELP! If you value this service, please help.

Let me start by saying that we really appreciate the individuals who give of themselves, but we don't hear from enough clubs. There are literally thousands, perhaps tens of thousands of traditional radio clubs and repeater clubs out there. These are the wonderful folks who re-transmit our broadcasts, bringing your nets increased value, and giving your members the latest in Amateur Radio news and information to enhance their hobby.

But Amateur Radio Newsline cannot continue without the funding needed to pay the monthly bills. And right now, we can't.

In the quarter century that it has existed, no one at the Amateur Radio Newsline has ever taken a salary. We all volunteer our time and talents. But we ARE faced with are monthly expenses for gathering and delivering the news to YOU! We are talking telephone, Internet access and the like. This hasn't changed.

We are also talking about the money we spend each year to help insure the future of Amateur Radio through the Young Ham of the Year award program. Yes, Vertex Standard, C-Q, Dave Bell Associates and Rosewood cover the expenses and gifts for the recipient. They do not cover the administration expenses. That's out part and it ran close to $1200 last year.

The bottom line is this. I am asking that you try to find it within your organization to continue this service. As we have said before, whether Amateur Radio Newsline continues to provide this service or if it disappears is totally

your decision. We are here to serve you for as long as you want us. You response the next several weeks will provide the answer.

The address for the Amateur Radio Newsline, Post Office Box 660937, Arcadia California, 91066.

Looking forward to hearing from you really soon, I’m Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Also, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2002 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year award closes May 30th. Less than three weeks from now. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our website at www.arnewsline.org. (ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline™. Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's™ only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA, in New Orleans saying 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline™ is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

3355. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 19:50:39 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205111949370.3537-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42674

On Sat, 11 May 2002, Dan Finn wrote:
>KØHB wrote:
> And, in
>> response to a third ARRL request, the FCC has proposed elevating
>> Amateur Radio to primary status at 2400 to 2402 MHz.
>
>
>Comment...I hadn't thought of this before (and sorry to change the
>subject) but I think this means we can add amplifiers to some of our
>common household 2.4 GHz devices such as cordless phones and wireless
>notebook adapters and transmitters as long as we have a ham license,
>provided we ensure that the transmitting frequency falls within the
>allocation. Sorry Hans, not a troll so you cannot use your fantasy toy,
>the troll o meter with the stingy "S-meter". Guess it doesn't work at
>2.4GHz.

There's more to it. Do you want to have to identify your
now-overpowered cordless phone transmissions with your callsign? ....

>Interesting concept. Seems to open up several legal avenues for creative
>UHF hobbyists. Just be a bit careful with the m-wave radiation keeping
>in mind the well-known safety limits.

3356. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 19:51:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205111951050.3537-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42675

On Sat, 11 May 2002, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:
>On Sat, 11 May 2002 04:18:31 -0400, Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Comment...I hadn't thought of this before (and sorry to change the
>>subject) but I think this means we can add amplifiers to some of our
>>common household 2.4 GHz devices such as cordless phones
>
>Oh boy; 1.5kW cordless phones and baby monitors...

More powerful than one's microwave oven! Time to cook some birds.....

3357. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 20:02:56 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205112000021.3537-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42676

On Sat, 11 May 2002, Dan Finn wrote:
>Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>>Subject: Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz
>>>From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
>>>Date: 05/11/02 04:56 Eastern Daylight Time
>>>Message-id:
>>><746B0001A5C6D093.60B74C3E536BCCDD.CA1E8625D64B535F@lp.airnews.net>
>>>
>>
>>>Oh boy; 1.5kW cordless phones and baby monitors...
>>
>> Great...now you leave the monitor on next to Junior's bed and come back to
>> find him medium rare!
>>
>> That will be one for JAMA to cover!
>>
>Baby monitors at 2.4GHz? I haven't seen any. A slight interference problem
>when you turn on the microwave.

I have never received any interference nor "falsing" from my microwave oven on my Kenwood TM-2400 35' away (and connected to a GP-24 15.6dBi vertical via 40' of 1/2" hardline) at any time in the past 6 years.

Cordless phones is another matter. And yes - there are 2.4GHz baby monitors.

3358. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 20:06:21 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205112003420.3537-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42677

On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
>NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the Dayton
>Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able to post
>the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.

Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM anyway.

It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
"rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and is
therefore inappropriate to .policy.

3359. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 20:06:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020511160657.19000.00001715@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 42678

In article <3CDC4F48.96D1E65A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> > N2EY wrote:
>> > > Your "scientific process" obviously only consists of two steps:
>> > >
>> > > 1) Formulate a presumption based on your feelings about something
>> > > 2) Conclude that this presumption is fact.
>
>> > You left out: Test the presumption against
>> > the evidence and if it doesn't fit, change the presumption and iterate.
>
>> I didn't leave it out.
>
>Of course you did.

I was describing your "scientific process", not mine.

>> > I said I thought digital experimentation by hams is a good idea.
>>
>> Of course it's a good idea. That's a "mom and apple pie" sort of
>> thing. All sorts of experimentation by hams is a good thing.
>
>But Dick responded, "Well, there you have it", exactly as I knew he
>would.

So? Is that supposed to be PROOF that W0EX is somehow against
"digital" experimentation by hams?

Let's ask him.

Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?

Do you think such experimentation is good or bad for ham radio?

Note that I'm not asking about how much success hams will have, or how many
hams will actually do any experimenting. And I'm not asking for comments about
the preaching done by some about "digital is the future of ham radio" and
"legacy modes" and such buzzphrases.

I'm simply asking "are you fer it or agin it"?

Me, I'm for it. I think it's a good thing.

>That's why I posted the troll - to provoke Dick into showing
>his true colors.

You failed, then. Why not just ask a simple, direct question, like I just did?

>You are defending an indefensible position, Jim,

I say experimentation by hams is a good thing. I'm all for it. That's an indefensible position?

>and losing respect in the process.

Losing whose respect?

>Please forgive me because I didn't
>plan for that to happen. I had no idea your agenda ran so deep.

You don't seem to understand my position on this at all.

>You
>appeared to have adopted a rational stance since the restructuring
>but now that appears to just have been posturing.

Have you read my comments on RM-10413? They're on the FCC website.
>
>> > Don't you think if that was a positive response, Dick would have said so?
>>
>> All depends on whether he is reading this exchange and whether he is
>> able to reply.
>
>Awwwhhhhhh

[expletive deleted]

>Jim! Dick could have simply said, "I agree", instead
>of, "Well, there you have it".

You have admitted trolling, Cecil. Your word tricks are so common that they no longer work.

Why not just ask a simple, direct question, as I just did?

>Dick is obviously against digital experimentation.

It's not obvious at all. You are a biased observer who is pinning all his "proof" to an ambiguous statement.

>Your support of Dick's position means that you are against digital
>experimentation.

Nope. I am not against it. I have repeatedly said that I am for experimentation by hams, including digital experimentation. I have commented to the FCC in support of rules changes that would make such experimentation by hams easier on HF.

>> > I've had my say and I'm tired of trying to communicate with someone who
>is not
>> > making a good faith effort.
>>
>> That would be you, not me.

>
>You are entitled to your obfuscations. Everyone who has been following this
>thread
>knows differently although obviously members of the anti-digital crowd won't
>admit it.

My position on experimentation is well known. See my comments on RM-10413,
posted here and on the FCC website.
>
>> You are the one who has something to prove, not me. So far you have not
>> proven anything, except perhaps that you are not serious about the subject
>> at all.
>
>Let me leave you with this parting thought, Jim.

Right.

>When you defend someone who
>is a known and well-defined problem within the ARS, you become part of that
>same problem.

I agree. I don't defend such people.

>I am really disappointed with your defense of an anti-digital
>position.

You obviously don't understand my position, then. Try reading what I actually
wrote, without the blinders of bias and prejudice you so often burden yourself
with.
>
>> Perhaps there are others who have filed comments, but so far they have
>> not shown up in searches of the ECFS system.

Actually, thanks to K0HB, I am now aware that several concerned amateurs have
filed comments. That's a good thing.
>
>What does it matter?

FCC reads those comments and they help shape policy. That doesn't mean FCC is
absolutely governed by them. But they have an effect.

>The FCC is going to do what they consider best for the ARS.

Not necessarily. They are going to do what they consider best for all
concerned, not just the ARS. And they are limited by consideration besides what
they think is best. For example, the restructuring R&O made it quite clear that
the FCC thinks that the elimination of all code testing for all ham licenses is
best for the ARS. But the FCC cannot eliminate all code testing now because of
S25.5. So they could not do what they thought was best. They had to go for
second-best until S25.5 goes away.

>The individual opinions of individual hams doesn't matter a whit.

That's a big, steaming pile of [expletive deleted], Cecil!

>The FCC is not going to allow the inmates to run the asylum.

I am not an "inmate". Neither are most hams. The ARS is not an "asylum".

Your insults are simply another pile of [expletive deleted].

>The Novice band restructuring will not be an experimental band.

You know this how?

>More probable is allowing broad band digital signals
>in the phone bands.

They are allowed there now - if they are voice or image.

>Try a top-down approach instead of a bottom-up approach
>next time. That's what the FCC does.

Try reading Part 97. Maybe someone will take you seriously. I sure don't.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

3360. Blast from the Past

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 21:49:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <IlgD8.3852$Nt3.311794@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42679

This will be meaningful to just a few of you (K2ASP, maybe couple of other plain-brown-rrapers).

Had a nice long chat on 14.057 this afternoon with W4BW. At age 92 his fist is still crisp and steady, and he just bought a new IC-756 Pro last week, which he hopes to wear out. Used to cuss him out for his policies, but sure was nice to hear the old guy on the air!

(&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;) 73, de Hans, K0HB

3361. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 22:03:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDD951A.1C45F3C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42680

N2EY wrote:
> Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?

Nope, that's much too obvious. What we need to ask Dick is if, "Well,
there you have it", means "I agree". It obviously doesn't and you
look mighty foolish for asserting that it does. Whatever Dick asserts
or denies now, most of us know what he meant when he said it.

> My position on experimentation is well known.

I thought it was until you started supporting Dick's negative position.
Birds of a feather ...

> I don't defend such people.

> CAM wrote:
> >The individual opinions of individual hams doesn't matter a whit.
>
> That's a big, steaming pile of [expletive deleted], Cecil!

You think my opinion matters? Exactly to whom? Do you think my
individual vote ever matters? Do you think the FCC would do
anything different if I died tomorrow? Get real!

> >The FCC is not going to allow the inmates to run the asylum.
>
> I am not an "inmate". Neither are most hams. The ARS is not an "asylum".

It's a metaphor, Jim. Don't you understand metaphors? It means that
any public/governmental organization needs oversight other than the
entrenched members of the service/society.

> >The Novice band restructuring will not be an experimental band.
>
> You know this how?

Lobster dinner on it?

> >More probable is allowing broad band digital signals
> >in the phone bands.
>
> They are allowed there now - if they are voice or image.

Data will someday be allowed in the phone bands.

> >Try a top-down approach instead of a bottom-up approach
> >next time. That's what the FCC does.
>

> Try reading Part 97. Maybe someone will take you seriously. I sure don't.

Of course you don't, Jim. That's why you make dozens of postings over
periods of weeks responding to my non-serious postings. When are you
going to do something about that burr under your blanket?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3362. Re: New Novice Class Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 22:50:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <IehD8.3449$%K3.88336716@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42681

"K HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:eHXC8.861$xI6.249@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "You Betcha (Mike H.)" <mhaas2@earthlinknospam.net> wrote
>
> > My point is this: The No-Code Techs on 2M (I look up their licenses
> > on QRZ) more fit my definition of HAMS than MOST Generals and Extra's
> > I hear on HF SSB. In short - I pray they stay where the hell they are
> > and never come up and infect 2M or 440.
> >
> > Your proposal is yet another way of forcing code on folks who frankly
> > appear to share my opinion and want nothing to do with HF and the
> > plethora of cranks, freaks, and goof-offs that use phone there.
>
> Couple of points in response to your broad-brush rant about HF
> operators.....
>
> FCC (Riley) has lately been citing more 2m FM operators for interference,
> lack of manners, and other assorted mischief than he has HF operators.

Lack of Manners? Could you please be more specific? Are they forcing
people to learn code?

> Your HF receiver hears the whole world, your 2m receiver hears maybe a
> couple of counties.

Unless you're on the Novice CW subbands. Then no one hears you.

3363. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 22:52:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <KghD8.3452$%K3.88336716@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42682

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020510180630.08742.00001262@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <C4wA8.2687$vT1.248559@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"K7JEB"
> <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:
>
> >>>> I'm a crony of N2EY's, and damn proud of it.
> >
> >>> It doesn't really matter, Jim. I think Brian not
> >>> only believes that Jim has cronies, he probably
> >>> has cohorts too.
> >
> >> Possibly even a few mechanics, minions, and lackeys.
> >
> >Not to mention the sycophants and stooges.
> >
> >And then there are opportunities for leadership in the
> >positions of lead crony, stooge supervisor, consulting
> >sycophant, mechanic vice president, etc. One has to
> >work one's way up the hierarchy, though, by starting
> >out as lackey associate.
> >
> All of which must be approved by the Grand Poobah, of course.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Nope. He just rubber-stamps it. Brian

3364. Re: No Comment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 22:56:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xkhD8.3455$l34.89295226@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42683

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020509205937.01774.00002951@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <hE%B8.10259$wa6.418471300@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >This
> >> could motivate him to get off the Geritol Net and start doing something
> >> interesting and useful in amateur radio! You won't get any complaints
> >from me!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Remember Larry, you're the guy on the mountain with the compound fracture
> >and a screaming wife, and you saviour is asking, "Da..... what's a
559?"
>
> Brian:
>
> Uh unh. Not me. I didn't give myself no steenking compound fracture
> and screaming XYL in that scenario. I was the one who was going to
> save the day with my QRP CW rig, remember?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Oh yeh, I knew there was something preposterous in there - you.

"Duh, Whazza 5by, gud buddie???" is gonna be your contact with the outside
world. GudGreef.

3365. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 23:00:47 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zohD8.3457$A44.89355545@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42684

```
"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:j5xC8.184236$tt4.12791961@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
>
> Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:uEgC8.11609$Ha2.443137292@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:VQfC8.53349$tT1.55960225@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > >
> > > Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> > > news:_kZB8.10130$wd3.413437173@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> > > > >
> > > > Jason, the "Old Hands" on this group don't necessarily want young
> people
> > > > or even more people in amateur radio.
> > > <<snip>>
> > >
> > > Whoa!
> > >
> > > I guess you could call me an old hand, but I welcome new people. It
is
> a
> > > neccesity to get new people into the hobby. I relish the chance to
talk
> > to
> > > young hams and hear their
> > > enthusiasm. My CW contacts with 10 year old Extras are highlighted in
> the
> > > log. I may
> > > be "old" (54), but I don't THINK old and I have no patience with old
> > > buzzards who are
> > > stuck in 1960, wear fedora hats, and go around grumping about how the
> > young
> > > hams will
> > > ruin the hobby. I say, BRING 'EM ON!
> > >
> > > Jerry
> > > K4KWH
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> > Jerry, just one question to determine your credibility: When was your
> last
> > Novice subband experience?
```

> >
> > Thanks, Brian/N0iMD
>
> I tried 75 and 40 within the last six months, but there was a noticable
lack
> (at that time)
> of operators on the air. I haven't been on CW since, but it doesn't mean
I
> don't like it.
> I need to "brush up" myself admittedly.
>
> Jerry

Jim, six months ago and nobody home? Jim would say that you have more credibility than me and thus be allowed to comment on the ARRL Novice subband refarming petition.

73, Brian

3366. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 23:05:02 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <yshD8.3458$xG3.88128788@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42685

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020510220816.02334.00000539@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <qZkC8.11444$do7.523772345@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry, Lance has no obligation to do anything for amateur radio. Why do
you
> >say he could and should...?
> >
> >Brian
>
> Brian:
>
> If he is/was a ham (which he appears *not* to be), why shouldn't he
> do something for amateur radio? Aren't we all supposed to be "giving
> something back to the hobby?"
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Nope. Simply passing a code test is the epitomy of giving back...blah blah
blah.

Now you've got someone to reply to your broken leg/screaming wife/CW/QRP
cries for help without asking "Duh, whazza 5by gud buddie?"

3367. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 23:20:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mHhD8.3465$kb3.86695170@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42686

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020510220818.02334.00000540@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <f7d9a152.0205090657.311e7554@posting.google.com>,
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>
> >> It would appear that there is a whole lot Lance Bass can and
> >> should be doing for ham radio before he ever gets a ride into
> >> space.
> >>
> >I did a qrz.com database search, and there is no Lance Bass. He would
> >probably operate as a third party, just like the students who have
> >talked to astronauts in the past.
>
> Jason:
>
> Same here, couldn't find him on QRZ.

Yet, he "should" do something for amateur radio, according to your last qso.

> I don't think that Lance's operation
> as a third party aboard the ISS would have quite the same positive impact
> on the hobby as if he were to go and get his own Tech license before
> making the trip. If he *IS* being considered for a trip to the ISS, then
I
> would hope that the ARRL would get a hold of him and attempt to give him
> a fast education on ham radio and a Tech ticket before the countdown
> reaches "zero."

Larry, I think "you" should get with Lance. Why are you always dreaming up
stuff for other people to do, like learning your favorite mode?

> >Even if Lance Bass himself never earns his ham radio license, the
> >experience would be a celebrity endorsement of ham radio.

Why wouldn't he "earn his ham radio license?" Remember, "they" just give
them away.

> I disagree, it would merely be a celebrity talking to kids on the
> ground, using *A* radio. May as well be Verizon Wireless for all they
> would know or care -- unless Mr. Bass himself became a licensed
> amateur and his fans knew that he did this so he could talk to them
> from the space station.

You mean people with Tech licenses actually realize that they're not on FRS?

> >The grade
> >school and high school students he talks to would learn that ham radio

> >is what makes such conversations possible.
>
> Only if Mr. Bass spent the majority of his "airtime" slamming that point
> home, which I'm sure wouldn't happen. However, his actually BEING a
> licensed ham, and the pre-spaceflight publicity of his licensing process
> would have some of the desired effect you speak of.

Larry, write "VOID" across your license and send it back to the FCC. Then
go through the licensing process while Lance becomes an astronaut. I'm sure
the media will give you'se guys concurrent coverage.

> >Talking to Lance Bass
> >would be MUCH more exciting to the students than talking to other
> >astronauts.
>
> No doubt about that, but ask them HOW they were able to talk to
> Lance the next day, and you'd probably get something like "on a radio"
> or "on the phone," or, at worst, "on the CB radio."

Larry has ALL da answers.

> >News coverage of this would be widespread, while news
> >coverage of other astronaut conversations with students is usually
> >spotty.
>
> You mean there was actually news coverage of the students talking to
> astronauts? Where? When?
>
> >The students would excitedly talk about this with their
> >friends. They would log onto N'Sync, Backstreet Boys, Britney Spears,
> >and Mandy Moore message boards and talk about this.
>
> Sure they would, but I have my doubts that the main topic of the
> discussion would be the METHOD of the conversation with Lance Bass,
> just THAT they were able to talk to him while he was in space. The
> medium would definitely NOT be the message in this instance.

What meduim did you use to communicate with Natasha? No, don't answer that.

rest of negativism snipped.

3368. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 23:23:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <RJhD8.3468$oh4.89928752@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42687

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020510220816.02334.00000538@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <22lC8.11449$LV6.522889542@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> What do you mean by that? When I was a Novice back in '81, I
> >> "actually communicated" with plenty of my fellow hams, utilizing
> >> my Novice CW privileges. In fact, I was trying for a Novice WAS,
> >> but my problem was I kept working all kinds of DX! Are you saying
> >> that it was impossible for Novices to communicate, or that it was
> >> just impossible for YOU to communicate *as* a Novice (assuming
> >> you were one)?
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >I think what I said was clear enough for persons of average intelligence
to
> >understand.
>
> Brian:
>
> Which is why people of above average intelligence, like myself, didn't
> understand.

Tuff luck.

> >If you require further clarification, we can discuss my
> >consultation fees.
>
> No consultation required, thanks. However, I think you should at
> least ask for a fee equivalent to the minimum wage. That way, you
> could "consult" on hamburger flipping at Mc Donalds!

-My- consultation fee, not yours.

3369. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 23:30:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <eQhD8.3471$Zl4.90153027@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42688

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020509072230.13101.00001480@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <CNgC8.11621$qs2.443548784@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020508071318.06141.00000469@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >> In article <gwZB8.10141$8o3.413718814@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>,
"Brian
> >P
> >> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:9f4bfe89.0205030353.5bbcfa8f@posting.google.com...
> >> >> FCC has been deemphasizing code testing since 1975, when they first
> >> >> tried to implement a nocodetest license. Then came the end of
sending
> >> >> tests, multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank options, and medical
> >> >> waivers.
> >> >
> >> >Perhaps not. It appears that 1991 is the first year that code was
> >> >deemphasized.
> >> >
> >> You don't know the relevant history, then.
> >
> >I know that 1991 the code exam was removed from Technician licensing.
>
> That's correct.
>
> >I know of no other period in time that the FCC issued licenses without a
code
> >examination, unless it was prior to WW ONE.
>
> FCC did not exist back then.

You're so clever.

> >> In 1975, the FCC proposed a restructuring that involved a "dual ladder"
> >system
> >> and no less than 7 (seven) distinct license classes. One of those
classes
> >was a
> >> VHF/UHF entry-level license with no code test at all.
> >

> >Proposed? How does this deemphasize anything?
>
> The fact that the FCC proposed a nocodetest license means they put less
> emphasis on it.
> It indicates where FCC thinking was back then.

It is meaningless.

> In addition, the FCC ended code sending tests (less emphasis),

All were passed. No need to test. Where is the de-emphasis? Or did they
"mean" to deemphasize it?

allowed
> multiple-choice
> and fill-in-the-blank options for the code test (more ways to pass means
less
> emphasis)

Were incorrect answers required to pass?

> and medical waivers. (much less emphasis). All BEFORE 1991.

Holy Crap!!! Crippled people should be made to walk?

> The invention of CSCEs also reduced emphasis on code testing.

???Huh??? Passing a test demphasizes the requirement to pass a test? It
that like being only a little pregnant?

> >"I propose that those without recent Novice subband experience be
restricted
> >from commenting on the ARRL Novice subband refarming proposal."
> >
> Is that a formal proposal?
>
> Your proposals do not have the same credibility as the FCC's.

Yet they have merely the very same credibility as your proposals.

73, Brian/N0iMD

3370. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 23:53:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <P9iD8.14560$Vm2.360266@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42689

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205112003420.3537-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the
Dayton
> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able to
post
> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
>
> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM
anyway.
>
> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and
is
> therefore inappropriate to .policy.
>

They aren't listening. If it really bothers you and you are running OE
set up a message rule blasting anything over say 200 lines and your life
will be longer and happier.

3371. Re: FISTs on 20m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-11 23:53:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2aiD8.3485$cz4.90760294@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42690

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CDC3C93.6040802@bellsouth.net...
> I had not been using code for the last 4-5 years so I tuned into 14057
> today and heard a lot of "CQ FISTs". I remember this NG back about 7
> years ago and the Morse Code wars and how we ultimately lost the battle
> to a 5 wpm slow (no) code requirement. It seems that back then, FISTs
> was a very small organization and by the end of the code war I had
> assumed they would ultimately disband (so to speak). Not so! They are
> still here, stronger than ever. It must be a much larger organization now.

Dan, I hadn't used sideband in about the same period of time. Yet since the FCC began SSB testing, I figured that mode would be history! Not so, its more popular than ever. Even the ARRL wants to expand SSB spectrum with the refarming of the old Novice subbands. Go figger.

> Good to see all that code activity on 20m. I think I'll dig out my good
> ole' straight key and get back to real HAM radio again. I just want to
> get away from all those CBer qrmers and other low lifes, at least once
> in a while, on the voice bands where a few fortuitous hams the FCC are
> trying to save this declining resource.

Just wait till Larry/K3LT's "friend" sends you "FU" in Morse code. And Larry is a bigtime FIST. I wonder what the connection is.

> I think that, ultimately, FISTs will be the one to save real HAM radio.
> No decadent CBer qrmers on the code sub-bands!

Perhaps CW should be exiled to the desert for 40 days. If it is truly our Saviour, then it won't be a problem. How do you feel about going in to the Lion's Den?

> GO FISTs!
>
> 73,
>
> de KR4AJ

Larry says 4-landers are knuckle draggers with accents. Good thing you're using code to disguise that accent.

Best of luck to you. Keep your key finger greased.

Brian

3372. Re: Giving something back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 00:00:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4giD8.3494$IB4.90866821@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42691

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:_10D8.1413$xI6.796@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>
> > Aren't we all supposed to be "giving
> > something back to the hobby?"
>
> Larry,
>
> I see that phrase a lot, usually when someone wants me to donate some
money,
> or run for club office, or 'guilt' me into some other action which I might
> not have otherwise engaged on my own volition.
>
> OK, here comes a serious question, for which I'm not sure that I know the
> answer. Now you can flame me to a crisp, or we can have a discussion.
>
> I see a lot of hams, having a great time at the hobby, enjoying
themselves,
> maybe getting smarter by virtue of their curiosity in areas like
technology,
> propagation, or simply engineering a better station to win in a radiosport
> contest, but not necessarily "giving something back".
>
> Are they good hams?
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Hans and Larry, I'm not totally against incentive licensing as most of you believe. I'll support additional spectrum for Extras providing they host 4 VE sessions of at least 6 examinees each year. Brian

3373. Re: Giving something back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 00:00:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <SgiD8.3495$BC4.90881298@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42692

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:%O9D8.2957$Nt3.246774@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > Not as good as Larry who absolutely hates being a ham but performs ham
> radio
> > services anyway for the good of mankind because he is just so very
> altruistic. :-)
>
> Go join Brian in the twit filter. Feel free to petition for
reconsideration
> when you feel like having a reasoned discussion.

What an ass.

3374. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 00:02:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <EiiD8.3497$om4.90159418@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42693

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CDD4D1F.5040904@bellsouth.net...
> Can a person improve sending speed when using paddle type keys instead
> of a straight key? Or is there a type of straight ket more suited to
> higher speeds? My old straight key, which I have mounted on a block of
> wood, and for which I paid $10.00 new in 1993 has been fairly reliable
> but the mechanism has too much damping to allow much more than 18 wpm.
> Any advice from coders would be appreciated. Thanks in advance.
>
> Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?
>
> Will there be a CW sub-band in the new 60 meter band? Thanks,
> de KR4AJ

I wanna hear Larry slam this guy for holding a 2x2 license and not knowing
the first thing about amateur radio.

Oh yeh, PCTA double standard. I forgot.

3375. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 00:07:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xniD8.3500$mG4.91072731@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42694

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:tjcD8.3348$Nt3.274454@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote
>
> > Can a person improve sending speed when using paddle type keys instead
> > of a straight key? Or is there a type of straight ket more suited to
> > higher speeds?
>
> My preferred Morse instrument is a Vibroplex bug, also called a "speed
key"
> for a reason. I can clip along much faster on that than I can on a
straight
> key, and with a lot less wrist fatigue. Paddles can be even faster, but
> require an electronic keyer (most modern rigs have one built in).

Coffee-bean boat swing?

What is your "dit" length? Is your "dah" length 3x longer?

> > Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?
>
> It isn't strictly against the rules, because Morse is allowed in virtually
> all amateur allocations, but it is bad manners to ignore bandplans.

This guy has been an Advanced since at least 2000. Good thing he's not a
Tech or you'se guys would have slammed him for such a question.

> > Will there be a CW sub-band in the new 60 meter band?
>
> I don't know (I haven't seen the NPRM) but I presume there will be.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

3376. Re: Blast from the Past

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 00:09:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <cpiD8.3501$yH4.91129048@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42695

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:IlgD8.3852$Nt3.311794@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> This will be meaningful to just a few of you (K2ASP, maybe couple of other
> plain-brown-rrapers).
>
> Had a nice long chat on 14.057 this afternoon with W4BW. At age 92 his
fist
> is still crisp and steady, and he just bought a new IC-756 Pro last week,
> which he hopes to wear out. Used to cuss him out for his policies, but
sure
> was nice to hear the old guy on the air!
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

```
Is it possible we'll say the same about you someday?
```

3377. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 00:40:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CDDBA09.AD989FA8@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42696

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote
>
> > Comment...I hadn't thought of this before (and sorry to change the
> > subject) but I think this means we can add amplifiers to some of our
> > common household 2.4 GHz devices such as cordless phones and wireless
> > notebook adapters and transmitters as long as we have a ham license,
> > provided we ensure that the transmitting frequency falls within the
> > allocation.
>
> As long as you remain in compliance with the general rules such ID every 10
> minutes, no music, one-way transmissions, allowed modulation methods, etc.,
> I don't think Reily would come looking for you.
>

Also no pecuniary interest traffic.....

3378. Re: FISTs on 20m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 00:43:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CDDBABE.1D3D3B2B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42697

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
>
> Just wait till Larry/K3LT's "friend" sends you "FU" in Morse code.

Wouldn't that be "QFU"? Besides, I'm sure any friend of Larry's
would behave themselves on the air....

3379. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 00:45:22 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CDDBB22.7000009@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 42698

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> I wanna hear Larry slam this guy for holding a 2x2 license and not knowing
> the first thing about amateur radio.
>
> Oh yeh, PCTA double standard. I forgot.

Hey Mr. Burke:

That's OK, I already received two slams from you in this thread, just
for asking a policy question (supposedly the topic of this rrap NG). Has
anyone ever characterized you as a positive influence on fellow
amateurs? Didn't think so.
de KR4AJ

3380. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 00:46:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CDDBB4B.C9A01753@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42699

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the Dayton
> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able to post
> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
>
> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM anyway.
>
> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and is
> therefore inappropriate to .policy.

I disagree. Newsline articles sometimes deal with policy or licensing
issues. Thus it is NOT spam.

3381. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 01:34:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CDDC6E9.44FF7705@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42700

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> I have never received any interference nor "falsing" from my microwave oven on
> my Kenwood TM-2400 35' away (and connected to a GP-24 15.6dBi vertical via 40'
> of 1/2" hardline) at any time in the past 6 years.
>
> Cordless phones is another matter. And yes - there are 2.4GHz baby monitors.

All fine and well if you have a 2.4 gHz baby!

- Mike -

3382. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 01:39:31 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <nJjD8.3531$1x5.93706544@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42601

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CDDBB22.7000009@bellsouth.net...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > I wanna hear Larry slam this guy for holding a 2x2 license and not
knowing
> > the first thing about amateur radio.
> >
> > Oh yeh, PCTA double standard. I forgot.
>
> Hey Mr. Burke:
>
> That's OK, I already received two slams from you in this thread, just
> for asking a policy question (supposedly the topic of this rrap NG). Has
> anyone ever characterized you as a positive influence on fellow
> amateurs? Didn't think so.
> de KR4AJ

Dan, I've never slammed you. However, our Extra friends on here tolerate no question that can be easily answered by a quick review of the question pool, with one caveat: it must be a Tech asking the question. As an Advanced, you'll probably get a pass rather than be told not to let the door hit you... on your way out.

Anyway, you asked, "Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?"

It is not.

You'll have to wait for the friendly Extras to give you advice on the spring loaded switch. My advice there is no good.

FWIW, I'm told by Extras that its OK to be a nasty jerk on here because this isn't amateur radio. I disagree, and it is apparent that you disagree also. I'll stand by and see if they'll rip you a new one, or if they'll invoke the PCTA double standard and give you a pass because of your amateur rank.

3383. Re: FISTs on 20m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 01:42:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <SLjD8.3535$IA5.93875512@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42602

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CDDBABE.1D3D3B2B@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Just wait till Larry/K3LT's "friend" sends you "FU" in Morse code.
>
> Wouldn't that be "QFU"? Besides, I'm sure any friend of Larry's
> would behave themselves on the air....

Bob, are you that "friend?"

3384. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 01:56:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CDDCBBD.1CB3DAE5@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42603

Of course, if all OT messages were removed from the group (like
actually talking about policy instead of three posts on a topic, then
the usual decline into personality slurs and definition contests, the
group could dissapear.

A twit filter is always a good excercise if your offended.

- Mike -

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the Dayton
> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able to post
> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
>
> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM anyway.
>
> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and is
> therefore inappropriate to .policy.

3385. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 02:07:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <p7kD8.3565$2M5.94440792@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42604

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:3QUC8.590$xI6.451@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> From ARRL bulletin ARLB028
>
> Good news for ham radio this week! FCC has proposed going along with
> ARRL's request for a new domestic (US-only), secondary HF allocation
> at 5.25 to 5.4 MHz. The FCC also is ready to permit operation on a
> 136-kHz "sliver band" in the low-frequency (LF) region. And, in
> response to a third ARRL request, the FCC has proposed elevating
> Amateur Radio to primary status at 2400 to 2402 MHz.
>
> "I'm just as tickled as I can be," ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP,
> said upon hearing the news. "This is a classic example of our ARRL
> at work."
>
> The FCC voted unanimously May 2 to adopt the Notice of Proposed
> Rulemaking in ET Docket 02-98. The Commission released a Public
> Notice May 9, and the NPRM is expected to be released soon. A
> comment deadline will be announced as soon as it's available.
>
> The FCC said the new 5-MHz band would help amateurs "better match
> their choice of frequency to existing propagation conditions." The
> band, if approved, would be the first new amateur HF allocation
> since World Administrative Radio Conference 1979 gave amateurs 30,
> 17 and 12 meters--the so-called "WARC Bands." Assuming the 5-MHz
> band eventually is authorized, it could be a few years before it
> actually becomes available.
>
> The League said its successful WA2XSY experiments demonstrated that
> amateurs can coexist with current users and that the band is very
> suitable for US-to-Caribbean paths. In comparisons with 80 and 40
> meters, the WA2XSY operation also showed the 60-meter band to be the
> most reliable of the three. The ARRL also argued that a new 150-kHz
> allocation at 5 MHz could relieve periodic overcrowding on 80 and
> 40.
>
> If allocated to amateurs on a secondary basis, hams would have to
> avoid interfering with--and accept interference from--current
> occupants of the spectrum, as they already do on 30 meters. The band
> 5.250 to 5.450 MHz now is allocated to Fixed and Mobile services on
> a co-primary basis in all three ITU regions.

What will be the new exam questions that will bring us to an understanding of how this new band works? For regulatory purposes, I propose that this new band be reserved for Extra class operators until the new license pools are released in 2004, because only Extras have the unique ability to understand and utilize frequencies that are a mere few kilohertz away from the General class frequencies.

73, Brian

3386. Re: Blast from the Past

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 02:39:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020511223945.15244.00008161@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 42605

>Subject: Blast from the Past
>From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 05/11/02 17:49 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <IlgD8.3852$Nt3.311794@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Had a nice long chat on 14.057 this afternoon with W4BW. At age 92 his fist
>is still crisp and steady, and he just bought a new IC-756 Pro last week,
>which he hopes to wear out. Used to cuss him out for his policies, but sure
>was nice to hear the old guy on the air!

Serious dittos. Prose's fist is as smooth as silk and makes for easy arm chair copy. And I have worked him a couple times...Unless he was recalling from a computer log, he immediately addressed me by name, etc.

A great Gentleman.

73

Steve K4YZ

3387. Re: TS-950S

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 02:48:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020511224818.04364.00003365@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 42606

In article <abgf4o$7n4$0@pita.alt.net>, "Eduardo Hernandez"
<EdH@HernandezCommsx.net> writes:

>
> I am going to donate it to a totally handicapped ham who was
>my mentor in computer programming. He is a retired professor.
>I owe the guy a lot, as I came here not speaking English and now
>have a very secure job with a high-tech firm.
>
>Thanks,
>
>Ed "Beans" Hernandez

Ed:

Sounds like the bargain of the century! If you don't take it, let me
know the guy's name and call sign ASAP!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3388. Re: Blast from the Past

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 02:48:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020511224819.04364.00003366@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 42607

In article <cpiD8.3501$yH4.91129048@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Had a nice long chat on 14.057 this afternoon with W4BW. At age 92 his
>fist
>> is still crisp and steady, and he just bought a new IC-756 Pro last week,
>> which he hopes to wear out. Used to cuss him out for his policies, but
>sure
>> was nice to hear the old guy on the air!
>>
>> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>Is it possible we'll say the same about you someday?

Brian:

I'm sure we'll be saying the same about you, except for the bit about
it being nice to hear you on the air!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3389. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 02:48:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020511224820.04364.00003368@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 42608

In article <3CDD24A8.99A25462@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Aren't we all supposed to be "giving something back to the hobby?"
>
>That "supposed to be" is purely voluntary. I bought a used pellet
>gun from the local gun store owner. Turns out he is an inactive
>Extra.

Cecil:

Sounds like he needs to get back on the air. An active Extra could
have sold you a S&W Model 29 .44 Magnum!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3390. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 02:48:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020511224820.04364.00003367@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 42609

In article <3CDD4D1F.5040904@bellsouth.net>, Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
writes:

>Can a person improve sending speed when using paddle type keys instead
>of a straight key?

Dan:

Short answer: Yes, most definitely. Going from a straight key to a paddle
took me from 5 to 20 WPM almost overnight, sending-wise. Also, hearing
perfectly-formed characters improved my copying ability dramatically,
especially since I drilled with the paddle/keyer combo quite a lot off-the-air,
in addition to making live QSO's.

>Or is there a type of straight ket more suited to
>higher speeds? My old straight key, which I have mounted on a block of
>wood, and for which I paid $10.00 new in 1993 has been fairly reliable
>but the mechanism has too much damping to allow much more than 18 wpm.
>Any advice from coders would be appreciated. Thanks in advance.

A J-38 key (with the coil spring) would probably have faster action than
the J-37, which has a leaf spring. You don't specify which type you are
using. My straight key is a WWII-vintage Lionel J-38 in original
condition.

>Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?

Nope. Fire away, Gridleak!

>Will there be a CW sub-band in the new 60 meter band? Thanks,
>de KR4AJ

I think the 150 KHz allocation on 60-meters should be divvied up
half CW and half digital -- no 'fone whatsoever! It's time for the NCTA
to put up or shut up on their promise of a digital revolution in ham
radio. No "legacy" voice modes in any new HF bands! If they wanna
yak into a microphone, let 'em squeeze in between the QR-Mary on
the existing HF phone segments.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3391. Re: FISTs on 20m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 03:09:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CDDDCF6.E90A49C2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42610

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3CDDBABE.1D3D3B2B@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > Just wait till Larry/K3LT's "friend" sends you "FU" in Morse code.
> >
> > Wouldn't that be "QFU"? Besides, I'm sure any friend of Larry's
> > would behave themselves on the air....
>
> Bob, are you that "friend?"

No, never met him or rode the bus in Delaware. :-)
Besides, I'm an "extra lite". :-) :-)

3392. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 03:52:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDDE70A.E477ADDB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42611

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3CDD24A8.99A25462@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Aren't we all supposed to be "giving something back to the hobby?"
> >
> >That "supposed to be" is purely voluntary. I bought a used pellet
> >gun from the local gun store owner. Turns out he is an inactive
> >Extra.
>
> Sounds like he needs to get back on the air. An active Extra could
> have sold you a S&W Model 29 .44 Magnum!

For shooting English Sparrows and European Starlings within the city limits?
Why would he want me to go to jail?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3393. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 04:43:45 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <13e3772967468b958a14ed015f48c1b7.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42612

Dan, as far as I know, CW is legal anywhere in the amateur band - but, you would be smart not to use it in the phone bands. A straight key is somewhat limiting - I couldn't send good cw past about 24 wpm on a straight key, and my maximum (and it wasn't very good) was about 27. I also had trouble with a bug as I never could send really good code with one. Personally, I like my fist to sound like it was being sent by a machine. Using an HA1-TO keyer (Hallicrafters, I think) allowed me to send as fast as I wished (perhaps 50 wpm back when) and it did sound as if a machine was sending it. The new machines have built-in keyers which will allow you to send whatever you can send/receive.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CDD4D1F.5040904@bellsouth.net

> Can a person improve sending speed when using paddle type keys instead
> of a straight key?

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3394. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 05:13:21 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <9C0DDB81FE358A5F.7C7208E7997D8D3D.7572D8150EBC2062@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42613

On Sat, 11 May 2002 20:40:41 -0400, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>> As long as you remain in compliance with the general rules such ID every 10
>> minutes, no music, one-way transmissions, allowed modulation methods, etc.,
>> I don't think Reily would come looking for you.
>>
>
>Also no pecuniary interest traffic.....

One more reason to tell the telemarketers not to call back, ever.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3395. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 05:18:35 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <DC5AD17A48E39F7E.14045317D35C0EFA.95C598931B91B3D3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42614

On Sun, 12 May 2002 01:39:31 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:

>Dan, I've never slammed you. However, our Extra friends on here tolerate no
>question that can be easily answered by a quick review of the question pool,
>with one caveat: it must be a Tech asking the question.

Oh cool. Now that I'm a General I get to ask stupid questions?

What do I get when I pass Extra?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3396. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 05:26:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CDDF917.5176113C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42615

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You and I were once "green-as-grass" amateur radio operators. We were not
> > > born with our present knowledge. I had all amateur frequency/power privileges
> > > in 1952 when I knew infinitely less than the present-day new Extras. Nothing
> > > has changed.
> >
> > Oh... You didn't know how to get on HF?
>
> Yep, I didn't know how to get on HF. My Elmer, W5OLV, told me what transmitting
> equipment to buy and designed all my antennas for me. I bought 100 ft. of RG-11
> and only needed about 60 ft. I didn't want to cut that 100 ft. run in the middle
> so I asked Shorty if rolling up the excess behind my ham desk would be OK. He
> said it would so I had a choke on my coax feedline and didn't realize it. He
> told me how long to make my 40m dipole. I put it up at ten feet and it didn't
> work very well. I told Shorty it wasn't working very well and he suggested I
> raise it to 20 feet at which height it worked very well. I had no clue as to
> why I raised the antenna.
>
> There have always been totally ignorant people getting their ham licenses, at
> least ever since 1952 when I gained all amateur frequency/power privileges
> without knowing the first technical thing about ham radio.

Instead of kissing your lazy butt he should have kicked it.

3397. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 05:26:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CDDFAB8.2F5C256@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42616

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3CDC4F48.96D1E65A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> > N2EY wrote:
> >> > > Your "scientific process" obviously only consists of two steps:
> >> > >
> >> > > 1) Formulate a presumption based on your feelings about something
> >> > > 2) Conclude that this presumption is fact.
> >
> >> > You left out: Test the presumption against
> >> > the evidence and if it doesn't fit, change the presumption and iterate.
> >
> >> I didn't leave it out.
> >
> >Of course you did.
>
> I was describing your "scientific process", not mine.
>
> >> > I said I thought digital experimentation by hams is a good idea.
> >>
> >> Of course it's a good idea. That's a "mom and apple pie" sort of
> >> thing. All sorts of experimentation by hams is a good thing.
> >
> >But Dick responded, "Well, there you have it", exactly as I knew he
> >would.
>
> So? Is that supposed to be PROOF that W0EX is somehow against
> "digital" experimentation by hams?
>
> Let's ask him.
>
> Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?
>

Of course I'm for any sort of experimentation by hams, and Cecil the Dip knows it. What I decry is his and Carl's rabid insistence that all hams should grab off a DSP eval board, build up their own, or whatever and leap to the fore of digital experimentation ahead of all the commercial enterprises, which is the essence of what they have been claiming. Most hams just are not and will no become proficient in digital design and he knows if, that is if he knows anything outside his own narrow sphere. Cecil is 99.9% troll and everyone here knows it. I don't have much

to say to him anymore because of it.

W0EX

3398. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 10:00:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205120200.60bf2d03@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42617

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020511224820.04364.00003367@mb-fi.aol.com>...

>
> I think the 150 KHz allocation on 60-meters should be divvied up
> half CW and half digital -- no 'fone whatsoever! It's time for the NCTA
> to put up or shut up on their promise of a digital revolution in ham
> radio. No "legacy" voice modes in any new HF bands! If they wanna
> yak into a microphone, let 'em squeeze in between the QR-Mary on
> the existing HF phone segments.
>
>
One of the widely advertised justifications for opening up a 60m band
was to have more phone space for emergency ops vs. the terminal
congestion in the 75 & 40M phone bands. No doubt done with a bit of
tongue-in-cheek standard motherhood leveraging of the "emergency ops"
thing. Can't lose with that old ploy. But it does make some marginal
sense from the standpoint of the propagation characteristics 60m
offers. My bet is that's it's gonna be wall-to-wall ssb with other
modes allowable. If they can tolerate operating amidst the
motormouths.
>
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
w3rv

3399. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 10:33:37 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5yrD8.21128$Ru2.422912@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42618

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:DC5AD17A48E39F7E.14045317D35C0EFA.95C598931B91B3D3@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 12 May 2002 01:39:31 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> >Dan, I've never slammed you. However, our Extra friends on here
tolerate no
> >question that can be easily answered by a quick review of the question
pool,
> >with one caveat: it must be a Tech asking the question.
>
> Oh cool. Now that I'm a General I get to ask stupid questions?
>
> What do I get when I pass Extra?
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH

Burdens, my son, burdens.

3400. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 10:48:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205120248.533ec39a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42619

Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:<3CDD4D1F.5040904@bellsouth.net>...
> Can a person improve sending speed when using paddle type keys instead
> of a straight key?
>
>
Absolutely. Paddle-type keying devices go all the way back to the days
when Morse ruled the landlines in 1800s. That's where sideswipers and
bugs came from long before radio was invented. The invention and
implementation of those widgets was brought about by the fact that
they provided much higher throughputs with much less work. Throughputs
and sloth were the name of the game 150 years ago just like they are
today. There are hams out there effortlessly pumping 40-50wpm hour
after hour with iambic paddles 'n electric keyers which ya could never
do with a J-38.
>
>
> Or is there a type of straight ket more suited to
> higher speeds? My old straight key, which I have mounted on a block of
> wood, and for which I paid $10.00 new in 1993 has been fairly reliable
> but the mechanism has too much damping to allow much more than 18 wpm.
>
>
The "damping" is in yer fingers, not in yer key. On average 18wpm +/-
is where straight keys max out. More like where the operator maxes
out. Bag the J-38, you're 150 years behind the power curve with the
thing.
>
>
> Any advice from coders would be appreciated. Thanks in advance.
>
> Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?
>
>
You can legally run cw anywhere in the HF ham bands. But it makes no
sense to do so in the phone bands, you won't find any cw contacts plus
you'll aggravate the hordes for no good reason.
>
>
> Will there be a CW sub-band in the new 60 meter band? Thanks,
>
>
Unknown at this early stage. Subscibe to the ARRL Newsletter, be the
first on yer block to find out what's up with 60m.
>

>
> de KR4AJ
>
>
Decent troll, actually.
>
>
w3rv

3401. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 11:45:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDE55E1.AA957B81@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42620

Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> Dan, as far as I know, CW is legal anywhere in the amateur band - but,
> you would be smart not to use it in the phone bands. A straight key is
> somewhat limiting - I couldn't send good cw past about 24 wpm on a
> straight key, and my maximum (and it wasn't very good) was about 27. I
> also had trouble with a bug as I never could send really good code with
> one. Personally, I like my fist to sound like it was being sent by a
> machine. Using an HA1-TO keyer (Hallicrafters, I think) allowed me to
> send as fast as I wished (perhaps 50 wpm back when) and it did sound as
> if a machine was sending it. The new machines have built-in keyers
> which will allow you to send whatever you can send/receive.

Many hams use keyboards to send CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3402. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 11:49:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDE56C2.45912ABC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42621

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Instead of kissing your lazy butt he should have kicked it.

He did hand me the two bare ends of 110vac wires one day after I
had gotten soaked by the rain. Shorty, if you're listening, I
apologize for being such a pain in the neck. And you were
instrumental in my choice of Electrical Engineering as a vocation.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3403. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 11:53:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDE57B0.3BE8F58B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42622

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Of course I'm for any sort of experimentation by hams, and Cecil the Dip knows it.

Then why did you respond, "Well, there you have it", when I said I would like to see hams experimenting as much with digital stuff today as they were experimenting with SSB in the late 50's? Is, "Well, there you have it", a positive or negative response? Jim says it was a positive response but you have never been known to respond positively to any of my postings including this one.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3404. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 11:55:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDE5848.F96DFE38@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42623

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Of course I'm for any sort of experimentation by hams, and Cecil the Dip knows it.

Actually, that was not the argument at all. The argument was over whether, "Well, there you have it", was a positive or negative response. If you agreed then why didn't you simply say, "I agree"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3405. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 14:50:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ejvD8.3576$HK6.98569714@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42624

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020510220816.02334.00000539@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <qZkC8.11444$do7.523772345@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry, Lance has no obligation to do anything for amateur radio. Why do
you
> >say he could and should...?
> >
> >Brian
>
> Brian:
>
> If he is/was a ham (which he appears *not* to be), why shouldn't he
> do something for amateur radio? Aren't we all supposed to be "giving
> something back to the hobby?"
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Yeh Larry, like you wanted to give back our VHF and UHF spectrum.

3406. Re: FISTs on 20m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 14:54:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tmvD8.3579$8H6.98400321@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42625

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CDDDCF6.E90A49C2@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3CDDBABE.1D3D3B2B@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Just wait till Larry/K3LT's "friend" sends you "FU" in Morse code.
> > >
> > > Wouldn't that be "QFU"? Besides, I'm sure any friend of Larry's
> > > would behave themselves on the air....
> >
> > Bob, are you that "friend?"
>
> No, never met him or rode the bus in Delaware. :-)
> Besides, I'm an "extra lite". :-) :-)

Yep, CW is that ultra-friendly mode where people like Larry and Dick assume
a different personality and talk about meaningful stuff.

73, Brian

3407. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 15:00:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <WrvD8.3588$2N6.98681019@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42626

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:DC5AD17A48E39F7E.14045317D35C0EFA.95C598931B91B3D3@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 12 May 2002 01:39:31 GMT, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> >Dan, I've never slammed you. However, our Extra friends on here tolerate
no
> >question that can be easily answered by a quick review of the question
pool,
> >with one caveat: it must be a Tech asking the question.
>
> Oh cool. Now that I'm a General I get to ask stupid questions?

Probably. Try one and see.

> What do I get when I pass Extra?

A free pass? You can ask all the dumb questions you want and the Cronies
won't bat an eye.

I'm referring to the PCTA double standard.

Had Dan been a Tech, Larry would have called him everything from a "knuckle
dragging 4-lander with a Southern accent," to "welfare mother of color with
her hand out." Then Larry would invite him to not let the door hit his ass
as he exits amateur radio. As the rest of us cry foul, Dick would jump in
and support Larry.

3408. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 15:09:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8BvD8.3600$m%6.99399727@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42627

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020511224820.04364.00003367@mb-fi.aol.com...
> I think the 150 KHz allocation on 60-meters should be divvied up
> half CW and half digital -- no 'fone whatsoever! It's time for the NCTA
> to put up or shut up on their promise of a digital revolution in ham
> radio. No "legacy" voice modes in any new HF bands! If they wanna
> yak into a microphone, let 'em squeeze in between the QR-Mary on
> the existing HF phone segments.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, you make no sense (not suprised). If CW is digital and digital is digital, then dividing the band into half digital and the other half digital, you could start the department of redundancey department - unless CW really isn't digital.

And since we will be secondary users, and the primary users also use phone...

But you aren't really interested in best use, best practices, or being a good neighbor. You're only interested in running your mouth. Congratulations, you've succeeded.

And I noticed that you gave the 12+ year Advanced a pass on the CW in phone subbands question. True to form, your PCTA double standard kicked in. We expect nothing less from you.

73, Brian

3409. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 15:12:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ZDvD8.3605$R17.99527099@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42628

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0205120200.60bf2d03@posting.google.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020511224820.04364.00003367@mb-fi.aol.com>...
>
> >
> > I think the 150 KHz allocation on 60-meters should be divvied up
> > half CW and half digital -- no 'fone whatsoever! It's time for the NCTA
> > to put up or shut up on their promise of a digital revolution in ham
> > radio. No "legacy" voice modes in any new HF bands! If they wanna
> > yak into a microphone, let 'em squeeze in between the QR-Mary on
> > the existing HF phone segments.
> >
> >
> One of the widely advertised justifications for opening up a 60m band
> was to have more phone space for emergency ops vs. the terminal
> congestion in the 75 & 40M phone bands. No doubt done with a bit of
> tongue-in-cheek standard motherhood leveraging of the "emergency ops"
> thing. Can't lose with that old ploy. But it does make some marginal
> sense from the standpoint of the propagation characteristics 60m
> offers. My bet is that's it's gonna be wall-to-wall ssb with other
> modes allowable. If they can tolerate operating amidst the
> motormouths.

Only Larry's interests matter. He said no phone; that's his story, and he's
sticking with it.

3410. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 15:19:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <cKvD8.3613$g47.99661161@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42629

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:13e3772967468b958a14ed015f48c1b7.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Dan, as far as I know, CW is legal anywhere in the amateur band - but,
> you would be smart not to use it in the phone bands. A straight key is
> somewhat limiting - I couldn't send good cw past about 24 wpm on a
> straight key, and my maximum (and it wasn't very good) was about 27. I
> also had trouble with a bug as I never could send really good code with
> one.

Who does?

> Personally, I like my fist to sound like it was being sent by a machine.

That is a great goal. You may find some here who vehemently disagree with
that notion. One even prides himself on sending so atrociously that no Tech
could ever possibly copy him using a computer.

http://www.fists.org/
http://www.ac6v.com/morseaids.htm

3411. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 15:26:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CQvD8.3624$Cc7.100078632@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42630

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0205120248.533ec39a@posting.google.com...
> Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<3CDD4D1F.5040904@bellsouth.net>...
>
> > Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?
>
> You can legally run cw anywhere in the HF ham bands. But it makes no
> sense to do so in the phone bands, you won't find any cw contacts plus
> you'll aggravate the hordes for no good reason.
>
> > de KR4AJ
>
> Decent troll, actually.
>
> w3rv

I especially liked the part where Dan thinks I've slammed him. Good acting. Then Larry performing true to form, sees he's an 2x2 Advanced licensee with at least 12 years time in grade, goes ahead and answers the most basic question without batting an eye. Larry actually looks like a good guy for once. I think they must have worked it all out before hand.

3412. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 15:54:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205120754.536654d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42631

> > >
> > Let's ask him.
> >
> > Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?
> >
>
> Of course I'm for any sort of experimentation by hams, and Cecil the Dip knows it.
> What I decry is his and Carl's rabid insistence that all hams should grab off a DSP
> eval board, build up their own, or whatever and leap to the fore of digital
> experimentation ahead of all the commercial enterprises, which is the essence of
> what they have been claiming. Most hams just are not and will no become proficient
> in digital design and he knows if, that is if he knows anything outside his own
> narrow sphere. Cecil is 99.9% troll and everyone here knows it. I don't have much
> to say to him anymore because of it.
>
>
It's worse than that, they're a bunch of hypocrites. There are
qualified digital design wizards crawling all over this NG babbling at
length about how digital modes are "absolutely necessary to save ham
radio" and the usual variations thereupon. Then they turn it into
beasting on those of us who either don't have the knowledge and/or the
inclination to do the development work and/or who are perfectly
content with the current modes and see no particular benefit to the
non-existing modes they "visualize". Yeah, we all really need an
Internet portal on 3.700, right.
>
>
Until the day comes when they put their expertise to work and actually
get off their dead butts and do ANYTHING digital with their own
soddering arns and eproms and actually put it on the air they're
written off here as just a pack of RRAP trolls per your conclusion.
>
>
> W0EX
>
>
w3rv

3413. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 16:32:49 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <3b5bd8cf26ffa0ca43d6f244d3d0615f.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42632

True, but who needs a computer to send/receive Morse - unless, of course, the speed is far too high to copy by other means? I remember having many nice RTTY QSOs with VK2NP, Norm, when I was staioned on Guam. It was on the second such QSO, I believe, that I had a brain cramp and briefly stopped typing. Then I started with slow shifting between numbers and letters, sped the shifting up to the max the 60 wpm machine would take and started typing again. When I turned it back to him he stated he couldn't believe it, but he figured out that I wasn't using the tape reader on the machine to send what I prepunched. I didn't need the tape reader, therefore I didn't use it. Besides, what will the computer react to if I use dit dit dah dah for om?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CDE55E1.AA957B81@IEEE.org

> Many hams use keyboards to send CW.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3414. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 17:18:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205120918.35f9c753@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42633

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3CDDBB4B.C9A01753@ix.netcom.com>...
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> > On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
> > >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the Dayton
> > >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able to post
> > >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
> >
> > Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM anyway.
> >
> > It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
> > "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and is
> > therefore inappropriate to .policy.
>
> I disagree. Newsline articles sometimes deal with policy or licensing
> issues. Thus it is NOT spam.
>
>
It's usually a week behind the ARRL Newsletter and has the same
content +/-. Pointless.
>
>
w3rv

3415. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 18:46:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abmdgbdnb1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42635

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0205120918.35f9c753@posting.google.com...
> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3CDDBB4B.C9A01753@ix.netcom.com>...
> > "D. Stussy" wrote:
> >
> > > On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
> > > >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the
Dayton
> > > >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able
to post
> > > >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
> > >
> > > Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM
anyway.
> > >
> > > It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
> > > "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue
and is
> > > therefore inappropriate to .policy.
> >
> > I disagree. Newsline articles sometimes deal with policy or licensing
> > issues. Thus it is NOT spam.
> >
> >
> It's usually a week behind the ARRL Newsletter and has the same
> content +/-. Pointless.
> w3rv

So if I post something that has already appeared in the ARRL newsletter,
another web site, the FCC site, etc., that making such a post is
inappropriate?

Keep the ARNewsline posts coming. They do a nice job of pulling
info together from a variety of places. If the posts bother one or two
denizens
of RRAP, they can "killfile" them for the future.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3416. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 18:46:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205121046.7865b203@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42634

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CDE55E1.AA957B81@IEEE.org>...
> > if a machine was sending it. The new machines have built-in keyers
> > which will allow you to send whatever you can send/receive.
>
> Many hams use keyboards to send CW.
>
>
More than you might suspect. Virtually all of the heavy-duty
contesters keyboard cw because the logging software needs keyboard
inputs which keys & keyers don't provide. But most of 'em put the
keyboards away when the 'tests are over and go back to the paddles for
more casual ops.
>
>
w3rv

3417. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 19:24:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020512152454.00680.00006478@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 42636

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>It's usually a week behind the ARRL Newsletter and has the same
>content +/-. Pointless.

I, for one, do not want to see the ARRL Letter be the only source of news about Amateur Radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3418. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 22:07:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205121407.15f21666@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42637

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<abmdgbdnb1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > >
> > >
> > It's usually a week behind the ARRL Newsletter and has the same
> > content +/-. Pointless.
> > w3rv
>
> So if I post something that has already appeared in the ARRL newsletter,
> another web site, the FCC site, etc., that making such a post is
> inappropriate?
>
>
I didn't say it was inappropriate, I said it was pointless. It's
simply a stale regurgitation of bits & pieces of the weekly ARRL
Newsletter. What's their point??
>
>
> Keep the ARNewsline posts coming. They do a nice job of pulling
> info together from a variety of places. If the posts bother one or two
> denizens
> of RRAP, they can "killfile" them for the future.
>
>
Whatever rings yer chimes works for me, I could care less, I'm not
paying for the server space. I don't read a lotta junk posts around
here, that one is just one more.
>
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
w3rv

3419. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 22:09:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205122207570.4133-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42638

On Sat, 11 May 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
>"D. Stussy" wrote:
>> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
>> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the Dayton
>> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able to post
>> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
>>
>> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM anyway.
>>
>> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
>> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and is
>> therefore inappropriate to .policy.
>
>I disagree. Newsline articles sometimes deal with policy or licensing
>issues. Thus it is NOT spam.

1) They don't on a REGULAR basis - yet every edition gets posted here.
2) The purpose of the post is an EXACT match to the purpose of the
"rec.radio.info" newsgroup. As there exists a more appropriate newsgroup, it's
inappropriate here.

3420. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 22:15:27 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205122213080.4133-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42639

On Sun, 12 May 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>news:d22b54c3.0205120918.35f9c753@posting.google.com...
>> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:<3CDDBB4B.C9A01753@ix.netcom.com>...
>> > "D. Stussy" wrote:
>> >
>> > > On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
>> > > >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the
>Dayton
>> > > >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able
>to post
>> > > >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
>> > >
>> > > Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM
>anyway.
>> > >
>> > > It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
>> > > "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue
>and is
>> > > therefore inappropriate to .policy.
>> >
>> > I disagree. Newsline articles sometimes deal with policy or licensing
>> > issues. Thus it is NOT spam.
>> >
>> >
>> It's usually a week behind the ARRL Newsletter and has the same
>> content +/-. Pointless.
>> w3rv
>
>So if I post something that has already appeared in the ARRL newsletter,
>another web site, the FCC site, etc., that making such a post is
>inappropriate?

To me, what makes it inappropriate is that the CONTENT often has very little to
do with POLICY. Occasionally, one story may have a policy aspect - and so they
may post that (without [my] objection), but not the ENTIRE report.

Off topic posts happen here frequently. So do the subsequent flames.

>Keep the ARNewsline posts coming. They do a nice job of pulling
>info together from a variety of places. If the posts bother one or two
>denizens
>of RRAP, they can "killfile" them for the future.

As I have said, there's a newsgroup that exists PURELY for their type of post, which they are NOT using.

3421. Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-12 23:01:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <abms96$58o$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42640

I wonder what the FCC will decide to take away now that they have 'given' us 5Mhz and 136khz and secondary in a sliver in amongst the wireless garbage all over the neighborhood?

Any thoughts?

Dan/W4NTI

3422. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 01:44:31 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CDF1A7F.1090502@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 42641

I think 160 will go away soon. This is one band needed commercially for
things like lo-jack. Many hams cannot use 160 anyways so taking it away
will not result in that much protest. We can only use it part of the
year for those who can use it at all. If one does not have acres of land
and he attempts to use it with any of a number of inefficient 'top hat'
or 'marconi' antennas, all he gets is a bunch of crabby old men saying
they cannot hear him without using their earphones. Technically, 5MHz is
better, even if the allocation is quite small. I personally have no
great concern about 160 but would hate to see it go away if only because
it is a part of ham culture. Still, 160 is only a secondary allocation
and used only by a select few hams who happen to live on large acreages
and farms.

de KR4AJ

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> I wonder what the FCC will decide to take away now that they have 'given' us
> 5Mhz and 136khz and secondary in a sliver in amongst the wireless garbage
> all over the neighborhood?
>
> Any thoughts?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
>

3423. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 02:16:35 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CDF2203.4040605@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 42642

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3CDD4D1F.5040904@bellsouth.net>, Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>Can a person improve sending speed when using paddle type keys instead
>>of a straight key?
>>
>
> Dan:
>
> Short answer: Yes, most definitely. Going from a straight key to a paddle
> took me from 5 to 20 WPM almost overnight, sending-wise. Also, hearing
> perfectly-formed characters improved my copying ability dramatically,
> especially since I drilled with the paddle/keyer combo quite a lot off-the-air,
> in addition to making live QSO's.
>
>
>>Or is there a type of straight ket more suited to
>>higher speeds? My old straight key, which I have mounted on a block of
>>wood, and for which I paid $10.00 new in 1993 has been fairly reliable
>>but the mechanism has too much damping to allow much more than 18 wpm.
>>Any advice from coders would be appreciated. Thanks in advance.
>>
>
> A J-38 key (with the coil spring) would probably have faster action than
> the J-37, which has a leaf spring. You don't specify which type you are
> using. My straight key is a WWII-vintage Lionel J-38 in original
> condition.
>
>
>>Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?
>>
>
> Nope. Fire away, Gridleak!
>
>
>>Will there be a CW sub-band in the new 60 meter band? Thanks,
>>de KR4AJ
>>
>
> I think the 150 KHz allocation on 60-meters should be divvied up
> half CW and half digital -- no 'fone whatsoever! It's time for the NCTA

> to put up or shut up on their promise of a digital revolution in ham
> radio. No "legacy" voice modes in any new HF bands! If they wanna
> yak into a microphone, let 'em squeeze in between the QR-Mary on
> the existing HF phone segments.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

TKS for the information Larry. I knew someone in this ng would spend a few moments to give me the simple refresher in Part 97. And yeah, I remember rrap back in 1995 where a lot of people were telling us to get rid of morse and to use the more 'modern' digital modes. This is the big unfulfilled promise of the reduction to 5 wpm. Today on HF I hear a lot more CW than any of the modern digital modes. That is as it should be because, of course, modern digital modes have much more promise on the higher frequency modes where they may have some decent bandwidth to accommodate their speed.

73 de KR4AJ

3424. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 02:18:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDF2290.A41E0BC0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42643

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> I wonder what the FCC will decide to take away now that they have 'given' us
> 5Mhz and 136khz and secondary in a sliver in amongst the wireless garbage
> all over the neighborhood?
>
> Any thoughts?

70cm is a coveted band.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3425. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 02:21:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205121821.1c0154c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42644

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020512152454.00680.00006478@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >It's usually a week behind the ARRL Newsletter and has the same
> >content +/-. Pointless.
>
> I, for one, do not want to see the ARRL Letter be the only source of news about
> Amateur Radio.
>
>
In the few instances I've bothered to read the thing there was nothing
in it which was not in the Newsletter. Multiple sources of news only
matters when they are sources of editorial content and opinion. Both
the Newsline and the Newsletter editors bend over backward to avoid
publishing "editorialized content" or opinions.
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
w3rv

3426. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 02:49:48 UTC
From: "Stephen C. Robbins" <srobbinsNOSPAMDUDES@netacc.net>
Message-ID: <3cdf29c4@news.netacc.net>
Source record: 42645

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message
news:abms96$58o$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> I wonder what the FCC will decide to take away now that they have 'given'
us
> 5Mhz and 136khz and secondary in a sliver in amongst the wireless garbage
> all over the neighborhood?
>
> Any thoughts?

Hmm, looking at the bands I had when I first got my ticket in 1965, and
comparing it to what we have today.....

Seems in 37 years the FCC has taken nothing but added alot of bands to the
amateur service.

Am I missing something???

Steve

3427. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 02:56:00 UTC
From: M Collinski <bothomasd4@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <4XFD8.2908$X%5.2397@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42646

Probably a nice chunk out of 440 or 900 Mhz.
The downturn in the Technology Industry has
caused a lighten-up of industry pressure
to re-assign most of the ham freq's in the
UHF and SHF bands. These are still the most at
risk from Commercial interests, but can you really
blame them? After all...ham radio is a dying
(literally) hobby seein that the average ham
is 60 yrs old. My guess is by 2020 there will be
HF and 2 meters, and that's all.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message
news:abms96$58o$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> I wonder what the FCC will decide to take
> away now that they have 'given' us
> 5Mhz and 136khz and secondary in a sliver
> in amongst the wireless garbage all over the neighborhood?
>
> Any thoughts?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

3428. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 02:56:04 UTC
From: M Collinski <bothomasd4@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <8XFD8.2909$X%5.1590@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42647

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020512152454.00680.00006478@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>
> >It's usually a week behind the ARRL Newsletter and has the same
> >content +/-. Pointless.
>
> I, for one, do not want to see the ARRL Letter be the only source of news
about
> Amateur Radio.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I couldn't agree more Ed.

The ARRL after all, has as good a track
record of publishing accurate and timely
information as does the IRS...

As long as you send in your membership
dues on time, they'll be friendly, and once
they get your check, you realize that
you've been screwed, just like with
Govt. taxes (adleast with the arrl we can
choose to opt-out, as I did in 1980 and
don't regret it one bit)

3429. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 03:19:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CDF30C2.F450A673@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42648

>
> Hmm, looking at the bands I had when I first got my ticket in 1965, and
> comparing it to what we have today.....
>
> Seems in 37 years the FCC has taken nothing but added alot of bands to the
> amateur service.
>
> Am I missing something???
>

There was the loss of 220-222 MHz about 12 years ago.
Though we did get 219-220 but that band is for packet
and use by coordination only, or something like that.
But you just can't go transmit there like you can everywhere
else in the amateur spectrum.

3430. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 05:06:44 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abogqh82t74@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42758

Jeesshhh..... We know the world of newsgroups revolves around YOU!

Some of us actually like getting this bulletin, as there are no outlets currently to listen to it on the air, at least until the West Michigan Superlink goes back up on the air.

If you have such a crappy internet connection that the message takes SOOOO much time to d/l, then you need to look at getting a better connect.

God I hate netcops!

Ryan

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205112003420.3537-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the Dayton
> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able to post
> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
>
> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM anyway.
>
> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and is
> therefore inappropriate to .policy.
>

3431. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 05:08:53 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abogqi92t74@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42757

Some ISP's do not have rec.radio.info on their newsgroups servers also.....

2) The purpose of the post is an EXACT match to the purpose of the
> "rec.radio.info" newsgroup. As there exists a more appropriate newsgroup,
it's
> inappropriate here.
>

3432. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 05:09:27 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abogqj02t74@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42759

Ever heard of Block Senders function of MS Outlook Express?

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205122207570.4133-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sat, 11 May 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
> >"D. Stussy" wrote:
> >> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
> >> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the
Dayton
> >> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able
to post
> >> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
> >>
> >> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM
anyway.
> >>
> >> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
> >> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and
is
> >> therefore inappropriate to .policy.
> >
> >I disagree. Newsline articles sometimes deal with policy or licensing
> >issues. Thus it is NOT spam.
>
> 1) They don't on a REGULAR basis - yet every edition gets posted here.
> 2) The purpose of the post is an EXACT match to the purpose of the
> "rec.radio.info" newsgroup. As there exists a more appropriate newsgroup,
it's
> inappropriate here.
>

3433. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 05:29:19 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abogqk12t74@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42756

REAL HAMS=STRAIGHT KEY OPERATION ONLY

(at least that's what the extra's I have heard from....)

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CDD4D1F.5040904@bellsouth.net...
> Can a person improve sending speed when using paddle type keys instead
> of a straight key? Or is there a type of straight ket more suited to
> higher speeds? My old straight key, which I have mounted on a block of
> wood, and for which I paid $10.00 new in 1993 has been fairly reliable
> but the mechanism has too much damping to allow much more than 18 wpm.
> Any advice from coders would be appreciated. Thanks in advance.
>
> Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?
>
> Will there be a CW sub-band in the new 60 meter band? Thanks,
> de KR4AJ
>
>

3434. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 05:39:16 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abogqm22t74@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42755

Those are the frequency bands where I have heard the most abusive, profane and just plain inconsiderate operation ever, that I have listened to on the shortwave reciever. Really makes me want to "cash in" my CSCE's and jump righton HF eh?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> 40 is my favorite band, followed closely by 80. (CW) I find the hams operating
> there to be very considerate and courteous. YMMV, of course.
>
> Just wondering why you singled out those bands.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3435. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 09:16:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020513051642.20500.00007241@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 42649

From: "M Collinski" bothomasd4@yahoo.com

> and once they get your check, you realize that
> you've been screwed

In what way did ARRL screw you?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3436. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 09:44:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dWLD8.351$Eo7.36259966@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42650

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CDF2203.4040605@bellsouth.net...

> TKS for the information Larry. I knew someone in this ng would spend a
> few moments to give me the simple refresher in Part 97. And yeah, I
> remember rrap back in 1995 where a lot of people were telling us to get
> rid of morse and to use the more 'modern' digital modes. This is the big
> unfulfilled promise of the reduction to 5 wpm. Today on HF I hear a lot
> more CW than any of the modern digital modes. That is as it should be
> because, of course, modern digital modes have much more promise on the
> higher frequency modes where they may have some decent bandwidth to
> accommodate their speed.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

Brian, there are definite clues that this was a troll:

1. He thanks Larry.
2. He comes to rrap for a Part 97 refresher when the entire document takes
5 minutes to read.
3. He remembers rrap in 1995, and knew this would be the place to get
answers.
4. He remembers being told to get rid of code, and the unfulfilled promise
of digital.
5. Put digital on the higher bands where it belongs.

3437. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 11:16:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020513071602.20703.00001800@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 42751

In article <3CDD951A.1C45F3C8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?
>
>Nope, that's much too obvious.

It's a simple, direct question, Cecil. The fact that you and some others
get so upset by simple, direct questions with no tricks speaks
volumes.

>What we need to ask Dick is if, "Well,
>there you have it", means "I agree".

Why? What is wrong with the simple, direct, honest question I posed?

> It obviously doesn't and you
>look mighty foolish for asserting that it does. Whatever Dick asserts
>or denies now, most of us know what he meant when he said it.

You are trying to weasel-word and mealy-mouth your way out of a
logical corner you painted yourself into, Cecil. You presume to
know what W0EX meant, but you don't really know.

>> CAM wrote:
>> >The individual opinions of individual hams doesn't matter a whit.
>>
>> That's a big, steaming pile of [expletive deleted], Cecil!
>
>You think my opinion matters?
>Exactly to whom? Do you think my
>individual vote ever matters? Do you think the FCC would do
>anything different if I died tomorrow?

A person's opinion or vote does not matter until they do something
with it.

> Get real!

I am real.
>
>> >The FCC is not going to allow the inmates to run the asylum.
>>
>> I am not an "inmate". Neither are most hams. The ARS is not an "asylum".
>
>It's a metaphor, Jim.

It's an insult.

>Don't you understand metaphors? It means that
>any public/governmental organization needs oversight other than the
>entrenched members of the service/society.

It's just a steaming pile of [expletive deleted], like some of the other
stuff you post.
>
>> >More probable is allowing broad band digital signals
>> >in the phone bands.
>>
>> They are allowed there now - if they are voice or image.
>
>Data will someday be allowed in the phone bands.

"Someday" could be 100 years from now.

Until a few weeks ago, the options being presented to the FCC for the Novice
bands were "leave 'em alone" vs. "reuse 'em for 'phone". Then Hans, K0HB,
proposed a third idea. Hans' opinion has gathered lots of backing from
others. Maybe the FCC will act on it, maybe not, but that single opinion
has had an effect.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3438. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 11:16:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020513071603.20703.00001801@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 42752

In article <3CDDFAB8.2F5C256@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <3CDC4F48.96D1E65A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >>
>> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> >> > N2EY wrote:

>> >> > I said I thought digital experimentation by hams is a good idea.
>> >>
>> >> Of course it's a good idea. That's a "mom and apple pie" sort of
>> >> thing. All sorts of experimentation by hams is a good thing.
>> >
>> >But Dick responded, "Well, there you have it", exactly as I knew he
>> >would.
>>
>> So? Is that supposed to be PROOF that W0EX is somehow against
>> "digital" experimentation by hams?
>>
>> Let's ask him.
>>
>> Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?
>>
>
> Of course I'm for any sort of experimentation by hams, and Cecil the Dip
>knows it.

Well, there you have it.

Dick, W0EX, has said unequivocally that he is FOR any sort of
experimentation by hams. A simple, direct answer to a simple direct
question.

>What I decry is his and Carl's rabid insistence that all hams should grab off
>a DSP
>eval board, build up their own, or whatever and leap to the fore of digital
>experimentation ahead of all the commercial enterprises, which is the essence
>of
>what they have been claiming.

I think it would be a good thing if all hams did just that. Or even most hams. But
again, that's a "mom and apple pie" kind of thing.

> Most hams just are not and will no become proficient
>in digital design and he knows if, that is if he knows anything outside his
>own narrow sphere.

Exactly. It'd be a good thing if all hams did the eval board thing, but it's not
gonna happen for a whole pile of reasons. Just like most hams aren't going
to homebrew FT-1000 equivalents or design/build their own towers.

For most hams, the ROI just isn't there.

Do you agree or disagree with the above, Dick?

> Cecil is 99.9% troll and everyone here knows it.

Sure. So don't get all heated up by his trolls. I sure don't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3439. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 13:16:14 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <y0PD8.23067$Ru2.586396@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42753

```
>> And then there are opportunities for leadership in the
>> positions of lead crony, stooge supervisor, consulting....

> All of which must be approved by the Grand Poobah, of course.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Isn't that the essence of cronyism?

Jim, K7JEB
```

3440. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 13:55:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CDFC58C.A50A4E3C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42754

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3CDDFAB8.2F5C256@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> In article <3CDC4F48.96D1E65A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> >writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> >> > N2EY wrote:
>
> >> >> > I said I thought digital experimentation by hams is a good idea.
> >> >>
> >> >> Of course it's a good idea. That's a "mom and apple pie" sort of
> >> >> thing. All sorts of experimentation by hams is a good thing.
> >> >
> >> >But Dick responded, "Well, there you have it", exactly as I knew he
> >> >would.
> >>
> >> So? Is that supposed to be PROOF that W0EX is somehow against
> >> "digital" experimentation by hams?
> >>
> >> Let's ask him.
> >>
> >> Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?
> >>
> >
> > Of course I'm for any sort of experimentation by hams, and Cecil the Dip
> >knows it.
>
> Well, there you have it.
>
> Dick, W0EX, has said unequivocally that he is FOR any sort of
> experimentation by hams. A simple, direct answer to a simple direct
> question.
>
> >What I decry is his and Carl's rabid insistence that all hams should grab off
> >a DSP
> >eval board, build up their own, or whatever and leap to the fore of digital
> >experimentation ahead of all the commercial enterprises, which is the essence

> >of
> >what they have been claiming.
>
> I think it would be a good thing if all hams did just that. Or even most hams.
> But
> again, that's a "mom and apple pie" kind of thing.
>
> > Most hams just are not and will no become proficient
> >in digital design and he knows if, that is if he knows anything outside his
> >own narrow sphere.
>
> Exactly. It'd be a good thing if all hams did the eval board thing, but it's
> not
> gonna happen for a whole pile of reasons. Just like most hams aren't going
> to homebrew FT-1000 equivalents or design/build their own towers.
>
> For most hams, the ROI just isn't there.
>
> Do you agree or disagree with the above, Dick?
>

Yes indeed.
I cannot do otherwise but agree, but I must note that if that were ever the case it would show that ham radio had been taken over by nothing but digital engineeers. The bulk of ham radio operators simply never will proceed technically to that point, and never have, the single "basis and purpose" noting advancement of the art as a reason for our existence notwithstanding. That fact becomes more true as technology advances and becomes more complex. The character of the hobby would be changed drastically. How many medical doctors who are hams have the time to teach themselves digital design theory on anything but the MOST basic conceptual level? Darn few, and the same apples to the majority of hams, who want to be ham radio operators, not design engineers. Now Cecil will insist that is isn't design engineers who come up with virtually all the modern communications advances. (It seems rudimentary that anyone with the sort skill needed to do that work would just naturally find employment where he could take advantage of those skill. So that makes Cecil and Carl's rabid rants no more than showboating.)

That factor is even more true today than in past times when the advanced licenses' qualifications were more difficult to meet. With the "Extra in a day" schools now out, that one should expect much at all in the way of experimentation by the bulk of hams, many of whom don't show enough interest to even build their own dipole antennas is almost laughable, and Cecil and Carl's attitude is almost laughable.

In spite of my reservations about a couple things that Hans' proposal will probably eventually cause, I must agree with the idea that it would provide a whole lot more stimulus for ham radio experimentation than Cecil and Carl do.

>
> > Cecil is 99.9% troll and everyone here knows it.
>

> Sure. So don't get all heated up by his trolls. I sure don't.

Trolling and personal attacks are not quite the same, but as I said, I just don't pay him much attention at all anymore.

3441. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 15:20:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDFD9C9.13954472@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42760

KC8PMX wrote:
> REAL HAMS=STRAIGHT KEY OPERATION ONLY

Sounds good to me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3442. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 15:39:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDFDE4A.3B5A7A3F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42761

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?
> >
> >Nope, that's much too obvious.
>
> It's a simple, direct question, Cecil. The fact that you and some others
> get so upset by simple, direct questions with no tricks speaks
> volumes.

But the question does NOT address the argument. The real argument is:
Was, "Well, there you have it", a positive or negative response to my
suggestion that digital experimentation is a good thing? That is the
entire crux of the argument. Do you want to settle the argument or
mealy mouth your way out of it?

> >What we need to ask Dick is if, "Well,
> >there you have it", means "I agree".
>
> Why? What is wrong with the simple, direct, honest question I posed?

Because it doesn't address the argument over whether, "Well, there you
have it", is a positive or negative response which was and is the only
argument. Dick's response was either positive or negative. You argue
that it was positive. I argue that it was negative. Whether Dick's
response was positive or negative is the *only* argument. All my
additional assumptions are based on the answer to that basic question.

> You presume to
> know what W0EX meant, but you don't really know.

Based on Dick's history of responses to my postings, I am 99 44/100
percent sure that Dick responded negatively to my recommendation that
hams do digital experimentation. You notice Dick has not denied that,
"Well, there you have it", was a negative response nor has he asserted
that it was a positive response.

> >It's a metaphor, Jim.
>
> It's an insult.

Metaphores are insults????? Someone should have told that to Jesus.

> >Don't you understand metaphors? It means that
> >any public/governmental organization needs oversight other than the
> >entrenched members of the service/society.
>
> It's just a steaming pile of [expletive deleted], like some of the other
> stuff you post.

Are you saying that public/governmental organizations don't need oversight?
I shudder to think what the ARS would be like without FCC oversight. Worse
than CB radio comes to mind.

> >> >More probable is allowing broad band digital signals
> >> >in the phone bands.
> >>
> >> They are allowed there now - if they are voice or image.
> >
> >Data will someday be allowed in the phone bands.
>
> "Someday" could be 100 years from now.

Could be next year.

> Maybe the FCC will act on it, maybe not, but that single opinion
> has had an effect.

It will have no effect on the actions of the FCC if the FCC doesn't take
some action on it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3443. Re: Giving something back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 15:43:00 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <8aRD8.20962$Vm2.591691@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42762

Hans, Kï¿½HB, posted:

> I see a lot of hams, having a great time at the hobby,
> enjoying themselves, maybe getting smarter by virtue
> of their curiosity in areas like technology, propagation,
> or simply engineering a better station to win in a
> radiosport contest, but not necessarily "giving
> something back".

I think that each and every amateur-radio activity,
from serving as president of the ARRL down to "kerchunking"
the local repeater, expands the avocation and, in some
sense, "gives something back". I am a strong believer
in the principle of the unintentional contribution.
Just by engaging in the act of communicating via amateur
radio, one both provides another connection node in
the vast, ad-hoc, worldwide network that is the ARS
but also, through the content of the communications,
influences the minds of others. Both aspects of this
activity have unintended, beneficial consequences.

One long-standing idea about amateur radio operators
"giving something back" has to do with mentoring or
"Elmering" young people in the radio communication
art. While formal instruction in the subject is
valuable, the principle of the unintentional
contribution also has major consequences. My
life experience as a young man was that of being
encouraged by older hams and broadcast engineers
to not only enter the technical field but to also
enter adulthood in a certain, responsibly-minded way.
They did this not by lecturing me but rather
by simply providing the other end of long-winded
and wide-ranging conversations, both on-the-air and
in person. They also, through their lifestyle
and interactions with each other, gave me role
models around which my emerging persona could
coalesce. It was all done by them just being
on the air and being themselves, with no intention
other than leading their lives.

> Are they good hams?

I thought so then, and I think so now.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3444. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 15:45:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDFDF83.58C3C5E6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42763

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:
> > Of course I'm for any sort of experimentation by hams, and Cecil the Dip
> >knows it.
>
> Well, there you have it.
>
> Dick, W0EX, has said unequivocally that he is FOR any sort of
> experimentation by hams. A simple, direct answer to a simple direct
> question.

But you and I know that was not the crux of the argument. The argument was over whether, "Well, there you have it", was a positive or negative response to my suggestion that hams do digital experimentation. You are engaging in petitio principii.

What Dick has so far refused to state is whether, "Well, there you have it", was a positive or negative response to my posting. That is the *crux* of the argument. Anything else is merely mealy mouthing.

So Dick, was, "Well, there you have it", a positive or negative response to my posting. We "will have it" when Dick answers that simple question.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3445. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 15:48:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CDFE041.3447FDA4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42764

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > Do you agree or disagree with the above, Dick?
>
> Yes indeed.
> I cannot do otherwise but agree, ...

But you two are mealy mouthing around the real issue which is: Was your response, "Well, there you have it", to my suggestion that hams do digital experimentation, a positive or negative response? Jims says it was positive. I say it was negative. So far, you have refused to answer this one simple question. So Dick, was your response positive or negative? _____ Can't wait for your answer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3446. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 17:52:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gw1zzo2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42765

On Sun, 12 May 2002 22:49:48 -0400, Stephen C. Robbins wrote:

>Hmm, looking at the bands I had when I first got my ticket in 1965, and
>comparing it to what we have today.....
>
>Seems in 37 years the FCC has taken nothing but added alot of bands to the
>amateur service.
>
>Am I missing something???

220-222 MHz is missing.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3447. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 17:52:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gw20a03.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42766

On Mon, 13 May 2002 02:56:00 GMT, M Collinski wrote:

>Probably a nice chunk out of 440 or 900 Mhz.
>The downturn in the Technology Industry has
>caused a lighten-up of industry pressure
>to re-assign most of the ham freq's in the
>UHF and SHF bands.

And Henry Goldberg, the wireless industries' legal mouthpiece, is
slowing down in his later years (aren't we all...)

Whenever you see a Pizza contest between the ARRL and the
wireless interests, you can be sure that Henry is involved on
"their" side.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3448. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 18:19:56 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E2526145D3638324.F55AAC04FA4E1313.273724D7B478DAD7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42767

On 12 May 2002 02:48:20 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I think the 150 KHz allocation on 60-meters should be divvied up
>half CW and half digital -- no 'fone whatsoever! It's time for the NCTA
>to put up or shut up on their promise of a digital revolution in ham
>radio. No "legacy" voice modes in any new HF bands! If they wanna
>yak into a microphone, let 'em squeeze in between the QR-Mary on
>the existing HF phone segments.

But why keep the even MORE out-of-date cw mode if even voice
is now "legacy?" Let's make the new bands computer modes ONLY (no
voice OR cw)--that way you can find out very quickly (1) if as many
people use the modes as NCTA states will use it and (2) if the modes
are really more efficient than the old fashioned ones as well.

How about it, Larry, willing to give up YOUR legacy mode if
others give up theirs?

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3449. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 19:05:08 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <E7UD8.3851$X%5.2290@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42768

Presumably to establish his level of involvement in Amateur Radio and thus imply his level of expertise in the matter, one amateur closed his comments to the FCC regarding RM-10413 with the following:

"III. Vitae: I passed my Novice exam in November 1986, and have not used the Novice CW only subbands since 1987."

Seriously, guys, I didn't make this up!

(&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;) 73, de Hans, K0HB
SOC # 291
http://www.qsl.net/soc/

3450. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 19:34:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <abp4g7qrc1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42769

I hope you are wrong. Top band is a very unique spot in the radio spectrum. Not quite HF and not quite LF. It supports many unique types of propagation that one does not see on the higher bands.

As far as a antenna in a small area...have you ever tried an 'Inverted L' ?? Only about 180 foot long. Run it up in a tree as vertical as possible (50' minimum in my opinion), run the rest horizontal. Don't take up much space.

I just run a single ground rod and a single ground wire just under ground and it works like a champ on Top Band. Feed with coax and a coaxial choke. Tune to resonance and go for it.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:3CDF1A7F.1090502@bellsouth.net...
> I think 160 will go away soon. This is one band needed commercially for
> things like lo-jack. Many hams cannot use 160 anyways so taking it away
> will not result in that much protest. We can only use it part of the
> year for those who can use it at all. If one does not have acres of land
> and he attempts to use it with any of a number of inefficient 'top hat'
> or 'marconi' antennas, all he gets is a bunch of crabby old men saying
> they cannot hear him without using their earphones. Technically, 5MHz is
> better, even if the allocation is quite small. I personally have no
> great concern about 160 but would hate to see it go away if only because
> it is a part of ham culture. Still, 160 is only a secondary allocation
> and used only by a select few hams who happen to live on large acreages
> and farms.
>
> de KR4AJ
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > I wonder what the FCC will decide to take away now that they have 'given' us
> > 5Mhz and 136khz and secondary in a sliver in amongst the wireless garbage
> > all over the neighborhood?
> >
> > Any thoughts?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >

> >
> >
>
>

3451. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 19:37:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <abp4l6$45a$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42770

What about 6 meters? Not much commercial demand for that is there?

As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO). They wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to VHF repeaters lately? See my point.

Dan/W4NTI

"M Collinski" <bothomasd4@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:4XFD8.2908$X%5.2397@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Probably a nice chunk out of 440 or 900 Mhz.
> The downturn in the Technology Industry has
> caused a lighten-up of industry pressure
> to re-assign most of the ham freq's in the
> UHF and SHF bands. These are still the most at
> risk from Commercial interests, but can you really
> blame them? After all...ham radio is a dying
> (literally) hobby seein that the average ham
> is 60 yrs old. My guess is by 2020 there will be
> HF and 2 meters, and that's all.
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:abms96$58o$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > I wonder what the FCC will decide to take
> > away now that they have 'given' us
> > 5Mhz and 136khz and secondary in a sliver
> > in amongst the wireless garbage all over the neighborhood?
> >
> > Any thoughts?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>

3452. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 21:48:13 UTC
From: M Collinski <bothomasd4@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <xwWD8.4138$X%5.464@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42771

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020513051642.20500.00007241@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: "M Collinski" bothomasd4@yahoo.com
>
> > and once they get your check, you realize that
> > you've been screwed
>
> In what way did ARRL screw you?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

The ARRL decision to go along with the publishing of
the FCC written exam question pools back in the 80's.
This is perhaps the greatest damage wrought upon Amateur
Radio, mabey even more than the Incentive Licence disaster
of the mid-60's. As a result of the ARRL's insane desire to
put Dick Bash and his "Bash Study Guides" out of business
the ARRL lobbied the FCC hard to publish the test questions.
(..and I have the word of 2 former ARRL Directors who told
me point blank, at Dayton, that the TRUE reason the ARRL
did this was for this reason - Dick Bash had "crossed the line"
and had to be "dealt with" by the old-boys-network based
in New England) As a result to this, today we have Extra Class
"Licensees" who couldn't identify 10 passive electronic
components if they were placed on a table in front of them
let alone explain Kirchoff's Voltage Loop Theorum or draw
up a simple Common-Emitter Transistor Circuit and calculate
the value of the biasing resistors for a desired operating
curve... Ham radio is now a "plug-and-play" hobby where
even the most basic operational parameters going on within
their Yaesu HF rig when it's powered up on the table is a
total mystery to the great percentage of new hams who got
their "ticket" in the last 15 Years. And they still have the
straight face to say that we are a service rooted in "technical"
pursuits - HA! What a joke.

Charles

3453. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 22:16:30 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2XWD8.4803$zw5.129587485@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42772

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020513071602.20703.00001800@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <3CDD951A.1C45F3C8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?
> >
> >Nope, that's much too obvious.
>
> It's a simple, direct question, Cecil. The fact that you and some others
> get so upset by simple, direct questions with no tricks speaks
> volumes.
>
> >What we need to ask Dick is if, "Well,
> >there you have it", means "I agree".
>
> Why? What is wrong with the simple, direct, honest question I posed?

The question was simple and unambiguous. The answer was ambiguous, to you
at least. So it is the answer that requires clarification, not the
question.

3454. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 22:20:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <z_WD8.4804$Ck5.129162307@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42773

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:E2526145D3638324.F55AAC04FA4E1313.273724D7B478DAD7@lp.airnews.net...
> On 12 May 2002 02:48:20 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >I think the 150 KHz allocation on 60-meters should be divvied up
> >half CW and half digital -- no 'fone whatsoever! It's time for the NCTA
> >to put up or shut up on their promise of a digital revolution in ham
> >radio. No "legacy" voice modes in any new HF bands! If they wanna
> >yak into a microphone, let 'em squeeze in between the QR-Mary on
> >the existing HF phone segments.
>
> But why keep the even MORE out-of-date cw mode if even voice
> is now "legacy?" Let's make the new bands computer modes ONLY (no
> voice OR cw)--that way you can find out very quickly (1) if as many
> people use the modes as NCTA states will use it and

How many is that?

> (2) if the modes
> are really more efficient than the old fashioned ones as well.

My Novice experience was less than efficient.

3455. Re: Blast from the Past

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 22:23:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <y1XD8.4805$4A5.129692977@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42774

"M. Cooper" <none-no-spam@nospamxxx.com> wrote in message
news:YXNoY2FrZQ==.9f825302ea87ebbd7d284141349e05e4@1021316089.cotse.net...
> K�HB wrote:
> >Used to cuss him out for his policies, but sure
> > was nice to hear the old guy on the air!
>
> Is there anyone you haven't cussed out? ;)

M, careful, he might call you a "dump huck."

3456. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 22:35:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bdXD8.4810$kB5.129733682@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42775

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:E7UD8.3851$X%5.2290@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Presumably to establish his level of involvement in Amateur Radio and thus
> imply his level of expertise in the matter, one amateur closed his
comments
> to the FCC regarding RM-10413 with the following:
>
> "III. Vitae: I passed my Novice exam in November 1986, and have not
> used the Novice CW only subbands since 1987."
>
> Seriously, guys, I didn't make this up!
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
> SOC # 291
> http://www.qsl.net/soc/

Good. My comments made it in. I haven't had time to check.

What did you think of the rest of it?

Brian/N0iMD

3457. Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 23:18:54 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CE049DE.90900@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 42776

Brian P Burke wrote:

> Brian, there are definite clues that this was a troll:
>
> 1. He thanks Larry.
> 2. He comes to rrap for a Part 97 refresher when the entire document takes
> 5 minutes to read.
> 3. He remembers rrap in 1995, and knew this would be the place to get
> answers.
> 4. He remembers being told to get rid of code, and the unfulfilled promise
> of digital.
> 5. Put digital on the higher bands where it belongs.

Brian, listen: What is wrong with thanking a good ham who takes the time to give some advice to a fellow ham? Does not ham radio also speak to international goodwill and fellowship? Or is it the purpose of ham radio to get on the usenet and flame fellow hams? We are all in this together. We all have a common interest that is built into us and nothing can change our love for radio and yes, Morse code if that is the case. Yes, we love radio. People who do not love radio do not understand us but we understand each other. We are friendly, we are mean, we are lowfers, we are VHFer, HFers and we are CBers. We all love radio. That is, until we start getting hooked on usenet. The usenet drug changes our personalities...it turns good men bad and even causes us to attack, for no reason at all, as you did me, our brothers in ham radio. What is wrong with seeking an interpretation of the complicated clauses in Part 97? I am not a lawyer and neither are you. We only have Phil Kane for that purpose and I will bet that Phil cannot guarantee that all voice bands are open to CW under all conditions. And of course I remember rrap in 1995 and when it was separated from rra-misc due to the overload of messages on the subject of code. I remember Todd Little and all the others who said there would be a digital revolution on HF if we would just open up HF to no coders. And I observed that this never happened. That is fact. Can I not state fact, Brian? And yes, technically, higher speed digital modes are obviously most effective on VHF and UHF where at least there is some bandwidth. Using digital on HF is akin to trying to make a full length movie recording on a vinyl 33rpm record and using that to play the movie. Fact is fact. Thanks Brian, for your comments, because even negative and unfriendly retorts, like QRM, make me a better ham in the long run. And, thanks Larry Roll, for adding a mature sense of stability to the newsgroup.

Best of 73,

de KR4AJ

3458. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 23:34:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CE04DB9.A4EF61AF@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42777

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> What about 6 meters? Not much commercial demand for that is there?
>
> As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO). They
> wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to VHF
> repeaters lately? See my point.

Umm, yes, I have listened to the repeaters lately. In our area, they
are pretty busy, and well utilized. Chatting, autopatch and lots of
public service events. So I don't get your point at all Dan!

3459. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-13 23:48:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CE050F7.F9526DFD@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42778

You bring up a good point here, Dan. I am firmly convinced that too many people - and not just Hams - use usenet as a sort of ultimate interactive typing adventure game. These good folk set down to their computer, and turn into vicious bastards, to be blunt.

They forget that there is a person on the other end of the line.

They forget the manners their mama taught them.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Dan Finn wrote:

> Brian, listen: What is wrong with thanking a good ham who takes the time
> to give some advice to a fellow ham? Does not ham radio also speak to
> international goodwill and fellowship? Or is it the purpose of ham radio
> to get on the usenet and flame fellow hams? We are all in this together.
> We all have a common interest that is built into us and nothing can
> change our love for radio and yes, Morse code if that is the case. Yes,
> we love radio. People who do not love radio do not understand us but we
> understand each other. We are friendly, we are mean, we are lowfers, we
> are VHFer, HFers and we are CBers. We all love radio. That is, until we
> start getting hooked on usenet. The usenet drug changes our
> personalities...it turns good men bad and even causes us to attack, for
> no reason at all, as you did me, our brothers in ham radio.

3460. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 00:23:13 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205131623.23c3db00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42779

"Stephen C. Robbins" <srobbinsNOSPAMDUDES@netacc.net> wrote in message
news:<3cdf29c4@news.netacc.net>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:abms96$58o$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > I wonder what the FCC will decide to take away now that they have 'given'
> us
> > 5Mhz and 136khz and secondary in a sliver in amongst the wireless garbage
> > all over the neighborhood?
> >
> > Any thoughts?
>
> Hmm, looking at the bands I had when I first got my ticket in 1965, and
> comparing it to what we have today.....
>
> Seems in 37 years the FCC has taken nothing but added alot of bands to the
> amateur service.
>
> Am I missing something???
>
>
No. Back when I first got on the bands the "new" fifteen meter band
was the big buzz and it's been uphill ever since. Except for the time
the FCC "reallocated" our eleven meter band. There wuz a huge leap in
forward-looking spectrum mangement . .
>
>
> Steve
>
>
w3rv

3461. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 00:27:20 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205140025060.4972-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42780

On Mon, 13 May 2002, KC8PMX wrote:
>Jeesshhh..... We know the world of newsgroups revolves around YOU!
>
>Some of us actually like getting this bulletin, as there are no outlets
>currently to listen to it on the air, at least until the West Michigan
>Superlink goes back up on the air.

Since when did I say that the bulletin shouldn't be posted SOMEWHERE? All I said is that this isn't an appropriate place and I indicated in which newsgroup(s) it would be appropriate (and yes, I read those other groups as well).

>If you have such a crappy internet connection that the message takes SOOOO
>much time to d/l, then you need to look at getting a better connect.
>
>God I hate netcops!

Then feel free to get all the SPAM you deserve.

>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205112003420.3537-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
>> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the Dayton
>> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able to
>post
>> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
>>
>> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM
>anyway.
>>
>> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
>> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and is
>> therefore inappropriate to .policy.
>>
>
>
>

3462. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 00:27:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <abpllp$p93$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42781

Glad to hear that Mike....around here they are basically dead. Nothing like it used to be a few years back.

Dan/W4NTI

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:3CE04DB9.A4EF61AF@adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > What about 6 meters? Not much commercial demand for that is there?
> >
> > As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO). They
> > wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to VHF
> > repeaters lately? See my point.
>
> Umm, yes, I have listened to the repeaters lately. In our area, they
> are pretty busy, and well utilized. Chatting, autopatch and lots of
> public service events. So I don't get your point at all Dan!

3463. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 00:29:19 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205140027320.4972-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42782

On Mon, 13 May 2002, KC8PMX wrote:
>Some ISP's do not have rec.radio.info on their newsgroups servers also.....

Then have their users will ask for them to add it. My ISP listens to customers' requests and usually adds within 24 hours. If their's won't, they got what they paid for - either minimal or [non-minimal] crappy service.

> 2) The purpose of the post is an EXACT match to the purpose of the
>> "rec.radio.info" newsgroup. As there exists a more appropriate newsgroup,
>it's
>> inappropriate here.
>>
>
>
>

3464. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 00:30:09 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205140029300.4972-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42783

On Mon, 13 May 2002, KC8PMX wrote:
>Ever heard of Block Senders function of MS Outlook Express?

Ever heard of using a newsgroup reader OTHER than some Micro$oft crap?

>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205122207570.4133-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Sat, 11 May 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
>> >"D. Stussy" wrote:
>> >> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
>> >> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the
>Dayton
>> >> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able
>to post
>> >> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
>> >>
>> >> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM
>anyway.
>> >>
>> >> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
>> >> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and
>is
>> >> therefore inappropriate to .policy.
>> >
>> >I disagree. Newsline articles sometimes deal with policy or licensing
>> >issues. Thus it is NOT spam.
>>
>> 1) They don't on a REGULAR basis - yet every edition gets posted here.
>> 2) The purpose of the post is an EXACT match to the purpose of the
>> "rec.radio.info" newsgroup. As there exists a more appropriate newsgroup,
>it's
>> inappropriate here.

3465. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 00:40:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <h2ZD8.4860$GJ6.132019459@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42784

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CE049DE.90900@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>
> > Brian, there are definite clues that this was a troll:
> >
> > 1. He thanks Larry.
> > 2. He comes to rrap for a Part 97 refresher when the entire document
takes
> > 5 minutes to read.
> > 3. He remembers rrap in 1995, and knew this would be the place to get
> > answers.
> > 4. He remembers being told to get rid of code, and the unfulfilled
promise
> > of digital.
> > 5. Put digital on the higher bands where it belongs.
>
>
> Brian, listen: What is wrong with thanking a good ham who takes the time
> to give some advice to a fellow ham? Does not ham radio also speak to
> international goodwill and fellowship? Or is it the purpose of ham radio
> to get on the usenet and flame fellow hams? We are all in this together.

Congratulations, you're Extra deceitful. You come on here and in your 1st
post refer to "Coders."

Why didn't I key in on that?

Brian Kelly has you pegged.

> We all have a common interest that is built into us and nothing can
> change our love for radio and yes, Morse code if that is the case. Yes,
> we love radio. People who do not love radio do not understand us but we
> understand each other. We are friendly, we are mean, we are lowfers, we
> are VHFer, HFers and we are CBers. We all love radio. That is, until we
> start getting hooked on usenet.

Right - you set me up, I took the bait, and Larry of all people comes out
smelling like a turd with lavender splashed on it. He's the guy who says
the "Buss Driver is his Favorite Black on the Bus because he's the only one
with a job." He's the one who says "Techs are like Welfare Mothers of Color
with their hands out." Or that "Techs are Knuckle dragging 4-landers with
Southern Accents." You two must have cooked this up.

The usenet drug changes our
> personalities...it turns good men bad and even causes us to attack, for
> no reason at all, as you did me, our brothers in ham radio. What is
> wrong with seeking an interpretation of the complicated clauses in Part
> 97?

Yes, yes, yes. Nearly every Advanced licensee I know can't remember if CW
is permissable on HF. Honest question. Good grief.

I am not a lawyer and neither are you. We only have Phil Kane for
> that purpose and I will bet that Phil cannot guarantee that all voice
> bands are open to CW under all conditions.

Very good innocent act. You deserve the Flying Fickle Finger of Fate award.

> And of course I remember
> rrap in 1995 and when it was separated from rra-misc due to the overload
> of messages on the subject of code. I remember Todd Little and all the
> others who said there would be a digital revolution on HF if we would
> just open up HF to no coders. And I observed that this never happened.
> That is fact. Can I not state fact, Brian?

Are you psychic? HF has yet to be opened up to "no-coders." What did you
observe?

> And yes, technically, higher
> speed digital modes are obviously most effective on VHF and UHF where at
> least there is some bandwidth. Using digital on HF is akin to trying to
> make a full length movie recording on a vinyl 33rpm record and using
> that to play the movie. Fact is fact. Thanks Brian, for your comments,
> because even negative and unfriendly retorts, like QRM, make me a better
> ham in the long run.

Then you should keep improving as long as you're able to troll.

> And, thanks Larry Roll, for adding a mature sense of stability to the
newsgroup.

Sweet baby Jesus! Do you realize what you've just said? The anti-Christ of
RRAP has been described as "mature sense of stability." You're crazy.

3466. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 00:43:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <u4ZD8.4861$xu6.131495238@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42785

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3CE050F7.F9526DFD@adelphia.net...
> You bring up a good point here, Dan. I am firmly convinced that too
> many people - and not just Hams - use usenet as a sort of ultimate
> interactive typing adventure game. These good folk set down to their
> computer, and turn into vicious bastards, to be blunt.
>
> They forget that there is a person on the other end of the line.
>
> They forget the manners their mama taught them.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, would you describe Larry Roll/K3LT as adding "a mature sense of
stability" to this group?

3467. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 00:44:55 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <777484f2eca4499286825efa980dc267.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42786

I'd hate to loose it. It's been 33 years since I've been on HF and 160 would be tough from my city lot, but I had a lot of fun on it back in the mid 60s. My antenna wasn't high, but several hundred feet of 8 gauge wire sure pushed out a darn good signal. While my high school buddy gloated about being able to work South Carolina on 75 in the evening with his 600 watts, my 25 watts of AM was good for most the lower 48 on 160 (at least anything I heard, I worked). Heck, 65 watts in the daytime allowed me to work Buffalo any time during the day (power limits were lower here at night) - and one time the Buffalo stations had to copy a breaker (whom I couldn't even hear). He was so weak he had to switch to cw. He just wanted to let me know I was banging into Washington, DC - this at 1:00 PM (AFTERNOON!). I loved that band.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CDF1A7F.1090502@bellsouth.net

> I think 160 will go away soon. This is one band needed commercially for
> things like lo-jack. Many hams cannot use 160 anyways so taking it away
> will not result in that much protest. We can only use it part of the
> year for those who can use it at all. If one does not have acres of land
> and he attempts to use it with any of a number of inefficient 'top hat'
> or 'marconi' antennas, all he gets is a bunch of crabby old men saying
> they cannot hear him without using their earphones. Technically, 5MHz is
> better, even if the allocation is quite small. I personally have no
> great concern about 160 but would hate to see it go away if only because
> it is a part of ham culture. Still, 160 is only a secondary allocation
> and used only by a select few hams who happen to live on large acreages
> and farms.
>
> de KR4AJ

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3468. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 00:50:53 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <c8885a3aad2f739e0fced0a8f6ca42d8.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42787

Phil, correct me if you think I'm wrong. Although there are 3rd world countries wanting more HF spectrum, my belief is that the pressure in on UHF and above. It is our MICROWAVE frequencies that are likely to get clipped. Everyone wants a cell phone. And a pager. And a wireless digital whatchamacallit ... and then there are the photo giants with bluetooth and newer wireless technologies. Wireless is nice, but needs RF spectrum ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message news:cuvyxnansvbet.gw1zzo2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com

> 220-222 MHz is missing.....
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3469. Re: Giving something back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 01:12:29 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <d5906c4be08efb23fda5e3f78ac4a7b3.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42788

Hans, my own personal thought on this subject is that by learning and understanding, one is creating the capability of giving back should the occasion arise. What good is an amateur repeater, other than having fun? Well, that nasty ice storm in the Northeast a few years back found the local police department (was it Watertown? I'm not sure, but if pressed can find out) patched into an amateur tower. Their tower was taken down. Speaking of towers being taken out, kinda helps if some dumb RMSN happens to know you don't run all knobs to the right - and can copy 'sparkplug1' just fine. The amateurs came through - and you were there. No, not everyone gets the opportunity to put the skills to the test; the point is that we do have a number of folks who ARE capable of helping out in a situation should one develop. To me, that is sufficient. That said, if you care to donate to a very worth cause, I would suggest the M for M fund. You always know where the money goes.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
(ps M for M stands for Money for Me - tens and twenties always welcome!)

"Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:_10D8.1413$xI6.796@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net

>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>
> > Aren't we all supposed to be "giving
> > something back to the hobby?"
>
> Larry,
>
> I see that phrase a lot, usually when someone wants me to donate some money,
> or run for club office, or 'guilt' me into some other action which I might
> not have otherwise engaged on my own volition.
>
> OK, here comes a serious question, for which I'm not sure that I know the
> answer. Now you can flame me to a crisp, or we can have a discussion.
>
> I see a lot of hams, having a great time at the hobby, enjoying themselves,
> maybe getting smarter by virtue of their curiosity in areas like technology,
> propagation, or simply engineering a better station to win in a radiosport
> contest, but not necessarily "giving something back".
>
> Are they good hams?
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3470. Re: Blast from the Past

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 02:03:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Jf_D8.1416$RX4.37368012@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42789

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020511224819.04364.00003366@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <cpiD8.3501$yH4.91129048@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Had a nice long chat on 14.057 this afternoon with W4BW. At age 92 his
> >fist
> >> is still crisp and steady, and he just bought a new IC-756 Pro last
week,
> >> which he hopes to wear out. Used to cuss him out for his policies, but
> >sure
> >> was nice to hear the old guy on the air!
> >>
> >> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >Is it possible we'll say the same about you someday?
>
> Brian:
>
> I'm sure we'll be saying the same about you, except for the bit about
> it being nice to hear you on the air!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

```
Larry, the FCC has policies. I have opinions. The ability to read Part 97,
coupled with the ability to reason, and practical experience has helped me
form those opinions. What I don't have is a racist bent, calling
Technicians "Welfare Mothers of Color," or my "Favorite Black on the Bus."
```

3471. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 02:05:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CE0712B.2869A840@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42712

Okay, now I see. I wasn't sure if you were talking about that or the
Southern California repeater situation!

- Mike KB3EIA -

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> Glad to hear that Mike....around here they are basically dead. Nothing like
> it used to be a few years back.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3CE04DB9.A4EF61AF@adelphia.net...
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > What about 6 meters? Not much commercial demand for that is there?
> > >
> > > As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO).
> They
> > > wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to
> VHF
> > > repeaters lately? See my point.
> >
> > Umm, yes, I have listened to the repeaters lately. In our area, they
> > are pretty busy, and well utilized. Chatting, autopatch and lots of
> > public service events. So I don't get your point at all Dan!

3472. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 02:59:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abpv3bmcv1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42790

"M Collinski" <bothomasd4@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:xwWD8.4138$X%5.464@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020513051642.20500.00007241@mb-mn.aol.com...
> > From: "M Collinski" bothomasd4@yahoo.com
> >
> > > and once they get your check, you realize that
> > > you've been screwed
> >
> > In what way did ARRL screw you?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> The ARRL decision to go along with the publishing of
> the FCC written exam question pools back in the 80's.
> This is perhaps the greatest damage wrought upon Amateur
> Radio, mabey even more than the Incentive Licence disaster
> of the mid-60's.

That statement has no basis in fact at all.

> As a result of the ARRL's insane desire to
> put Dick Bash and his "Bash Study Guides" out of business
> the ARRL lobbied the FCC hard to publish the test questions.
> (..and I have the word of 2 former ARRL Directors who told
> me point blank, at Dayton, that the TRUE reason the ARRL
> did this was for this reason - Dick Bash had "crossed the line"
> and had to be "dealt with" by the old-boys-network based
> in New England)

Even if true, so what?

> As a result to this, today we have Extra Class
> "Licensees" who couldn't identify 10 passive electronic
> components if they were placed on a table in front of them
> let alone explain Kirchoff's Voltage Loop Theorum or draw
> up a simple Common-Emitter Transistor Circuit and calculate
> the value of the biasing resistors for a desired operating
> curve...

The license is NOT a graduation certificate. Some people
will pass the test and promptly forget anything technical.
As for Kirchoff's law and circuit design, seems there was
no great concern about not knowing those aspects when

all you needed was a General to have full operating privileges.

> Ham radio is now a "plug-and-play" hobby where
> even the most basic operational parameters going on within
> their Yaesu HF rig when it's powered up on the table is a
> total mystery to the great percentage of new hams who got
> their "ticket" in the last 15 Years.

The circuitry in my VCR, DVD, TV, cable box and a host
of other stuff does the same thing. The same is true for almost
anything electronic today. Unless you ARE a designer, most
people have no need to get into the component level design.
That is totally true in industry also.

> And they still have the
> straight face to say that we are a service rooted in "technical"
> pursuits - HA! What a joke.

The service can be as technical as YOU want it to be. It
appears, however, that YOU being technical isn't enough...instead
YOU want everyone else to meet some criteria you want
to set. The reality, howeevr, is that YOU don't get to
make that final decision.

Just how long ago did you drop your ARRL membership anyway?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3473. Re: FCC Proposes two new ham bands, plus increased status on 2400MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002104.16785.00002455@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42792

In article <p7kD8.3565$2M5.94440792@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>For regulatory purposes, I propose that this
>new band be reserved for Extra class operators until the new license pools
>are released in 2004, because only Extras have the unique ability to
>understand and utilize frequencies that are a mere few kilohertz away from
>the General class frequencies.
>
>73, Brian

Brian:

That works for me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3474. Re: Blast from the Past

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002104.16785.00002454@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42793

In article <y1XD8.4805$4A5.129692977@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>"M. Cooper" <none-no-spam@nospamxxx.com> wrote in message
>news:YXNoY2FrZQ==.9f825302ea87ebbd7d284141349e05e4@1021316089.cotse.net...
>> Kï¿½HB wrote:
>> >Used to cuss him out for his policies, but sure
>> > was nice to hear the old guy on the air!
>>
>> Is there anyone you haven't cussed out? ;)
>
>M, careful, he might call you a "dump huck."

Hmmm, I wonder if "M" has brothers named "Q" and "D. B."?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3475. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002105.16785.00002456@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42800

In article <u4ZD8.4861$xu6.131495238@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Mike, would you describe Larry Roll/K3LT as adding "a mature sense of
>stability" to this group?

Brian:

As usual, that would depend on your point of view. Were the NCTA's who accused me of "ethnic cleansing," being a "NIMBY," and not being "inclusive" on Fidonet a decade ago, and later here on rrap, for supporting a "Morse hazing ritual," adding a "mature sense of stability" to the group? You forget that "what goes around, comes around;" and here on Usenet, things will most certainly "go around" and "come around." All I've done is give my opposition a tast of their own medicine, and they seem to have found it quite distasteful, indeed -- as have I when given my dosages.

In the past few months, I have been making a conscious effort to curb the flaming rhetoric and produce much more helpful and thought-provoking responses. Unfortunately, it doesn't seem as if I'll ever get any credit for that, especially not from the likes of you, but then again, I've learned not to look for that to come from you.

I have always recognized that it is the character and nature of Usenet for people to shoot their fingers off, and I'm certainly not an innocent party along those lines. At least I'll admit that, and make an attempt to keep that temptation under some sort of control. However, your constant ragging on me doesn't place you in any kind of position of moral superiority. I think the difference between us is that I have a conscience about some of the things I've said here, and I realize that the only way to compensate for it is to try to do better in the future. What I'd like to know is, is there any hope of you doing likewise? Or are you simply determined to pick up on the compulsive K3LT-bashing where Kim Walker left off?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3476. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002106.16785.00002458@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42791

In article <3CDE56C2.45912ABC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>He did hand me the two bare ends of 110vac wires one day after I
>had gotten soaked by the rain. Shorty, if you're listening, I
>apologize for being such a pain in the neck. And you were
>instrumental in my choice of Electrical Engineering as a vocation.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil:

If I were you, I'd have had "Shorty" arrested for attempted murder.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3477. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002106.16785.00002457@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42796

In article <ejvD8.3576$HK6.98569714@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> If he is/was a ham (which he appears *not* to be), why shouldn't he
>> do something for amateur radio? Aren't we all supposed to be "giving
>> something back to the hobby?"
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Yeh Larry, like you wanted to give back our VHF and UHF spectrum.
>

Brian:

I believe I stated that I'd willingly give away vast amounts of currently allocated amateur spectrum *above 500 MHz* if it could be utilized more effectively and profitably by commercial communications interests. And don't look now, but whether we want to keep it or not, they're probably going take it away from us anyway! What are us hams doing at >500 MHz that justifies keeping over 25 GHz of spectrum in that region? What is the highest frequency you've ever used as a licensed amateur? (1.2 GHz here -- but it was on CW!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

3478. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002107.16785.00002460@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42795

In article <z_WD8.4804$Ck5.129162307@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>My Novice experience was less than efficient.

Why was that, Brian? As a Novice, I found Morse/CW to be an exceptionally efficient and personally rewarding communications experience. Sure, there was the learning curve to overcome, but that was a simple matter of applying some good 'ole fashioned work ethic and overcoming my earlier objections to having to learn what I thought (incorrectly) was an outdated and ineffective communications skill. Having proved myself wrong, I ultimately became a True Believer in the Morse/CW mode. It sounds to me like you've never advanced past your own preconceived notions and personal objections, and have therefore found Morse/CW not to be of your liking -- a common NCTA characteristic. However, just because I didn't care for the code testing requirements in place at the time I was initially attracted to ham radio didn't mean that they should have been reduced and/or eliminated -- and I'm glad that they weren't prior to my getting my Novice ticket (KA3HXE). Too bad you didn't have the same advantage of superior licensing requirements that I was able to benefit from!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3479. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002107.16785.00002459@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42798

In article <E2526145D3638324.F55AAC04FA4E1313.273724D7B478DAD7@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>>I think the 150 KHz allocation on 60-meters should be divvied up
>>half CW and half digital -- no 'fone whatsoever! It's time for the NCTA
>>to put up or shut up on their promise of a digital revolution in ham
>>radio. No "legacy" voice modes in any new HF bands! If they wanna
>>yak into a microphone, let 'em squeeze in between the QR-Mary on
>>the existing HF phone segments.
>
> But why keep the even MORE out-of-date cw mode if even voice
>is now "legacy?" Let's make the new bands computer modes ONLY (no
>voice OR cw)--that way you can find out very quickly (1) if as many
>people use the modes as NCTA states will use it and (2) if the modes
>are really more efficient than the old fashioned ones as well.

Rick:

That idea is perfectly OK with me! Shall we co-author a Proposal for
Rulemaking?

> How about it, Larry, willing to give up YOUR legacy mode if
>others give up theirs?

In this case, I'd be all for it! Unlike the NCTA who "talk the talk" of
digital modes, I'm one PCTA who is ready and willing to "walk the
(digital) walk." I'll gladly forego CW on 60-meters in favor of making
it a purely digital band, as long as we're talking about digital *data*
modes only, not digitized voice. Let the "digital voice" mavens use the
current HF phone bands for their experiments along those lines.
An exception I'd be willing to consider would be digital voice modes
to be used exclusively for emergency preparedness, with NTS
traffic-handling used as the means of exercising this capability.
No bowel-and-bladder reports from the Al Zheimer's (my own
Cockney rhyming-slang for "Old Timers").

BTW, my all-time favorite mode, good 'ole Baudot RTTY, is indeed
a digital mode, but it is also a "legacy" mode. Should it still be
authorized? I vote "Yea!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

3480. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002108.16785.00002461@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42797

In article <d22b54c3.0205120200.60bf2d03@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>One of the widely advertised justifications for opening up a 60m band
>was to have more phone space for emergency ops vs. the terminal
>congestion in the 75 & 40M phone bands. No doubt done with a bit of
>tongue-in-cheek standard motherhood leveraging of the "emergency ops"
>thing. Can't lose with that old ploy. But it does make some marginal
>sense from the standpoint of the propagation characteristics 60m
>offers. My bet is that's it's gonna be wall-to-wall ssb with other
>modes allowable. If they can tolerate operating amidst the
>motormouths.
>>
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Brian:

I'm sure it will end up that way, if the ARRL has anything to do about it. They know that their bread is buttered on the side of the Ham Hero™ wannabe microphone jockeys!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3481. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002109.16785.00002463@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42794

In article <ZDvD8.3605$R17.99527099@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> One of the widely advertised justifications for opening up a 60m band
>> was to have more phone space for emergency ops vs. the terminal
>> congestion in the 75 & 40M phone bands. No doubt done with a bit of
>> tongue-in-cheek standard motherhood leveraging of the "emergency ops"
>> thing. Can't lose with that old ploy. But it does make some marginal
>> sense from the standpoint of the propagation characteristics 60m
>> offers. My bet is that's it's gonna be wall-to-wall ssb with other
>> modes allowable. If they can tolerate operating amidst the
>> motormouths.
>
>Only Larry's interests matter. He said no phone; that's his story, and he's
>sticking with it.

When all else fails, a pop-culture country music lyric will suffice in the absence of a reasoned argument, eh, Brian?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3482. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002109.16785.00002462@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42799

In article <8BvD8.3600$m%6.99399727@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Larry, you make no sense (not suprised). If CW is digital and digital is
>digital, then dividing the band into half digital and the other half
>digital, you could start the department of redundancey department - unless
>CW really isn't digital.

Brian:

If you'd be so kind as to Google-up a quote where I make the claim that CW is "digital," I'll gladly agree with you. However, before you do that, you might want to look up the correct spelling of the word "redundancy." (Note: I just spelled it correctly, but I don't expect you to take MY word for it!)

>And since we will be secondary users, and the primary users also use
>phone...

I'm sure you have nothing to worry about, and that phone will be authorized on 60-meters. Gives you something to look forward to, I'm sure!

>But you aren't really interested in best use, best practices, or being a
>good neighbor. You're only interested in running your mouth.
>Congratulations, you've succeeded.

And the above paragraph was an example of you doing -- what? Was there some constructive point that I missed?

>And I noticed that you gave the 12+ year Advanced a pass on the CW in phone
>subbands question.

What sort of reply did you expect? Sounds like you're pre-judging me, Brian -- something you liberals aren't supposed to do, or so you claim.

>True to form, your PCTA double standard kicked in. We
>expect nothing less from you.

I surely hope not, Brian, since I *am* an admittedly card-carrying member of the PCTA! At least I'll truthfully identify myself and my cause. And let's face it -- it gives you NCTA's something to whine about, which is what we PCTA's usually get from *you!*

73 de Larry, K3LT

3483. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:21:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020514002110.16785.00002464@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42701

In article <CQvD8.3624$Cc7.100078632@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> > Also, is it against Part 97 rules to transmit CW in the voice sub-bands?
>>
>> You can legally run cw anywhere in the HF ham bands. But it makes no
>> sense to do so in the phone bands, you won't find any cw contacts plus
>> you'll aggravate the hordes for no good reason.
>>
>> > de KR4AJ
>>
>> Decent troll, actually.
>>
>> w3rv
>
>I especially liked the part where Dan thinks I've slammed him. Good acting.
>Then Larry performing true to form, sees he's an 2x2 Advanced licensee with
>at least 12 years time in grade, goes ahead and answers the most basic
>question without batting an eye. Larry actually looks like a good guy for
>once. I think they must have worked it all out before hand.
>

Brian:

My response to Dan's question has nothing to do with the fact that he is an Advanced-class licensee with ~12 years TIG. He's been a participant in this newsgroup for years, but I don't recall seeing him whine about the code testing requirements, or make absurd claims that those who support code testing requirements are some sort of politically-incorrect international criminals. I treat people fairly, in accordance with how they treat myself and others. You can disagree with me the whole day long, as long as you show the same respect for my opinion as you demand that I have for yours. The NCTA, like most liberals, don't seem to be interested in a fair and two-way exchange of ideas. It's their way or the highway. I'm just giving as I have received.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3484. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 04:53:50 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abrhl331q64@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42715

It was kinda a play on that one guy that rears his ugly head once a month on average..... :) !

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3CDFD9C9.13954472@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > REAL HAMS=STRAIGHT KEY OPERATION ONLY
>
> Sounds good to me.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3485. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 05:07:02 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abrhl441q64@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42716

That is why I encourage many people to utilize the 6m and up bands! Use them before we lose them!

If HF is the supposed Golden Egg, I guess I don't want an omelet at this point. Most HF operation I have heard is not what I want to be a part of. (Trash talking CB mentality from people who have been licensed for years, allegedly)

I prefer to start to get to know people on a local level and move outward kind of like the rings formed when a rock lands in water. (Kinda like something I have heard elsewhere; "I am a ham radio operator, I have friends worldwide, but none in my backyard.)

6m and up typically is what is gonna be used for the overwhelming majority of disasters that I will ever encounter. If I need to get a message to somebody in California about our little disaster here in Mid-Michigan, there is resources already for that.

95% of my activity is public service/weather nets/emergency services work as far as on the air, and the practices to make myself efficient in doing so. (message handling etc.) The other five percent is the ragchewing.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message
news:abp4l6$45a$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> What about 6 meters? Not much commercial demand for that is there?
>
> As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO).
They
> wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to
VHF
> repeaters lately? See my point.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "M Collinski" <bothomasd4@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:4XFD8.2908$X%5.2397@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > Probably a nice chunk out of 440 or 900 Mhz.
> > The downturn in the Technology Industry has

> > caused a lighten-up of industry pressure
> > to re-assign most of the ham freq's in the
> > UHF and SHF bands. These are still the most at
> > risk from Commercial interests, but can you really
> > blame them? After all...ham radio is a dying
> > (literally) hobby seein that the average ham
> > is 60 yrs old. My guess is by 2020 there will be
> > HF and 2 meters, and that's all.
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:abms96$58o$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > I wonder what the FCC will decide to take
> > > away now that they have 'given' us
> > > 5Mhz and 136khz and secondary in a sliver
> > > in amongst the wireless garbage all over the neighborhood?
> > >
> > > Any thoughts?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
>

3486. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 05:41:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CE0A385.C7A7418A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42702

>
>
> Are you psychic? HF has yet to be opened up to "no-coders." What did you
> observe?

Maybe 5wpm is equivalent to "no code". But the Novice license was
always 5wpm. That would mean that the old "all code" license was
really "no-code"? And remember that there are two subands on 6 and
2 for CW only. There no-code techs can operate code if they want to.

:-)

>
>
> > And yes, technically, higher
> > speed digital modes are obviously most effective on VHF and UHF where at
> > least there is some bandwidth. Using digital on HF is akin to trying to
> > make a full length movie recording on a vinyl 33rpm record and using
> > that to play the movie.

Well, if you can do 56K thru a phone line,....
But you don't usually get QRM, QRN, and QSB on phone lines.
How about we move voice modes from 40 where all those SW
broadcasters QRM us to the new 5MHz band and put wide
bandwidth digital modes on 40? And allow us say 10KW? :-)
Or move voice on 40 to match the non usa users and digital
high power bandwidth on the SW broadcasters? :-)

>
>
> Then you should keep improving as long as you're able to troll.
>
> > And, thanks Larry Roll, for adding a mature sense of stability to the
> newsgroup.
>
> Sweet baby Jesus! Do you realize what you've just said? The anti-Christ of
> RRAP has been described as "mature sense of stability." You're crazy.

Think you missed the bus. :-) CW does have one feature in its favor,
it's the only human readable "digital" mode we have. Requires minimal
equipment to operate. But it does take extra bandwidth to make it
human readable (a few hundred hertz, about the bandwidth needed for
say 150 baud). If you made CW's bandwidth "match" its baud rate
(to crudely state it), the dits and dahs would be too "soft" for humans
to be able to "read".

3487. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 06:08:20 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <16B9FEC972964FD3.0319D3D7BB2714A0.9036A72E56C62735@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42703

On Mon, 13 May 2002 14:37:10 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote:

>As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO). They
>wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to VHF
>repeaters lately? See my point.

Reallocating 2m would be like reallocating 11m; there's too much
equipment out there for them to ever hope to make it commercially
viable. Nobody's going to smash up a $300+ mobile just because we
lost the band, and they'll find their way into the hands of the
freebanders eventually, even assuming that most of the Techs out there
don't get pissed off at losing the band, tear up their tickets, and
keep using it anyway.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3488. Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 09:43:56 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <w%4E8.2095$Kj5.122863711@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42704

I'm trying to find out what knowledge and skills an amateur radio operator needs to possesss in order to obtain a Tech class license. Anyone have any info or links? - Lars121

3489. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 10:24:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020514062420.20508.00006614@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 42705

From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@mindspringnospam.com

>Glad to hear that Mike....around here they are basically dead. Nothing like
>it used to be a few years back.

In looking at the two differing opinions about the viability of 2 meters in each area, there may be some correlation between the enthusiasm of the old timers involved and the amount of local activity.

Are you *part* of the FCC secret conspiracy you allege that wants to convince hams to operate on HF so they can give away 2 meters?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3490. Re: Giving something back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 10:26:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020514062627.20508.00006615@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 42706

From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net

>Hans, my own personal thought on this subject is that by learning and
>understanding, one is creating the capability of giving back should the
>occasion arise.

That learning and understanding is one of the values of Amateur Radio in and of itself.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3491. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 11:27:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020514072735.06141.00000646@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42707

In article <abogqm22t74@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Those are the frequency bands where I have heard the most abusive, profane
>and just plain inconsiderate operation ever, that I have listened to on the
>shortwave reciever.

A simple, direct answer to a simple, direct question. Thanks Ryan.

What mode(s) were the abusive, profane and just plain inconsiderate operators
using?

> Really makes me want to "cash in" my CSCE's and jump
>right on HF eh?

Exactly.

One thing to remember, though. With a decent HF receiver, you can hear any
abusive, profane or inconsiderate operators within a radius of several hundred
to several thousand miles - that's an area of hundreds of thousands to millions
of square miles. On VHF/UHF, the distance covered is usually only a radius of a
few dozen to a hundred or so miles, covering a few hundred to a few thousand
square miles. And if somebody acts up on a repeater, the control op can shut it
down.

Here's a fellow who isn't on the HF ham bands:

http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=10978

see also:

(2nd letter)

http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/2001/1201.html

73 de Jim, N2EY

>> 40 is my favorite band, followed closely by 80. (CW) I find the hams
>operating
>> there to be very considerate and courteous. YMMV, of course.
>>
>> Just wondering why you singled out those bands.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3492. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 11:30:05 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <1z6E8.22291$Vm2.722121@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42708

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:w%4E8.2095$Kj5.122863711@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
> I'm trying to find out what knowledge and skills an amateur radio
operator
> needs to possesss in order to obtain a Tech class license. Anyone have
any
> info or links? - Lars121
>
>

http://www.arrl.org for good pubs and poop
http://www.qrz.com one of several good sources of sample exams
http://ah0a.org for Morse Academy which is not needed for the Tech but is
the next step in the process for all other classes.

You will be amazed at how blessed easy Amateur licensing is. The Tech, at
the risk of making a lot of people mad, is not now and never was designed
to be the entry level, it was designed to allow a spouse to order bread
and milk, take the kid hunting, and for all twelve real experimenters most
of whom find Bluetooth is easier under Part 15. The code might take you
three weeks if you work at it about an hour a day via Morse Academy or the
ARRL CDs.

Rattle my E-mail if you wish but you might be better advised being in
PacTel territory to look up one of the local clubs on the ARRL site.

Welcome to the Magical Mystery Tour.

Dick N&#65533;BK

3493. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 13:47:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE1156D.53309868@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42709

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3CDE56C2.45912ABC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >
> > >He did hand me the two bare ends of 110vac wires one day after I
> > >had gotten soaked by the rain. Shorty, if you're listening, I
> > >apologize for being such a pain in the neck. And you were
> > >instrumental in my choice of Electrical Engineering as a vocation.
>
> If I were you, I'd have had "Shorty" arrested for attempted murder.

I'm not that easy to murder, Larry. 220vac might have done it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3494. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 13:51:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE11666.B61B7454@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42710

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'll gladly forego CW on 60-meters in favor of making
> it a purely digital band, as long as we're talking about digital *data*
> modes only, not digitized voice.

Larry, digitized voice *IS* data. The electronics cannot tell the
difference.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3495. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 13:55:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE11746.69091680@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42711

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> If you'd be so kind as to Google-up a quote where I make the claim that
> CW is "digital," I'll gladly agree with you.

Doesn't matter what you claim, Larry, OOK/Morse/CW *IS* digital.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3496. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 14:32:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CE11FD5.641D29B5@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42713

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <3CDE56C2.45912ABC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > > >
> > > >He did hand me the two bare ends of 110vac wires one day after I
> > > >had gotten soaked by the rain. Shorty, if you're listening, I
> > > >apologize for being such a pain in the neck. And you were
> > > >instrumental in my choice of Electrical Engineering as a vocation.
> >
> > If I were you, I'd have had "Shorty" arrested for attempted murder.
>
> I'm not that easy to murder, Larry. 220vac might have done it.
> -

If Shorty handed a kid a pair of wires hot with 110VAC on them, he wasn't very bright. If you think that wouldn't kill you quick you're no brighter.

Maybe he was trying to rid himself of a pest.

3497. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 17:46:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE14D91.F63EE3BA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42714

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If Shorty handed a kid a pair of wires hot with 110VAC on them, he wasn't very
> bright. If you think that wouldn't kill you quick you're no brighter.

I've gotten on 120vac tens of times in my life and never died yet. If one
is careful to avoid 120vac in the bathtub or when standing barefooted on
wet concrete, one can usually quickly turn loose of it. I certainly did.

Think of all the people who have been bitten by AC/DC radios in the past.
(before polarized plugs). That was 120vac directly on the chassis if the AC
plug was turned wrong. Virtually the only ones who died were the ones
in bad health and/or with a separate very low impedance path to ground.

> Maybe he was trying to rid himself of a pest.

It worked.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3498. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 18:03:06 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE1515A.6BEF3B5D@psu.edu>
Source record: 42717

Most all of us have been guilty of newsgroup nastiness. And yes, Larry has too. But he has been (self admittedly) working on behaving. I don't always agree with all he says, but I still enjoy reading his posts.

- mike KB3EIA -

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3CE050F7.F9526DFD@adelphia.net...
> > You bring up a good point here, Dan. I am firmly convinced that too
> > many people - and not just Hams - use usenet as a sort of ultimate
> > interactive typing adventure game. These good folk set down to their
> > computer, and turn into vicious bastards, to be blunt.
> >
> > They forget that there is a person on the other end of the line.
> >
> > They forget the manners their mama taught them.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Mike, would you describe Larry Roll/K3LT as adding "a mature sense of
> stability" to this group?

3499. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 18:10:47 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE15326.B5738B2D@psu.edu>
Source record: 42718

Hmm, there are wacko broadcasters on the hf bands, both in our country, and around the world. some are sworn enemies of the U.S. If we apply your logic, will you throw away your shortwave?

You will find problems anywhere you go. No use letting the bad guys dictate your actions. There are plenty of fine gentlemen and ladies on HF also. They're the ones you want to comm with. If you are a gentleman, your addition will help.

- Mike KB3EIA -

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> Those are the frequency bands where I have heard the most abusive, profane
> and just plain inconsiderate operation ever, that I have listened to on the
> shortwave reciever. Really makes me want to "cash in" my CSCE's and jump
> righton HF eh?

3500. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 18:17:51 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE154CE.DDBD6A4E@psu.edu>
Source record: 42719

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
> news:w%4E8.2095$Kj5.122863711@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
> > I'm trying to find out what knowledge and skills an amateur radio
> operator
> > needs to possesss in order to obtain a Tech class license. Anyone have
> any
> > info or links? - Lars121
> >
> >
>
> http://www.arrl.org for good pubs and poop
> http://www.qrz.com one of several good sources of sample exams
> http://ah0a.org for Morse Academy which is not needed for the Tech but is
> the next step in the process for all other classes.
>
> You will be amazed at how blessed easy Amateur licensing is. The Tech, at
> the risk of making a lot of people mad, is not now and never was designed
> to be the entry level, it was designed to allow a spouse to order bread
> and milk, take the kid hunting, and for all twelve real experimenters most
> of whom find Bluetooth is easier under Part 15.

Where is the proof of this Richard? I know that is what a lot of people
use it for, but I never saw it as that.

But yes, the technician requirements are not that hard. and for some of
us, neither are the General or Extra.

> The code might take you
> three weeks if you work at it about an hour a day via Morse Academy or the
> ARRL CDs.

Took me over 6 months of intense effort. DOH! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3501. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 19:15:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <abrnp0$na2$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42720

I hadn't thought of that Joe. I keep forgeting that the 'newer ham' types were brought up different. It never occured me to do that.

Dan/W4NTI

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message news:16B9FEC972964FD3.0319D3D7BB2714A0.9036A72E56C62735@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 13 May 2002 14:37:10 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote:
>
> >As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO). They
> >wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to VHF
> >repeaters lately? See my point.
>
> Reallocating 2m would be like reallocating 11m; there's too much
> equipment out there for them to ever hope to make it commercially
> viable. Nobody's going to smash up a $300+ mobile just because we
> lost the band, and they'll find their way into the hands of the
> freebanders eventually, even assuming that most of the Techs out there
> don't get pissed off at losing the band, tear up their tickets, and
> keep using it anyway.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

3502. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 19:19:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <abrnvj$2i2$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42721

Not I. I would prefere we return to pre 1968 and drop incentive licensing
and begin anew from that point. But that won't happen either.

I think the FCC, being a government agency of political appointees will do
whatever is necessary to passify whatever pet project in government is going
on at the time. Whatever it takes to get the 'job done' regardless of the
flack. As long as the 'flack' doesn't hit them that is.

Dan/W4NTI

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020514062420.20508.00006614@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@mindspringnospam.com
>
> >Glad to hear that Mike....around here they are basically dead. Nothing
like
> >it used to be a few years back.
>
> In looking at the two differing opinions about the viability of 2 meters
in
> each area, there may be some correlation between the enthusiasm of the old
> timers involved and the amount of local activity.
>
> Are you *part* of the FCC secret conspiracy you allege that wants to
convince
> hams to operate on HF so they can give away 2 meters?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

3503. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 21:19:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8bfE8.5172$9N.147575004@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42722

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020514002106.16785.00002457@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <ejvD8.3576$HK6.98569714@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> If he is/was a ham (which he appears *not* to be), why shouldn't he
> >> do something for amateur radio? Aren't we all supposed to be "giving
> >> something back to the hobby?"
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Yeh Larry, like you wanted to give back our VHF and UHF spectrum.
> >
>
> Brian:
>
> I believe I stated that I'd willingly give away vast amounts of currently
> allocated amateur spectrum *above 500 MHz* if it could be utilized
> more effectively and profitably by commercial communications interests.
> And don't look now, but whether we want to keep it or not, they're
> probably going take it away from us anyway! What are us hams
> doing at >500 MHz that justifies keeping over 25 GHz of spectrum
> in that region? What is the highest frequency you've ever used as
> a licensed amateur? (1.2 GHz here -- but it was on CW!)
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Prove you said above 500 mhz.

3504. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 21:20:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pcfE8.5173$xY.147866799@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42723

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020514002109.16785.00002463@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <ZDvD8.3605$R17.99527099@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> One of the widely advertised justifications for opening up a 60m band
> >> was to have more phone space for emergency ops vs. the terminal
> >> congestion in the 75 & 40M phone bands. No doubt done with a bit of
> >> tongue-in-cheek standard motherhood leveraging of the "emergency ops"
> >> thing. Can't lose with that old ploy. But it does make some marginal
> >> sense from the standpoint of the propagation characteristics 60m
> >> offers. My bet is that's it's gonna be wall-to-wall ssb with other
> >> modes allowable. If they can tolerate operating amidst the
> >> motormouths.
> >
> >Only Larry's interests matter. He said no phone; that's his story, and
he's
> >sticking with it.
>
> When all else fails, a pop-culture country music lyric will suffice in
> the absence of a reasoned argument, eh, Brian?

Reasoned argument is that the primary users use phone in the band we are
about to share with them. That's the third time its been said. What part
of it don't you get?

3505. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 21:21:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <edfE8.5174$4Z.147881180@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42724

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020514002108.16785.00002461@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <d22b54c3.0205120200.60bf2d03@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >One of the widely advertised justifications for opening up a 60m band
> >was to have more phone space for emergency ops vs. the terminal
> >congestion in the 75 & 40M phone bands. No doubt done with a bit of
> >tongue-in-cheek standard motherhood leveraging of the "emergency ops"
> >thing. Can't lose with that old ploy. But it does make some marginal
> >sense from the standpoint of the propagation characteristics 60m
> >offers. My bet is that's it's gonna be wall-to-wall ssb with other
> >modes allowable. If they can tolerate operating amidst the
> >motormouths.
> >>
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Brian:
>
> I'm sure it will end up that way, if the ARRL has anything to do about
> it. They know that their bread is buttered on the side of the Ham HeroT
> wannabe microphone jockeys!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

It sure isn't buttered with "I wanna give away VHF+ Larry tRoll."

3506. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 21:24:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <AgfE8.5177$G%.147949779@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42725

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020514002109.16785.00002462@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <8BvD8.3600$m%6.99399727@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry, you make no sense (not suprised). If CW is digital and digital is
> >digital, then dividing the band into half digital and the other half
> >digital, you could start the department of redundancey department -
unless
> >CW really isn't digital.
>
> Brian:
>
> If you'd be so kind as to Google-up a quote where I make the claim that
> CW is "digital," I'll gladly agree with you.

Others have done it for you.

However, before you do that,
> you might want to look up the correct spelling of the word "redundancy."
> (Note: I just spelled it correctly, but I don't expect you to take MY word
> for it!)

Not a problem. I a-kashenally mispell a word.

> >And since we will be secondary users, and the primary users also use
> >phone...
>
> I'm sure you have nothing to worry about, and that phone will be
> authorized on 60-meters. Gives you something to look forward to, I'm
> sure!

Beats dropping a carrier on our new neighbors.

> >But you aren't really interested in best use, best practices, or being a
> >good neighbor. You're only interested in running your mouth.
> >Congratulations, you've succeeded.
>
> And the above paragraph was an example of you doing -- what? Was
> there some constructive point that I missed?

Yes. Your hatred for phone and things phone related. Eat it.

> >And I noticed that you gave the 12+ year Advanced a pass on the CW in
phone
> >subbands question.

>
> What sort of reply did you expect? Sounds like you're pre-judging me,
> Brian -- something you liberals aren't supposed to do, or so you claim.

Your crappy reputation precedes you.

> >True to form, your PCTA double standard kicked in. We
> >expect nothing less from you.
>
> I surely hope not, Brian, since I *am* an admittedly card-carrying member
> of the PCTA! At least I'll truthfully identify myself and my cause. And
> let's face it -- it gives you NCTA's something to whine about, which is
> what we PCTA's usually get from *you!*

Well there you have it.

3507. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 21:26:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020514172654.11738.00011142@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 42726

>Took me over 6 months of intense effort. DOH! 8^)
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

You must have a Mental problem

3508. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-14 22:00:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CE188E9.4CC9A4ED@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42727

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> I hadn't thought of that Joe. I keep forgeting that the 'newer ham' types
> were brought up different. It never occured me to do that.

This didn't happen with the loss of 220-222MHz. But there was
always a cloud of sorts over that band before that happened.
And the FCC did compensate a *little* by making us primary
in 222-225 and allowing us to use 219-220 for coordinated digital
backbones and such.

3509. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 01:29:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gw4h1f8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42728

On Mon, 13 May 2002 19:27:37 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Glad to hear that Mike....around here they are basically dead. Nothing like
>it used to be a few years back.

Up here is NW Oregon, 2-m repeater use is a big thing, because of a
big push to grt new abd ypgraded hams (w/ and w/o code) by several
clubs.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3510. Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 01:45:44 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <c5jE8.991$D41.87393@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42729

The June Q-Street in the world above 50 MHz has a description of JT44 which is designed for EME which epitomizes a decent approach to digital communication. It is among other things self-adjusting between -2 and +4 seconds in clock diff (mildly useful on an EME path) and a 600 Hz frequency difference which is also damned useful for a method that copies below audibility.

Gee whiz, somebody thought it thru and used the available intelligence for something intelligent. Will miracles never cease.

Dick N&#65533;BK

3511. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 02:01:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8kjE8.5237$vh3.151967877@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42730

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020514072735.06141.00000646@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <abogqm22t74@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Those are the frequency bands where I have heard the most abusive,
profane
> >and just plain inconsiderate operation ever, that I have listened to on
the
> >shortwave reciever.
>
> A simple, direct answer to a simple, direct question. Thanks Ryan.
>
> What mode(s) were the abusive, profane and just plain inconsiderate
operators
> using?

And had the abusers passed a code examination? (the exam that is supposed
to weed out abusive people.)

> > Really makes me want to "cash in" my CSCE's and jump
> >right on HF eh?
>
> Exactly.
>
> One thing to remember, though. With a decent HF receiver, you can hear any
> abusive, profane or inconsiderate operators within a radius of several
hundred
> to several thousand miles - that's an area of hundreds of thousands to
millions
> of square miles. On VHF/UHF, the distance covered is usually only a radius
of a
> few dozen to a hundred or so miles, covering a few hundred to a few
thousand
> square miles. And if somebody acts up on a repeater, the control op can
shut it
> down.
>
> Here's a fellow who isn't on the HF ham bands:
>
> http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=10978
>
> see also:
>
> (2nd letter)

>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/2001/1201.html
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> >> 40 is my favorite band, followed closely by 80. (CW) I find the hams
> >operating
> >> there to be very considerate and courteous. YMMV, of course.
> >>
> >> Just wondering why you singled out those bands.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
>

3512. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 02:03:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zljE8.5238$iY2.151375929@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42731

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020514002106.16785.00002458@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3CDE56C2.45912ABC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >He did hand me the two bare ends of 110vac wires one day after I
> >had gotten soaked by the rain. Shorty, if you're listening, I
> >apologize for being such a pain in the neck. And you were
> >instrumental in my choice of Electrical Engineering as a vocation.
> >--
> >cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Cecil:
>
> If I were you, I'd have had "Shorty" arrested for attempted murder.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You would? First you'd have to get a LEO to take you seriously.

3513. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 02:14:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_vjE8.5242$1B3.152558636@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42732

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CE0A385.C7A7418A@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> >
> >
> > Are you psychic? HF has yet to be opened up to "no-coders." What did
you
> > observe?
>
> Maybe 5wpm is equivalent to "no code". But the Novice license was
> always 5wpm. That would mean that the old "all code" license was
> really "no-code"? And remember that there are two subands on 6 and
> 2 for CW only. There no-code techs can operate code if they want to.
>
> :-)

That is correct. The FCC and everyone else recognizes that 5wpm is code.
So much so that the ARRL and W5YI VEC's send it at 16wpm on the exam. But
its all "no-code" to a select few idiots on RRAP. No smiley.

> > > And yes, technically, higher
> > > speed digital modes are obviously most effective on VHF and UHF where
at
> > > least there is some bandwidth. Using digital on HF is akin to trying
to
> > > make a full length movie recording on a vinyl 33rpm record and using
> > > that to play the movie.
>
> Well, if you can do 56K thru a phone line,....

Often.

> But you don't usually get QRM, QRN, and QSB on phone lines.
> How about we move voice modes from 40 where all those SW
> broadcasters QRM us to the new 5MHz band and put wide
> bandwidth digital modes on 40? And allow us say 10KW? :-)
> Or move voice on 40 to match the non usa users and digital
> high power bandwidth on the SW broadcasters? :-)

The throughput on HF is kept artificially low.

> > Then you should keep improving as long as you're able to troll.
> >
> > > And, thanks Larry Roll, for adding a mature sense of stability to the
> > newsgroup.

> >
> > Sweet baby Jesus! Do you realize what you've just said? The
anti-Christ of
> > RRAP has been described as "mature sense of stability." You're crazy.
>
> Think you missed the bus. :-) CW does have one feature in its favor,
> it's the only human readable "digital" mode we have. Requires minimal
> equipment to operate. But it does take extra bandwidth to make it
> human readable (a few hundred hertz, about the bandwidth needed for
> say 150 baud). If you made CW's bandwidth "match" its baud rate
> (to crudely state it), the dits and dahs would be too "soft" for humans
> to be able to "read".

CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to emulate a
modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.

3514. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 02:24:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <MFjE8.5249$dC3.152592515@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42733

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020514002107.16785.00002460@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <z_WD8.4804$Ck5.129162307@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >My Novice experience was less than efficient.
>
> Why was that, Brian? As a Novice, I found Morse/CW to be an
> exceptionally efficient and personally rewarding communications
> experience.

What year (AD) was that?

> Sure, there was the learning curve to overcome,

Yes, yes, no problem there.

but
> that was a simple matter of applying some good 'ole fashioned
> work ethic

You have a work ethic? Yet you complain about all the other Blacks on your
bus?

> and overcoming my earlier objections to having to learn
> what I thought (incorrectly) was an outdated and ineffective
> communications skill.

That's your problem. I learned the code without prejudice. It was my
on-the-air experience that turned me off.

> Having proved myself wrong,

No doubt you'll continue the trend the rest of your life.

> I ultimately
> became a True Believer in the Morse/CW mode.

Did you quit smoking, too?

> It sounds to me
> like you've never advanced past your own preconceived notions
> and personal objections, and have therefore found Morse/CW not
> to be of your liking -- a common NCTA characteristic.

I had no preconceived notions. I bought in to the inventive licensing lie.

> However,
> just because I didn't care for the code testing requirements in

> place at the time I was initially attracted to ham radio didn't mean
> that they should have been reduced and/or eliminated

Oh, I agree. Today I think it should be eliminated because it is
irrelevant.

-- and I'm
> glad that they weren't prior to my getting my Novice ticket
> (KA3HXE).

Me too. I'm glad you were made to do something irrelevant and meaningless,
and that you didn't like it is icing on the cake.

> Too bad you didn't have the same advantage of
> superior licensing requirements that I was able to benefit from!

But I did. Ha!

3515. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 02:31:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ELjE8.5255$oM3.152941898@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42734

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020514002110.16785.00002464@mb-fc.aol.com...

> Brian:
>
> My response to Dan's question has nothing to do with the fact that
> he is an Advanced-class licensee with ~12 years TIG. He's been
> a participant in this newsgroup for years, but I don't recall seeing him
> whine about the code testing requirements, or make absurd claims
> that those who support code testing requirements are some sort of
> politically-incorrect international criminals. I treat people fairly, in
> accordance with how they treat myself and others. You can disagree
> with me the whole day long, as long as you show the same respect
> for my opinion as you demand that I have for yours. The NCTA, like
> most liberals, don't seem to be interested in a fair and two-way
> exchange of ideas. It's their way or the highway. I'm just giving as
> I have received.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, you're simply a liar. You judge Blacks on Busses, Welfare Mothers of
Color with their hands out, Knuckle Dragging 4-Landers with Southern
Accents, and No-Code Technicians. All people you don't even know. And
its -your- way or the highway.

Get over it.

Brian

3516. Re: Blast from the Past

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 02:32:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <TMjE8.5256$1O3.152999072@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42735

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020514002104.16785.00002454@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <y1XD8.4805$4A5.129692977@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >"M. Cooper" <none-no-spam@nospamxxx.com> wrote in message
>
>news:YXNoY2FrZQ==.9f825302ea87ebbd7d284141349e05e4@1021316089.cotse.net...
> >> K?HB wrote:
> >> >Used to cuss him out for his policies, but sure
> >> > was nice to hear the old guy on the air!
> >>
> >> Is there anyone you haven't cussed out? ;)
> >
> >M, careful, he might call you a "dump huck."
>
> Hmmm, I wonder if "M" has brothers named "Q" and "D. B."?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

```
Then there's "Cooper's Real Ale" from Australia.
```

3517. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 02:34:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gPjE8.5261$%O3.153032026@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42736

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CE154CE.DDBD6A4E@psu.edu...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
> > news:w%4E8.2095$Kj5.122863711@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
> > > I'm trying to find out what knowledge and skills an amateur radio
> > operator
> > > needs to possesss in order to obtain a Tech class license. Anyone have
> > any
> > > info or links? - Lars121
> > >
> > >
> >
> > http://www.arrl.org for good pubs and poop
> > http://www.qrz.com one of several good sources of sample exams
> > http://ah0a.org for Morse Academy which is not needed for the Tech but
is
> > the next step in the process for all other classes.
> >
> > You will be amazed at how blessed easy Amateur licensing is. The Tech,
at
> > the risk of making a lot of people mad, is not now and never was
designed
> > to be the entry level, it was designed to allow a spouse to order bread
> > and milk, take the kid hunting, and for all twelve real experimenters
most
> > of whom find Bluetooth is easier under Part 15.
>
> Where is the proof of this Richard? I know that is what a lot of people
> use it for, but I never saw it as that.
>
> But yes, the technician requirements are not that hard. and for some of
> us, neither are the General or Extra.

Where I came from a Tech is a General without extra code.

> > The code might take you
> > three weeks if you work at it about an hour a day via Morse Academy or
the
> > ARRL CDs.
>
> Took me over 6 months of intense effort. DOH! 8^)

It was a lot of effort with very little payoff.

3518. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 02:36:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <UQjE8.5264$aE3.152669383@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42737

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020514172654.11738.00011142@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >Took me over 6 months of intense effort. DOH! 8^)
> >
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> You must have a Mental problem

Bruice has the mental problem.

3519. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 03:32:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42738

Brian P Burke wrote:

> CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to emulate > a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.

CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would appear
that modems emulate humans.

Dave K8MN

3520. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 03:53:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <UYkE8.1829$Ec.162914@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42739

Dick,

Could you give us an example of "Digital Done wrong"?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3521. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 04:10:36 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CE1DFBC.3853E0A7@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42741

I've heard that feeding a TNC (which is roughly equivalent
to a phone modem) to the audio input of an FM transmitter
is not the best way to transmit data over a radio channel.
It was done that way because everyone had FM transceivers
and were using modem chips to design and build TNCs with.
It was expedient but somewhat inefficient.

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> Dick,
>
> Could you give us an example of "Digital Done wrong"?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

3522. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 04:10:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <kdlE8.23940$Vm2.834772@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42740

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:UYkE8.1829$Ec.162914@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> Dick,
>
> Could you give us an example of "Digital Done wrong"?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

If you gots a compooter handy doing all the work and don't use it to lend some intelligent flexibility to the system but merely use it as a big scoreboard that is a vast effort and expense toward a less than half-vast improvement. If you sit up nites dreaming up a coding structure that does not contain some major clues to its tuning and decoding you have no improvement whatsoever. If you have the clues and don't use them, the designer is a nincompoop.

You want to see the ultimate in raw stupidity, sit with your tuning knob trying to get the boops and beeps right and then have to tell the software it is SITOR not Baudot/Murray so you can watch it on a screen. Or only slightly less inane, tune to the display until it likes you.

That is bad digital.

3523. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 04:13:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CE1E06F.2D969195@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42742

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
>
> Where I came from a Tech is a General without extra code.
>

You must have gotten your tech before '87. Then they reduced
the written a little and later dropped the code.

3524. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 04:20:57 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <6A3982AD856137E2.7C70D20E67F35A23.B5230485A0BE0038@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42743

On Tue, 14 May 2002 18:00:10 -0400, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>This didn't happen with the loss of 220-222MHz.

Maybe it did, but nobody noticed all five of the hams who used it
trying to QRM the new owners.

2m wouldn't slip away mostly unnoticed the way 220 did/will. It's way
too popular in too many areas.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3525. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 05:24:56 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu34s4d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42813

If I was recieving this at my personal email, by all means I would be extremely concerned but this is a public forum for lack of better terms. I guess you must be the type that complains about every single ad in the newspaper, magazine or television, as well as any ad posted on any real life bulletin board too.....

Again, if your ISP or PC is so bad that the little few K that it takes up bothers you that much, get a better PC or ISP.

GROW UP!

> >
> >God I hate netcops!
>
> Then feel free to get all the SPAM you deserve.

3526. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 05:26:41 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu34t5d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42807

Yep.... Serves me adequately for my needs and purposes for now. See absolutely no reason, either by my own personal operation or others comments that would create the need for me to change. Definitely not EVER going to use Netscape crap.

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205140029300.4972-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Mon, 13 May 2002, KC8PMX wrote:
> >Ever heard of Block Senders function of MS Outlook Express?
>
> Ever heard of using a newsgroup reader OTHER than some Micro$oft crap?
>
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205122207570.4133-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> >> On Sat, 11 May 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
> >> >"D. Stussy" wrote:
> >> >> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
> >> >> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the
> >Dayton
> >> >> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be able
> >to post
> >> >> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
> >> >>
> >> >> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to SPAM
> >anyway.
> >> >>
> >> >> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
> >> >> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue and
> >is
> >> >> therefore inappropriate to .policy.
> >> >
> >> >I disagree. Newsline articles sometimes deal with policy or licensing
> >> >issues. Thus it is NOT spam.
> >>
> >> 1) They don't on a REGULAR basis - yet every edition gets posted here.
> >> 2) The purpose of the post is an EXACT match to the purpose of the
> >> "rec.radio.info" newsgroup. As there exists a more appropriate newsgroup,
> >it's
> >> inappropriate here.
>

3527. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 05:27:24 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu34u6d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42814

So does mine, I am not concerned about every single "possible" newgroup out there. I have all of the ones I choose to utilize.

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205140027320.4972-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Mon, 13 May 2002, KC8PMX wrote:
> >Some ISP's do not have rec.radio.info on their newsgroups servers also.....
>
> Then have their users will ask for them to add it. My ISP listens to
> customers' requests and usually adds within 24 hours. If their's won't, they
> got what they paid for - either minimal or [non-minimal] crappy service.
>
> > 2) The purpose of the post is an EXACT match to the purpose of the
> >> "rec.radio.info" newsgroup. As there exists a more appropriate newsgroup,
> >it's
> >> inappropriate here.
> >>
> >
> >
> >
>

3528. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 09:33:51 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu34v7d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42810

Not defending the NCTA, but gee, but a group that also wants things a certain way, following a certain belief as long as it matches theirs, and to do certain things a certain way, in other words imposing a certain morality or choice of decisions sounds like the Republican party.... (reference Germany in early 40's) ("Do like I preach, not like I do" or "It's my way or the highway" mentality)

I am neither aligned with the Republican or Democat party or what is referred to as left and right winged as far as I am concerned. Thinking that there is only two possibilities is closed and small mindedness. The political spectrum, as far as I am concerned is more like the spokes from a wheel as opposed to linear thinking.

Ryan

The NCTA, like
> most liberals, don't seem to be interested in a fair and two-way
> exchange of ideas. It's their way or the highway. I'm just giving as
> I have received.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

3529. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 09:46:14 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu3508d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42808

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020514072735.06141.00000646@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <abogqm22t74@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Those are the frequency bands where I have heard the most abusive,
profane
> >and just plain inconsiderate operation ever, that I have listened to on
the
> >shortwave reciever.
>
> A simple, direct answer to a simple, direct question. Thanks Ryan.
>
> What mode(s) were the abusive, profane and just plain inconsiderate
operators
> using?
>

HF phone

> > Really makes me want to "cash in" my CSCE's and jump
> >right on HF eh?
>
> Exactly.
>

My enthusiasm for HF is not what it what it used to be. Me thinks I will stay a SWL'er like I originally was, for a while as far as that part of the spectrum is concerned. I can only speak for my local area, but I have never heard yet a full blown arguement, or profanity other than the occaisional use of the word "hell" (heard on 4 times in almost 2 years) and that was during a stressfull situation a person saw occur directly in front of them. (We all slip once in a while, no matter how perfect or prudent we think we are. Only one person that is that close to perfect and he's got a severe aversion to high places combined with nails!) Anything that I have heard that would be construed even in the most vague sense of an argument were of the debate format. One night there was me, and 3 others who wound up holding a debate on a particular subject, with four of us with clearly different opinions on the matter, and we all acted and operated in a way that would impress anyone. As far as that goes, whether or not we agreed with one another, we got along, and that is most important thing. And I also believe we all learned a few things from the debate. For the record, this was for over 3 hours the four of us held this debate in the "roundtable" format on a simplex 2 meter freq.

There was another post with the past few days that sums up my feelings about operation..... get to know locally, and slowly but in a postive manner move outward. That also applies for my knowledge of ham radio. I met the requirements set forth at the time, and will never stop learning. That is the beauty of ham radio; there is so much damned stuff to learn, that you could never learn EVERYTHING in one lifetime.

Ryan
KC8PMX

3530. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 09:53:14 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu3519d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42812

> Hmm, there are wacko broadcasters on the hf bands, both in our country,
> and around the world. some are sworn enemies of the U.S. If we apply
> your logic, will you throw away your shortwave?

Good point, but at this point, I know exactly where to look for the broadcasters I *want* to hear.

>
> You will find problems anywhere you go. No use letting the bad guys
> dictate your actions. There are plenty of fine gentlemen and ladies on
> HF also. They're the ones you want to comm with. If you are a gentleman,
> your addition will help.
>

Yeah, that is true also. I just seem to find much more professional operation about the 50mhz mark. Granted, as stated in another post fairly close to when this exact message is posted, I am making my observations from what I am experiences here locally. I cannot speak for people in your general locale.

As a firefighter, I *must* be a gentleman. I am sure there are some people that I would wish to chat with... It is just a combination of things, along with what was discussed in this immediate thread, that has kind of left a bad taste in my mouth, as a figure of speech.....
Guess I am gonna have to find some form of proverbial mouthwash to get rid of that, to entice myself to get on HF. I better do something soon before the CSCE's expire. (Cash them in or lose them)

Ryan

3531. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 09:57:19 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu3520d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42806

Cecil.... I must say that is absolutely shocking. What reVOLTing behavior!!!!!! I bet you definitely got a charge from it though. Did you scream "Ohm my god?" (or some other expletitive)

Did your friendship suffer any Resistance after that? Watt was this persons reason for doing this?

Ryan KC8PMX

(yeah, I got a sense of humor.... never said it was a good one though! :)

>
> > If I were you, I'd have had "Shorty" arrested for attempted murder.
>
> I'm not that easy to murder, Larry. 220vac might have done it.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

3532. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 10:10:23 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu3531d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42805

I believe from what some hams have referred to as cycles hams go through. Repeater usage, and even club/event participation is related to the sunspot cyles in some form or another.

Our repeaters around here have about a 30 minute per day usage. Took recording survays, and that is the average for most all of the repeaters within my local areas. That includes any nets, repeater time statements, and repeater I.D.'s. There have been a few rare instances outside of that, but for the most part 30 minutes total usage per day. Did this with a VOX recording program with all of the repeaters 4-5 times each, for a 24hr. period. Just wanted to prove to someone here locally that wanted to say the repeaters ar e over utilized.

In this activity I discovered it is a wonderful tool, the recording program that is. I am now recording the public service nets, and SKYWARN nets for post-critique and also for people who may have to skip the nets due to other obligations. Saving this as a medium quality MP3 makes it a nice, small file.

Ryan KC8PMX

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message news:abpllp$p93$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> Glad to hear that Mike....around here they are basically dead. Nothing like
> it used to be a few years back.
>

3533. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 10:15:55 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu3542d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42811

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020514062420.20508.00006614@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@mindspringnospam.com
>
> >Glad to hear that Mike....around here they are basically dead. Nothing
like
> >it used to be a few years back.
>
> In looking at the two differing opinions about the viability of 2 meters
in
> each area, there may be some correlation between the enthusiasm of the old
> timers involved and the amount of local activity.

If these "old timer's" beleive in what they say, and in their "knowledge", should they not be sharing that "wealth of knowledge" with the "new-timers" on the evil no-coder allocations?? Seems to me that is the best way for them to dictate and change what they seem to be bitching about the most..... through education/elmering.

Granted there is going to be some that will never be reached, but there is a good percentage that could learn from the seasoned op's if they actually bother to consider the VHF/UHF frequency allocations as "real ham bands."

Ryan KC8PMX

3534. An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 10:28:13 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <abu3553d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42809

I was discussing this recently with a ham....

Should Field Day be rescheduled for a weekend closer to the times that schools and colleges are still having classes? Something like the first weekend of June instead?

I ask this because this would be a great chance to maybe get some more youth in the hobby, since it is easier to reach a large body of people when they are actually there. From a promotional standpoint, advertising F.D. in the schools, might be the impetus (sp.?) to get something for the youth to work on over the summer.

(I know that some people don't want anything to EVER change, but wonder if this has any merit?)
(Ed, as our "unofficial" ARRL representative, watch this thread. Unofficial meaning not necessarily sanctioned by the ARRL, more or less coincidental as a representative.)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

3535. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 11:17:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3trE8.1677$xl.81983889@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42744

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to emulate >
a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
>
> CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would appear
> that modems emulate humans.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem, humans
emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper tape.

Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.

73, Brian

3536. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 12:51:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020515085154.00524.00012406@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 42745

Bubba Brian kiss my ASS

3537. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 12:55:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020515085505.00524.00012408@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 42746

>Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
>electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
>
>73, Brian

Brian, would you prefer being known as a Dumb Ass all of your life? At least
thats the way you appear to be.

3538. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 14:12:05 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE26CB5.F45E0@psu.edu>
Source record: 42747

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Took me over 6 months of intense effort. DOH! 8^)
> >
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> You must have a Mental problem

Well, yeah..... But that isn't why it took so long. I have a hearing problem with major holes in my hearing and tinnitus. I think that for years I mentally tuned out most audio so that the tinnitus didn't drive me crazy. To learn CW, I had to kind of untrain myself to process things audio-wise. And yes, it took over 6 months of a couple hours each day.

Remember, just because it is easy for some doesn't mean it is easy for others. I had to work my kiester off to learn Morse. Glad I did it tho'.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3539. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 14:28:07 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE27077.4F7FBA20@psu.edu>
Source record: 42748

I dunno Brian. All the arguments aside, I got to get my license. I don't mind working hard for my hobbies.

I don't really have a problem with the CW requirements. At least they have some use. Let's try an excercise in getting rid of things we don't like or don't see a use for:

My own pet peeve is the stupid frequency allocations. Why test for that? At my station, I have a nice chart from the ARRL with the bandplans on it. Get rid of 'em!

I also don't have much use for the inane questions about how long before a space station transmission you have to notify the authorities. And how long after. I'm not likely to ever do that mode of operation. It is a mode specific thing. Get rid of it!

I'd rather see more questions involving calculations. My favorite part of the whole test. Set me down with a calculator or even a slide rule (am I the only person left who likes those things?) and a bunch of problems and I'm in hog heaven.

Now let's ask other people what they don't like or have any use for. We'll get a lot of different answers. So many that you will find that eventually you might as well scrap the test altogether because someone somewhere doesn't like any part of the whole testing scheme.

It was simple, I wanted to be a ham, so I did what was asked of me to become one. The tests were easy, the CW was not. Too bad for me there. But others had problems the other way around. That's life in the jungle.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3CE154CE.DDBD6A4E@psu.edu...

<a bunch of my stuff snipped>

> > Took me over 6 months of intense effort. DOH! 8^)
>
> It was a lot of effort with very little payoff.

3540. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 15:04:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CE278C0.101784F7@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42749

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to emulate >
> a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> >
> > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would appear
> > that modems emulate humans.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem, humans
> emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper tape.
>
> Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
>
> 73, Brian

Lessee now....before humans domesticated the horse, they emulated horses by walking around, but since they couldn't do it nearly as speedily, they just had to learn to lasso the beasts....

Before the wheel was invented, humans had to emulate one by rolling up in a little ball to travel smoothly.....only worked on downhill grades, tho..

Gosh I guess poor ol' humans were really emulating a gas engine, too. Had to get their 'go' from somewhere.

Before stoves were invented humans had to emulate them by rubbing sticks together to make something burn.

Before Tom Edison came along humans had to emulate a light bulb by using that burning to see at night.

I finally figured out Brian and Carl's problem. They just don't feel worth anything as humans. After all, all we ever did, or ever do, in their view, is emulate something technical that some other human invented. With that poor a feeling of selfworth, no wonder they can't actually DO anything.

3541. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 16:03:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abu122$9ti$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42750

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CE278C0.101784F7@townsqr.com...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to
emulate >
> > a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> > >
> > > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would
appear
> > > that modems emulate humans.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem, humans
> > emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper tape.
> >
> > Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> > electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
> >
> > 73, Brian
>
> Lessee now....before humans domesticated the horse, they emulated horses
by
> walking around, but since they couldn't do it nearly as speedily, they
just had
> to learn to lasso the beasts....
>
> Before the wheel was invented, humans had to emulate one by rolling up in
a
> little ball to travel smoothly.....only worked on downhill grades, tho..
>
> Gosh I guess poor ol' humans were really emulating a gas engine, too. Had
to
> get their 'go' from somewhere.
>
> Before stoves were invented humans had to emulate them by rubbing sticks
> together to make something burn.
>
> Before Tom Edison came along humans had to emulate a light bulb by using

that
> burning to see at night.
>
> I finally figured out Brian and Carl's problem. They just don't feel
worth
> anything as humans. After all, all we ever did, or ever do, in their view,
is
> emulate something technical that some other human invented. With that poor
a
> feeling of selfworth, no wonder they can't actually DO anything.

The selfworth is there. The point is that as humans we have devised
ways to eliminate the mundane and routine activities by creating
the technology and the devices to do the same things humans
did in a faster, more efficient, and literally untiring manner. THAT is
where we derive the self worth.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3542. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 16:11:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abu1hd$tj9$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42801

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:6A3982AD856137E2.7C70D20E67F35A23.B5230485A0BE0038@lp.airnews.net...
> On Tue, 14 May 2002 18:00:10 -0400, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>
> >This didn't happen with the loss of 220-222MHz.
>
> Maybe it did, but nobody noticed all five of the hams who used it
> trying to QRM the new owners.
>
> 2m wouldn't slip away mostly unnoticed the way 220 did/will. It's way
> too popular in too many areas.

There is also probably a few hundred thousand rigs capable of 2m
operation that would be rendered useless if 2m went away.
Just how quickly those rigs would pass into the hands of the
illegal ops folks is anyone's guess, but I'd bet the equipment would
quickly migrate into their hands. Such a situtation would create
another illegal CB like band of 2m if hams were "kicked off" by
the FCC.

Just my thoughts.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3543. What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 16:29:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abu2jrcer1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42802

Mike, et al;

Good post...
I have opened a new subject line to continue this discussion:

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CE27077.4F7FBA20@psu.edu...
> I dunno Brian. All the arguments aside, I got to get my license. I
> don't mind working hard for my hobbies.
>
> I don't really have a problem with the CW requirements. At least they
> have some use. Let's try an excercise in getting rid of things we don't
> like or don't see a use for:

We can disagree as to the merits of CW testing. I'd have NO
problem if CW was "tested" as a knowledge base related to the
mode itself rather than a skill test to determine if someone can "copy"
morse characters at a minimum speed.

> My own pet peeve is the stupid frequency allocations. Why test for
> that? At my station, I have a nice chart from the ARRL with the
> bandplans on it. Get rid of 'em!

I presume you mean get rid of the questions which ask you to
regurgitate band edges, etc. I agree for two reasons:
(1) The frequency chart should be a basic component of
everyone's ham shack and (2) the bands and subbands have
and will continue to change over time.

> I also don't have much use for the inane questions about how long
> before a space station transmission you have to notify the authorities.
> And how long after. I'm not likely to ever do that mode of operation. It
> is a mode specific thing. Get rid of it!

Agree 100%. The most useless memorization excersize I ever
engaged in.

> I'd rather see more questions involving calculations. My favorite part
> of the whole test. Set me down with a calculator or even a slide rule (
> am I the only person left who likes those things?) and a bunch of
> problems and I'm in hog heaven.

Agree 100%. Additionally, the ones that already exist need to be
"expanded" to include more variety of variables to minimize
memorization and emphasis knowing the formula and how to
use/calculate the answer.

> Now let's ask other people what they don't like or have any use for.

Add electrical and RF safety as a priority for Tech. Add emergency
communications concepts for all...different levels of knowledge
and expectations for the different licenses.

> We'll get a lot of different answers.

I sure hope so. At least this becomes a positive discussion
for a change.

> So many that you will find that
> eventually you might as well scrap the test altogether because someone
> somewhere doesn't like any part of the whole testing scheme.

I disagree. I think there will be significant concurrance.

> It was simple, I wanted to be a ham, so I did what was asked
> of me to become one.
> The tests were easy, the CW was not. Too bad for me there.
> But others had problems the other way around. That's life in the jungle.

True, and just as times and test requirements change elsewhere, the
same will apply for ham licensing. My dad HAD nno choice but to
learn and take a drivers test using a manual 3 speed column shift
automobile. Today you get the license without any need for
knowledge of manual shifting. Once licensed you are free to
still drive a manual gearshift auto.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3544. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 16:40:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <7cdab4120b6cb8732eb642165e96f3f1.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42803

Richard, seems no one actually addressed his query. I'd say starting from ground zero, a week, tops, would be necessary. It goes beyond the tech ticket. Look at a multiple guess question where you are given a 1000 ohm resistor and a capacitor (a value, in uf or nf or pf will be given) and a frequency. Now, this is to see if you can calculate the impedance, right? Look at the multiple guess answers:

a) 100 + j200
b) 100 - j200
c) 200 + j100
d) 200 - j100

Duh! Why reach for a calculator? Other questions are similarly difficult (would this be on the tech, general, or extra theory?).

I remember the multiple guess for the 1st phone. What is the colorburst frequency? All answers began with 3.579 .... one had to know the true answer. Likewise, the multiple guess format (which either is being or has been changed to a fill in the blank) for cw. Back when, you had to have one minute of errorless copy at 20 for the extra. I'm not complaining about the reduction in the cw format, I'm just pointing out how much easier the test is. Also bear in mind that most of us now have testing in the local area. When I decided to get back into radio, I only had to drive 4 miles. A lot different that driving 60 miles to Buffalo, NY, to the FCC.

Anything you pass, you keep credit for for a year (should one try for a higher class ticket and fail the code). It used to be 'fail and sail' for the CW test. You passed that first in order to take the theory tests. In any case, when I decided to get my ticket back I simply walked in and tested out - and waited for the ticket to arrive.

Best answer is go to the library and borrow the book on the technician class ticket to see what will be asked (assuming you are cheap), or, if you don't want to drive that far, Rat Shack sells manuals too. Of course, you can order from the ARRL as well if you don't mind waiting a week. It isn't brain surgery, for sure!

BTW Richard, I wanted to run a microwave link to a friend about 12 miles from here. Start reading the regs and - yep, easier under part 15! I know where I can get a free dish, but in a city lot, my co-worker can keep her 12 foot dish (which she is trying to give away!). Yes Dick, we don't have to go to Disney World - we are already living in fantasy land!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:1z6E8.22291$Vm2.722121@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net
> http://www.arrl.org for good pubs and poop
> http://www.qrz.com one of several good sources of sample exams
> http://ah0a.org for Morse Academy which is not needed for the Tech but is
> the next step in the process for all other classes.
>
> You will be amazed at how blessed easy Amateur licensing is. The Tech, at
> the risk of making a lot of people mad, is not now and never was designed
> to be the entry level, it was designed to allow a spouse to order bread
> and milk, take the kid hunting, and for all twelve real experimenters most
> of whom find Bluetooth is easier under Part 15. The code might take you
> three weeks if you work at it about an hour a day via Morse Academy or the
> ARRL CDs.
>
> Rattle my E-mail if you wish but you might be better advised being in
> PacTel territory to look up one of the local clubs on the ARRL site.
>
> Welcome to the Magical Mystery Tour.
>
> Dick Nï¿½BK

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3545. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 16:43:58 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <8831844f54aee49ea4574e231f48c916.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42804

BTW, I accidentally left off the correct answer to the impedence
question. e) none of the above. Senior moment. It should either be
a 100 ohm resistor or all of the 100s in the answers should read 1000.
Now, if a brain-dead like me can screw up like that, imagine how easy
the tests are!

73 from brain-dead
AA2QA

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:7cdab4120b6cb8732eb642165e96f3f1.80792@mygate.mailgate.org

> Richard, seems no one actually addressed his query. I'd say starting
> from ground zero, a week, tops, would be necessary. It goes beyond the
> tech ticket. Look at a multiple guess question where you are given a
> 1000 ohm resistor and a capacitor (a value, in uf or nf or pf will be
> given) and a frequency. Now, this is to see if you can calculate the
> impedance, right? Look at the multiple guess answers:
>
> a) 100 + j200
> b) 100 - j200
> c) 200 + j100
> d) 200 - j100
>
> Duh! Why reach for a calculator?

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3546. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 17:03:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abu541$529$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42815

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:7cdab4120b6cb8732eb642165e96f3f1.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Richard, seems no one actually addressed his query. I'd say starting
> from ground zero, a week, tops, would be necessary. It goes beyond the
> tech ticket. Look at a multiple guess question where you are given a
> 1000 ohm resistor and a capacitor (a value, in uf or nf or pf will be
> given) and a frequency. Now, this is to see if you can calculate the
> impedance, right? Look at the multiple guess answers:
>
> a) 1000 + j200
> b) 1000 - j200
> c) 200 + j1000
> d) 200 - j1000
>
> Duh! Why reach for a calculator? Other questions are similarly
> difficult (would this be on the tech, general, or extra theory?).

Similar questions exist using the resisteor and an inductor.

This was on the Extra as I recall. I agree, if you understand the
basic of impedance then all you needed to do was eliminate the
three that were impossibilities based on the resistive factor
being 1000 (no calculation needed) and then the correct answer
being either +j or -j for the appropriate component
given in the question itself.

I would suggest, however, that the "average" prospective
layman test taker without a techical training background
wouldn't necessarily make that instant recognition. Never-the-less
I'd rather see at least two or more answers that would require
calculation of the non-resistive component based on the
value of that component and the frequency. Using the
example Jim gave, the 4 answers should have been something
like:

a) 1000 + j200
b) 1000 - j200
c) 1000 + j300
d) 1000 - j300

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3547. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 17:16:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abu5amuun1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42816

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020514002110.16785.00002464@mb-fc.aol.com...
> .... You can disagree
> with me the whole day long, as long as you show the same respect
> for my opinion as you demand that I have for yours. The NCTA, like
> most liberals, don't seem to be interested in a fair and two-way
> exchange of ideas. It's their way or the highway.

Bzzzzt. Wrong!
The formal exchange of ideas has been completed.
The FCC has listend to both sides and made their decision regarding
TEST requirements. Larry and anyone else is free to discuss
their opinions regarding morse testing all they want.

The ability to learn, use, encourage use, preach
use is the same today as always. Nothing in the NCTA "agenda"
opposes the learning and use of morse code.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3548. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 17:35:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3CE29C42.96FFBF6B@townsqr.com>
Source record: 42817

One thing more, Gadfly. You seem oblivious to the fact that every time you open your yap you emulate a speech synthesizer. You know, one of those thingies that always answer the phone these days giving you all sorts of options. Such as

"To exit ham radio without the door hitting you in the ass on your way out, press one"!

3549. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 17:53:28 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <6b12ac6b2bedcc0e4e73136f4b5f42ec.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 42818

Bill, you offer a very reasonable accomodation. Your suggestion would make a lot of sense, and these type of offerings as multiple choices would likely be sufficient to prove the individual has a basic knowlege of the subject. I personally feel that basic knowlege of operating practice and safety should be sufficient to obtain an entry class license. The purpose would be to allow the individual some air time, gain experience, and ensure they are not too likely to hurt themselves nor others whilst enjoying the hobby. For more advanced tickets, more theory should be involved, but not college level theory. The hobby should be to allow people to experiment and have fun, not prove they are already a rocket scientist. Specific questions on specific modes may not make much more sense than testing cw. However, one should be aware of bandwidths occupied by various modes. Some understanding of why we don't allow 19k baud on 75 meters. Hopefully, as you suggest, we may get some good input on this subject. We shouldn't try and lock people out, yet we should ensure that new operators, whatever their class, have sufficient knowlege to ensure that they may persue the hobby without disrupting or endangering others.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:abu541$529$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net

> difficult (would this be on the tech, general, or extra theory?).
>
> Similar questions exist using the resisteor and an inductor.
>
> This was on the Extra as I recall. I agree, if you understand the
> basic of impedance then all you needed to do was eliminate the
> three that were impossibilities based on the resistive factor
> being 1000 (no calculation needed) and then the correct answer
> being either +j or -j for the appropriate component
> given in the question itself.
>
> I would suggest, however, that the "average" prospective
> layman test taker without a techical training background
> wouldn't necessarily make that instant recognition. Never-the-less
> I'd rather see at least two or more answers that would require
> calculation of the non-resistive component based on the
> value of that component and the frequency. Using the
> example Jim gave, the 4 answers should have been something
> like:
>

> a) 1000 + j200
> b) 1000 - j200
> c) 1000 + j300
> d) 1000 - j300
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3550. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 18:00:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205151000.3c8e7b36@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42819

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals
on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of May 14, 2002:

Novice - 38,344 (decrease of 10,985)
Tech - 240,510 (increase of 35,116)
Tech Plus - 79,744 (decrease of 49,116)
General - 139,023 (increase of 26,346)
Advanced - 85,556 (decrease of 14,226)
Extra - 100,733 (increase of 21,983)
Total - 683,910 (increase of 9,118)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3551. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 19:46:26 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE2BB13.41916FC4@psu.edu>
Source record: 42820

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> Mike, et al;
>
> Good post...
> I have opened a new subject line to continue this discussion:
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3CE27077.4F7FBA20@psu.edu...
> > I dunno Brian. All the arguments aside, I got to get my license. I
> > don't mind working hard for my hobbies.
> >
> > I don't really have a problem with the CW requirements. At least they
> > have some use. Let's try an excercise in getting rid of things we don't
> > like or don't see a use for:
>
> We can disagree as to the merits of CW testing. I'd have NO
> problem if CW was "tested" as a knowledge base related to the
> mode itself rather than a skill test to determine if someone can "copy"
> morse characters at a minimum speed.

> > My own pet peeve is the stupid frequency allocations. Why test for
> > that? At my station, I have a nice chart from the ARRL with the
> > bandplans on it. Get rid of 'em!
>
> I presume you mean get rid of the questions which ask you to
> regurgitate band edges, etc. I agree for two reasons:
> (1) The frequency chart should be a basic component of
> everyone's ham shack and (2) the bands and subbands have
> and will continue to change over time.

Yep, I didn't word that too precisely.

>
> > I also don't have much use for the inane questions about how long
> > before a space station transmission you have to notify the authorities.
> > And how long after. I'm not likely to ever do that mode of operation. It
> > is a mode specific thing. Get rid of it!
>
> Agree 100%. The most useless memorization excersize I ever
> engaged in.

> > I'd rather see more questions involving calculations. My favorite part
> > of the whole test. Set me down with a calculator or even a slide rule (
> > am I the only person left who likes those things?) and a bunch of

> > problems and I'm in hog heaven.
>
> Agree 100%. Additionally, the ones that already exist need to be
> "expanded" to include more variety of variables to minimize
> memorization and emphasis knowing the formula and how to
> use/calculate the answer.

Now we're getting somewhere. I haven't seen the new Extra exam, but hopefully this is the direction in which it is headed

> > Now let's ask other people what they don't like or have any use for.
>
> Add electrical and RF safety as a priority for Tech. Add emergency
> communications concepts for all...different levels of knowledge
> and expectations for the different licenses.

Sounds very good. Some hams I know think the rf safety part is overemphasised. I withheld judgement until the day I got my first rf shock 8^).

> > We'll get a lot of different answers.
>
> I sure hope so. At least this becomes a positive discussion
> for a change.

I'd like to put together an imaginary test with some of the suggestions.

Lets say......

Technician:

10 questions on operation procedure - ID'ing, etiquette, non-commercial operations, modes and the like - all relevent and important.

5 questions regarding emergency operations.

2 questions regarding public service.

5 questions on RF safety - similar to what is done now

5 questions on electronic components - to include two questions on simple RF circuitry like high/lowpass filters.

5 questions on RF terminology - VSWR FM, AM, etc not complicated stuff.

5 questions on Ohm's law - at least 3 involving calculations.

5 questions regarding antennas.

42 questions total. If anyone got excited, we could add 8 more, but I don't think it is necessary.

The questions should be of a practical nature, that which will help ease the prospective ham into the fold. It will be slightly more difficult than the present test. The prospective ham should expect to need a calculator, and a command of high school math as well as very

basic electronic formulae should be known.

Next post will have my ideas for the General test.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3552. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 19:57:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205151157.1c80866a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42821

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<c5jE8.991$D41.87393@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> The June Q-Street in the world above 50 MHz has a description of JT44
> which is designed for EME which epitomizes a decent approach to digital
> communication. It is among other things self-adjusting between -2 and +4
> seconds in clock diff (mildly useful on an EME path) and a 600 Hz
> frequency difference which is also damned useful for a method that copies
> below audibility.

And it's just one tool in the toolbox of that software.
>
> Gee whiz, somebody thought it thru and used the available intelligence for
> something intelligent.

Dig out QST for December, 2001 to see who that "somebody" is. One of
those old-time 20 wpm code-tested Extras.....

>Will miracles never cease.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3553. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 20:05:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE2BF7D.415B5C28@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42822

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to emulate >
> a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> >
> > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would appear
> > that modems emulate humans.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem, humans
> emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper tape.
>
> Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.

Sure there are, Brian. Morse has been sent and received by humans since
the inception of radio. I'll wager you've never even SEEN an
electro-writer.

Dave K8MN

3554. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 23:37:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CE2F15E.DB0EF86A@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42823

Is Hellschrieber a digital mode, Cecil?

- Mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > If you'd be so kind as to Google-up a quote where I make the claim that
> > CW is "digital," I'll gladly agree with you.
>
> Doesn't matter what you claim, Larry, OOK/Morse/CW *IS* digital.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3555. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 23:40:35 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205152337090.5926-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42824

On Tue, 14 May 2002, Lars121 wrote:
>I'm trying to find out what knowledge and skills an amateur radio operator
>needs to possesss in order to obtain a Tech class license. Anyone have any
>info or links? - Lars121

Pass a 35 question exam with 75% (26 questions) correctly answered - multiple choice: 1 of 4.

As for knowledge: The question pool (all possible questions which appear on the examination) is public.

As for skill: None, beyond being able to read and write. The Technician class license is the entry level class and therefore is designed for those who have no operational experience.

3556. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 23:43:45 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205152341080.5926-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42825

On Tue, 14 May 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
>You will be amazed at how blessed easy Amateur licensing is. The Tech, at
>the risk of making a lot of people mad, is not now and never was designed
>to be the entry level, it was designed to allow a spouse to order bread
>and milk, take the kid hunting, and for all twelve real experimenters most
>of whom find Bluetooth is easier under Part 15. The code might take you
>three weeks if you work at it about an hour a day via Morse Academy or the
>ARRL CDs.

Perhaps not designed as the entry level license, but in practice, it IS the
entry level license, most certainly now and since April 15, 2000, now that the
novice license is effectively gone (except for renewals).

3557. So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 23:44:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <aburtf$i9m$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42826

Posted by W4NTI/life member ARRL

SB QST @ ARL $ARLB029
ARLB029 Landmark bill could provide amateurs relief from restrictive covenants

ZCZC AG29
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 29 ARLB029
From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT May 14, 2002
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB029
ARLB029 Landmark bill could provide amateurs relief from restrictive covenants

A bill introduced in Congress May 14 could provide relief to amateurs prevented by private deed covenants, conditions and restrictions--CC&Rs--from installing outdoor antennas. Rep Steve Israel (D-NY) has introduced the ''Amateur Radio Emergency Communications Consistency Act.'' The measure is aimed at preventing private land-use rules from ''unreasonably interfering with'' the installation and use of ''appropriate antenna structures'' for amateurs. Rep Greg Walden, WB7OCE (R-OR)--the only Amateur Radio operator in Congress--and Rep Pete Sessions (R-TX) have signed on as original cosponsors.

The measure contains but one sentence: ''For purposes of the Federal Communications Commission's regulation relating to station antenna structures in the Amateur Radio Service (47 CFR 97.15), any private land use rules applicable to such structures shall be treated as a state or local regulation and shall be subject to the same requirements and limitations as a state or local regulation.''

The bill, which does not yet have a number, is expected to be assigned to the Telecommunications and Internet Subcommittee of the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

After the ARRL ran into a brick wall trying to convince the FCC to include CC&Rs under the limited federal preemption known as PRB-1, the League's Board of Directors agreed to pursue a congressional remedy. ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, and other League officials met with Israel, Walden, Sessions and others on Capitol Hill earlier this year to discuss the prospect of such a bill and how it should be worded. With the proposal now in the legislative hopper, Haynie

says the ''really hard work'' is up to the amateur community, League members or not.

''It becomes important for all of us to write your congressman, call your congressman and voice your support,'' Haynie said. ''This will have to be a grassroots effort, and we're going to pull out all the stops.''

Israel, whose father, Howard, is K2JCC, said in a statement read into the Congressional Record that his bill seeks to ensure the continued viability of a volunteer public service resource. ''My bill would provide Amateur Radio licensees with the ability to negotiate reasonable accommodation provisions with homeowners' associations,'' Israel said, ''just as they do now with governmental land-use regulators, to ensure that our nation is not left with areas devoid of the public safety services amateurs can provide.''

Visit the US House of Representatives ''Write Your Representative Service'' Web page http://www.house.gov/writerep/ for information on how to contact your representative.

ARRL requests those contacting members of Congress to copy ARRL on their correspondence--via e-mail to ccr-bill@arrl.org or via US Mail to CC&R Bill, ARRL, 225 Main St, Newington, CT 06111. Please include your name and address on all correspondence.
NNNN
/EX

3558. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 23:47:22 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205152344510.5926-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42827

On Tue, 14 May 2002, mike coslo wrote:
>> You will be amazed at how blessed easy Amateur licensing is. The Tech, at
>> the risk of making a lot of people mad, is not now and never was designed
>> to be the entry level, it was designed to allow a spouse to order bread
>> and milk, take the kid hunting, and for all twelve real experimenters most
>> of whom find Bluetooth is easier under Part 15.
>
> Where is the proof of this Richard? I know that is what a lot of people
>use it for, but I never saw it as that.

Read the FCC's report on why they created it back in 1951. THere's your proof.

3559. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 23:50:10 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205152349380.5926-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42828

On Wed, 15 May 2002, KC8PMX wrote:
>Yep.... Serves me adequately for my needs and purposes for now. See
>absolutely no reason, either by my own personal operation or others comments
>that would create the need for me to change. Definitely not EVER going to
>use Netscape crap.

That's your choice. However, you will find that I'm not using that either.

>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205140029300.4972-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Mon, 13 May 2002, KC8PMX wrote:
>> >Ever heard of Block Senders function of MS Outlook Express?
>>
>> Ever heard of using a newsgroup reader OTHER than some Micro$oft crap?
>>
>> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> >news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205122207570.4133-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> >> On Sat, 11 May 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
>> >> >"D. Stussy" wrote:
>> >> >> On 11 May 2002, Radionews wrote:
>> >> >> >NOTICE: Rick, Mike and I are taking the motor home driving to the
>> >Dayton
>> >> >> >Hamvention and wont be back home until Sunday night. I won't be
>>able
>> >to post
>> >> >> >the next ARNewsline until Monday May 20.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Good! To post this crap on "rec.radio.amateur.policy" amounts to
>>SPAM
>> >anyway.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> It may be acceptable to the other groups (i.e. "rec.radio.info" and
>> >> >> "rec.radio.amateur.misc") but it is NOT a policy or licensing issue
>>and
>> >is
>> >> >> therefore inappropriate to .policy.
>> >> >
>> >> >I disagree. Newsline articles sometimes deal with policy or licensing
>> >> >issues. Thus it is NOT spam.
>> >>
>> >> 1) They don't on a REGULAR basis - yet every edition gets posted here.
>> >> 2) The purpose of the post is an EXACT match to the purpose of the
>> >> "rec.radio.info" newsgroup. As there exists a more appropriate
>>newsgroup,
>> >it's

>> >> inappropriate here.
>>
>
>
>

3560. Re: ARNewsline 1291 - May 10 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-15 23:52:52 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205152351310.5926-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 42829

Right. And the "Newsline" spammers should utilize the newsgroup that their post is appropriate to, not the ones that is it not, and then maybe they won't be referred to as spammers anymore since they will be posting ON TOPIC and appropriately.

On Wed, 15 May 2002, KC8PMX wrote:
>So does mine, I am not concerned about every single "possible" newgroup out
>there. I have all of the ones I choose to utilize.
>
>
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205140027320.4972-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Mon, 13 May 2002, KC8PMX wrote:
>> >Some ISP's do not have rec.radio.info on their newsgroups servers
>also.....
>>
>> Then have their users will ask for them to add it. My ISP listens to
>> customers' requests and usually adds within 24 hours. If their's won't,
>they
>> got what they paid for - either minimal or [non-minimal] crappy service.
>>
>> > 2) The purpose of the post is an EXACT match to the purpose of the
>> >> "rec.radio.info" newsgroup. As there exists a more appropriate
>newsgroup,
>> >it's
>> >> inappropriate here.

3561. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 00:06:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020515200648.06141.00000707@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42831

In article <abu2jrcer1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>I have opened a new subject line to continue this discussion:

Excellent idea.
>
>"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3CE27077.4F7FBA20@psu.edu...
>> I dunno Brian. All the arguments aside, I got to get my license. I
>> don't mind working hard for my hobbies.
>>
>> I don't really have a problem with the CW requirements. At least they
>> have some use. Let's try an excercise in getting rid of things we don't
>> like or don't see a use for:
>
>We can disagree as to the merits of CW testing. I'd have NO
>problem if CW was "tested" as a knowledge base related to the
>mode itself rather than a skill test to determine if someone can "copy"
>morse characters at a minimum speed.

The problem with that approach, Bill, is this: The usefulness of Morse is
in the skill. Testing other things about Morse ("how many dits in H"?) is
like testing on shift patterns and clutch types rather than manual transmission
skill. ("Where is reverse on a 5 speed VW transmission?")
>
>> My own pet peeve is the stupid frequency allocations. Why test for
>> that? At my station, I have a nice chart from the ARRL with the
>> bandplans on it. Get rid of 'em!
>
>I presume you mean get rid of the questions which ask you to
>regurgitate band edges, etc. I agree for two reasons:
>(1) The frequency chart should be a basic component of
>everyone's ham shack and (2) the bands and subbands have
>and will continue to change over time.
>
>> I also don't have much use for the inane questions about how long
>> before a space station transmission you have to notify the authorities.
>> And how long after. I'm not likely to ever do that mode of operation. It
>> is a mode specific thing. Get rid of it!
>
>Agree 100%. The most useless memorization excersize I ever
>engaged in.

I agree with most of the above, too. However, the FCC tests these things for a reason. If they are not on the test, how can the FCC hold a ham responsible if he/she breaks the rules? It's my understanding that the FCC requires that the question pools contain questions on the regs - all the applicable regs - for just this reason. Perhaps K2ASP can speak to this aspect of testing.
>
>> I'd rather see more questions involving calculations. My favorite part
>> of the whole test. Set me down with a calculator or even a slide rule (
>> am I the only person left who likes those things?) and a bunch of
>> problems and I'm in hog heaven.

You're not the only one, Mike.

>Agree 100%. Additionally, the ones that already exist need to be
>"expanded" to include more variety of variables to minimize
>memorization and emphasis knowing the formula and how to
>use/calculate the answer.

Yup.

>> Now let's ask other people what they don't like or have any use for.
>
>Add electrical and RF safety as a priority for Tech. Add emergency
>communications concepts for all...different levels of knowledge
>and expectations for the different licenses.

I'd say the biggest problem is in how the tests are made up and graded. All questions have the same weight, and a new ham can be totally ignorant of certain things and still pass. I'd like to see the test in sections, so that you'd see a minimum of, say, 6 safety questions on the Tech, and you'd have to get, say, at least 4 of them right to pass.
>
>> We'll get a lot of different answers.
>
>I sure hope so. At least this becomes a positive discussion
>for a change.

We should also consider what privs the licenses convey. I think the current Tech is simply inadequate from a safety standpoint, considering that it allows full 1500W power on all VHF/UHF, even if a new ham gets all the RF exposure questions wrong.
>
>> So many that you will find that
>> eventually you might as well scrap the test altogether because someone
>> somewhere doesn't like any part of the whole testing scheme.
>
>I disagree. I think there will be significant concurrance.

Opinions will range from practically no testing to the equivalent of an EE. Somewhere in between is the "right" level.
>
>> It was simple, I wanted to be a ham, so I did what was asked
>> of me to become one.

>> The tests were easy, the CW was not. Too bad for me there.
>> But others had problems the other way around. That's life in the jungle.
>
>True, and just as times and test requirements change elsewhere, the
>same will apply for ham licensing.

Yup.

>My dad HAD nno choice but to
>learn and take a drivers test using a manual 3 speed column shift
>automobile. Today you get the license without any need for
>knowledge of manual shifting. Once licensed you are free to
>still drive a manual gearshift auto.

Exactly. But would you consider a test of gearshift patterns to be
an adequate substitute for a driving test?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3562. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 00:06:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020515200649.06141.00000708@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 42830

In article <abu3553d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Should Field Day be rescheduled for a weekend closer to the times that
>schools and colleges are still having classes? Something like the first
>weekend of June instead?

Back before WW2, FD was the first full weekend in June. It changed to the
fourth full weekend after the war.

>I ask this because this would be a great chance to maybe get some more youth
>in the hobby, since it is easier to reach a large body of people when they
>are actually there. From a promotional standpoint, advertising F.D. in the
>schools, might be the impetus (sp.?) to get something for the youth to work
>on over the summer.

Excellent point!
>
>(I know that some people don't want anything to EVER change, but wonder if
>this has any merit?)

I think it has some merit. One of the goals of FD is publicity for the ARS.

The main problem I see is that it would put FD in direct competition with
end-of-school-year activities like exams, graduations, proms, etc. The kids we
are trying to reach may be doing other things that weekend. This may be why it
was moved from early June to late June.

>(Ed, as our "unofficial" ARRL representative, watch this thread. Unofficial
>meaning not necessarily sanctioned by the ARRL, more or less coincidental as
>a representative.)

Although FD has been "the fourth full weekend in June" for more than half a
century, most of the hams I know think it's "the last full weekend in June",
despite educational efforts by folks like me. In most years the two definitions
are one and the same, but once in a while (like this year) there are five full
weekends in June.
End result is confusion and some no-shows. Maybe it should be the last weekend
in June, or the first.
--

Historic note:

For the first few years (1933-35?) there were actually two FDs per year - one
in early June and another in late August. The late August one was not nearly so
popular as the June outing, as was discontinued.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Grand Poobah, "Jug Southgate's Bunch"

3563. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 00:34:04 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <08DE8.1037$HE2.101487@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42832

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message
news:aburtf$i9m$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> Posted by W4NTI/life member ARRL

> SB QST @ ARL $ARLB029
> ARLB029 Landmark bill could provide amateurs relief from restrictive
> covenants

Dan, I know it will not come as a surprise to you, but there are some folks who would bitch if you hanged them with a new rope.

In a not-so-long-ago thread here on rrap, there were folks (licensed Amateur Radio operators) adamantly opposed to the ARRL attempt to gain relief from antenna-unfriendly CC&R's. W5TIT comes to mind, but there were others. I'm drafting a letter to my congress-critters urging them to get behind the passage of this bill.

(&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;) 73, de Hans, K0HB
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

3564. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 00:35:01 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <V8DE8.2622$D41.225923@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42833

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0205151157.1c80866a@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<c5jE8.991$D41.87393@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > The June Q-Street in the world above 50 MHz has a description of JT44
> > which is designed for EME which epitomizes a decent approach to
digital
> > communication. It is among other things self-adjusting between -2 and
+4
> > seconds in clock diff (mildly useful on an EME path) and a 600 Hz
> > frequency difference which is also damned useful for a method that
copies
> > below audibility.
>
> And it's just one tool in the toolbox of that software.
> >
> > Gee whiz, somebody thought it thru and used the available intelligence
for
> > something intelligent.
>
> Dig out QST for December, 2001 to see who that "somebody" is. One of
> those old-time 20 wpm code-tested Extras.....
>
> >Will miracles never cease.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Yes, and the brains behind the only functional internet via cellphone caper is another OT in Japan. He will freely admit that he barely groks the technology but set out to get content and better yet revenue out of it as part of the plan.

It's nice when a plan comes together.

3565. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 00:37:22 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <6bDE8.2626$D41.226269@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42834

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205152341080.5926-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Tue, 14 May 2002, Richard McCollum wrote:
> >You will be amazed at how blessed easy Amateur licensing is. The Tech,
at
> >the risk of making a lot of people mad, is not now and never was
designed
> >to be the entry level, it was designed to allow a spouse to order bread
> >and milk, take the kid hunting, and for all twelve real experimenters
most
> >of whom find Bluetooth is easier under Part 15. The code might take
you
> >three weeks if you work at it about an hour a day via Morse Academy or
the
> >ARRL CDs.
>
> Perhaps not designed as the entry level license, but in practice, it IS
the
> entry level license, most certainly now and since April 15, 2000, now
that the
> novice license is effectively gone (except for renewals).

That it is is undeniable. That to sell it as such is fraudulent is
equally undeniable. And a lot of the conflict is between those sold a
bridge and those who have the unpleasant duty to tell them they don't own
it.
>

3566. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 00:38:32 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ccDE8.2630$D41.226298@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42835

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205152344510.5926-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Tue, 14 May 2002, mike coslo wrote:
> >> You will be amazed at how blessed easy Amateur licensing is. The
Tech, at
> >> the risk of making a lot of people mad, is not now and never was
designed
> >> to be the entry level, it was designed to allow a spouse to order
bread
> >> and milk, take the kid hunting, and for all twelve real experimenters
most
> >> of whom find Bluetooth is easier under Part 15.
> >
> > Where is the proof of this Richard? I know that is what a lot of
people
> >use it for, but I never saw it as that.
>
> Read the FCC's report on why they created it back in 1951. THere's your
proof.

The Tech has gone thru a lot of convolutions since it was Element 3 and
5wpm.
>

3567. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 01:11:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abv1be$3nu$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42837

I'd also suggest a couple of questions on
RFI and what the implications/cure might be.

Bill K2UNK

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CE2BB13.41916FC4@psu.edu...
> I'd like to put together an imaginary test with some of the suggestions.
> Lets say..... Technician:
>
> 10 questions on operation procedure - ID'ing, etiquette, non-commercial
> operations, modes and the like - all relevent and important.
>
> 5 questions regarding emergency operations.
> 2 questions regarding public service.
> 5 questions on RF safety - similar to what is done now
> 5 questions on electronic components - to include two questions on
simple RF circuitry like high/lowpass filters.
> 5 questions on RF terminology - VSWR FM, AM, etc not complicated stuff.
> 5 questions on Ohm's law - at least 3 involving calculations.
> 5 questions regarding antennas.
>
> 42 questions total. If anyone got excited, we could add 8 more, but I
> don't think it is necessary.
>
> The questions should be of a practical nature, that which will help
> ease the prospective ham into the fold. It will be slightly more
> difficult than the present test. The prospective ham should expect to
> need a calculator, and a command of high school math as well as very
> basic electronic formulae should be known.>
> Next post will have my ideas for the General test.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

3568. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 01:14:12 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020515211412.12027.00008808@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 42836

>I was discussing this recently with a ham....
>
>Should Field Day be rescheduled for a weekend closer to the times that
>schools and colleges are still having classes? Something like the first
>weekend of June instead?

How about having "field month" on the four weekends in June. This shouldn't be much of a problem since most clubs make their own plans. I don't see any logistical problems with that. Attending more than one field day would allow for greater exposure to Amateur Radio activities.

Also, multiple days would increase the number of attendees. Next field day will be my first Field Day and I would almost miss it because a relative scheduled a family event in June. Luckilly, the event was on another weekend.

3569. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 01:22:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <abv1r4$3el$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42838

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020515200648.06141.00000707@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <abu2jrcer1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >My dad HAD no choice but to
> >learn and take a drivers test using a manual 3 speed column shift
> >automobile. Today you get the license without any need for
> >knowledge of manual shifting. Once licensed you are free to
> >still drive a manual gearshift auto.
>
> Exactly. But would you consider a test of gearshift patterns to be
> an adequate substitute for a driving test?

Let's not get caught up in this too much. IF you must test
for a skill, then clearly you must have a skill test. But, the states
don't care IF you blow out your clutch or gearbox at
all, so they don't mandate manual shift testing as a skill test to drive at
all.

Back to what we think should be tested.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3570. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 01:55:41 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <xkEE8.1316$HE2.117110@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42839

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> The selfworth is there. The point is that as humans we have devised
> ways to eliminate the mundane and routine activities by creating
> the technology and the devices to do the same things humans
> did in a faster, more efficient, and literally untiring manner. THAT is
> where we derive the self worth.
>

You derive self worth from the application of technology? That is scarily funny on one hand, and eerily sad on another, like some unfortunate empty character from the mind of Kurt Vonnegut or James Barrie. I derive self worth from love given and received; from the values and social contributions that I've instilled in my offspring; from the sense of community and ethics with which I serve my employees and employer. There is no self-worth attached to my choice between using existing Amateur Radio operating modes or fiddling around with a new one.

(&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;) 73, de Hans, K0HB
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

3571. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 02:06:38 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CE3142E.9000109@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 42840

Brian P Burke wrote:

> Larry, you're simply a liar. You judge Blacks on Busses, Welfare Mothers of
> Color with their hands out, Knuckle Dragging 4-Landers with Southern
> Accents, and No-Code Technicians. All people you don't even know. And
> its -your- way or the highway.
>
> Get over it.
>
> Brian

Brian, this slamming of fellow Hams: YOU need to get over it.

de KR4AJ

3572. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 02:38:34 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020515223834.24893.00000246@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 42841

From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>I personally feel that basic knowlege of operating
>practice and safety should be sufficient to obtain an entry class
>license. The purpose would be to allow the individual some air time,
>gain experience, and ensure they are not too likely to hurt themselves
>nor others whilst enjoying the hobby.

This would seem reaonable, but lets see another argument.

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Let's not get caught up in this too much. IF you must test
>for a skill, then clearly you must have a skill test. But, the states
>don't care IF you blow out your clutch or gearbox at
>all, so they don't mandate manual shift testing as a skill test to drive at
>all.

Therefore we should have no testing at all. You should just have to attend 3 days of classes and they should hand you a Technician, General, then Extra class licence. Right now, we have a question pool. Many people passed the Technician test after a 1 day "licence in a day" class. Did they remember the material the next day? Most likely not.

Question pools do not prove you understand the material. Since, we do not know for SURE that anyone knows the material and no harm has been done by this, we should not require anyone to pass the tests to get the various licence classes. They should just hand it to you after attending 3 days of classes.

The Morse code test uses actual code tapes which you must copy, so in order to pass the Morse code element, you have to understand Morse code to some extent. Not everyone needs to know Morse code - only those that want to get a licence above Technician.

Therefore,
(1) No knowledge of electronics is required for a Ham licence.
A question pool test does not test this for sure, so this is unnecessary.
(2) No knowledge of operating procedures is required for a Ham licence.
A question pool test does not test this for sure, so this is unnecessary.
(3)Some people, but not everyone needs to know Morse code.
The Morse test requires you to understand Morse code, so this is neccessary for a licence class above Technician. Therefore, keep the Morse test, unless it can be proven that its removal would cause no harm. At any rate, Morse code is not needed for everyone, only those people that want to get a licence above the Technician class.

3573. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 02:48:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <b6FE8.1467$HE2.127389@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42842

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote

>
> You want to see the ultimate in raw stupidity, sit with your tuning knob
> trying to get the boops and beeps right and then have to tell the software
> it is SITOR not Baudot/Murray so you can watch it on a screen. Or only
> slightly less inane, tune to the display until it likes you.
>
> That is bad digital.
>

Not to cast asparagus on Joe Taylor (who has a Nobel prize in Physics which makes him much brighter than me!), but his JT44 is the ultimate in extreme specialization, designed to solve one single problem -- weak signals.

This extreme focus places some significant limitations on the practical use of his mode.

It requires the computers at all stations involved to have their clocks set within +/- 1 second of each other. It can only accept errors of -2 to +4 seconds to this standard. I don't know of any other digital mode which even CARES what time, date, or year my computer clock is set at!

It is hardwired to accept only messages of precisely 22 characters, and all transmissions are exactly 25.1 seconds long, without variation, with 4.9 seconds of mandatory "turn-around time", adding up to a nice even half-minute to send 22 characters at which time you are obliged to be silent for a full half minute, even if the response from your correspondent is simply "R" (and 21 null characters of padding). In other words, it is slooooooooooowwwwwww -- max throughput under perfect conditions is 22 characters in each direction (44 characters total) -- 9WPM under perfect conditions.

It has horrendous overhead -- under perfect reception in the 135 time-intervals it takes to send a message, only 16.3% of the time is used to send the message, the remaining time intervals are devoted to synchronization and repetition. In other words, 83.7% of the transmission time is overhead. There is no provision to trim back the overhead and increase the payload under good conditions, a feature of even the dumbest digital protocols decades ago.

Now tell me again how "right" this digital is! It looks lovely for very slow communications under extreme weak signal conditions with very stringent requirements on computer clock synchronization. Beyond that narrow focus, even a couple of 10WPM Morse operators would move more traffic.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

3574. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 02:59:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <XfFE8.1494$HE2.129605@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42843

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote

> How about having "field month" on the four weekends in June. This
shouldn't be
> much of a problem since most clubs make their own plans. I don't see any
> logistical problems with that. Attending more than one field day would
allow
> for greater exposure to Amateur Radio activities.

Most clubs would pick one weekend out of the four (or five this year).

Now have you ever sat and tried to drum up contacts during the last couple of hours on Sunday, after the preceding operators have worked everything that rose above the noise floor on every band from DC to daylight.

Now, can you imagine how boring Field Day would be if there were only 25% (or 20%) of the clubs participating on a given weekend?

(&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;) 73, de Hans, K0HB
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

3575. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:03:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020515230324.29123.00002014@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42844

In article <8bfE8.5172$9N.147575004@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Prove you said above 500 mhz.

Brian:

Prove I didn't. (Hi, Cecil!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

3576. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:03:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020515230326.29123.00002015@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42849

In article <zljE8.5238$iY2.151375929@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >He did hand me the two bare ends of 110vac wires one day after I
>> >had gotten soaked by the rain. Shorty, if you're listening, I
>> >apologize for being such a pain in the neck. And you were
>> >instrumental in my choice of Electrical Engineering as a vocation.
>> >--
>> >cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>>
>> Cecil:
>>
>> If I were you, I'd have had "Shorty" arrested for attempted murder.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>You would? First you'd have to get a LEO to take you seriously.

Brian:

If I called the police and stated that a co-worker had just handed my rain-soaked self live wires carrying 110 VAC, are you suggesting that the officer receiving the complaint wouldn't take it seriously? How much do you wanna bet my attorney could get him/her to take my complaint seriously? Any law enforcement officer who didn't take a complaint of an attempted homicide seriously wouldn't be making a very wise career move, at the very least! Fortunately, all of the cops I've ever known would handle such a complaint much more intelligently than YOU obviously would!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3577. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:03:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020515230327.29123.00002016@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42850

> I don't really have a problem with the CW requirements. At least they
> have some use. Let's try an excercise in getting rid of things we don't
> like or don't see a use for:

We can disagree as to the merits of CW testing. I'd have NO
problem if CW was "tested" as a knowledge base related to the
mode itself rather than a skill test to determine if someone can "copy"
morse characters at a minimum speed.

Bill:

The effective use of the Morse/CW mode is nothing more and
nothing less than an operational communications skill. Moreover,
it is a skill which cannot be exploited by hams unless the operator
acquires a minimum level of proficiency. The way this skill has
been developed in the past is through a requirement to test for
this skill at progressively higher skill levels, and an incentive to
achieve these higher skill levels was increased privileges on
the HF amateur bands. This system worked well for years, and
resulted in an ARS which included a large number of licensees
who could effectively exploit the CW mode. Now that the incentive
is removed, the ability for hams to exploit the benefits and
advantages of the Morse/CW mode will eventually disappear.
Is this a good thing for the ARS?

SNIP

> Now let's ask other people what they don't like or have any use for.

Add electrical and RF safety as a priority for Tech. Add emergency
communications concepts for all...different levels of knowledge
and expectations for the different licenses.

I'd like to see some hands-on practical testing of basic ham skills.
Something like "Here's some pieces of coax, a PL-259, a female
BNC connector, a female N connector, and a female SMA
connector, a soldering iron, and all other necessary tools. Pick
any two connectors, and properly install them on the appropriate
piece of coax (different types given to match the application usually
associated with the respective connector)."

Next: "Here's a 2-meter HT with a fully-charged battery pack, the
VFO memories reset, and the manufacturer's instruction manual.
Program the memory channels for the following frequencies:

146.52 (simplex)

146.61 (-600 kHz offset)

147.180 (+600 kHz offset, CTCSS 156.7 hz. encode only)

145.21 (-600 kHz offset, CTCSS 77 hz, encode and decode)

147.540 (simplex)"

Next: "Draw a block diagram of a properly set up amateur HF
station showing the following:

An HF transceiver and power supply, microphone, and headset

A multi-mode Terminal Node Controller

A personal computer

A sound card to computer interface unit for software-based digital modes

An antenna

A station ground

A Morse code key or keyer/paddle combination"

I could go on and on, but you get the idea.

> We'll get a lot of different answers.

I sure hope so. At least this becomes a positive discussion
for a change.

> So many that you will find that
> eventually you might as well scrap the test altogether because someone
> somewhere doesn't like any part of the whole testing scheme.

I disagree. I think there will be significant concurrance.

With the exception of practical hands-on knowledge testing as
described above, I can't think of much that is currently on the
tests with which I disagree, except that I obviously would also
like to see the clock rolled back on the 13- and 20-WPM code
test requirements.

> It was simple, I wanted to be a ham, so I did what was asked
> of me to become one.
> The tests were easy, the CW was not. Too bad for me there.
> But others had problems the other way around. That's life in the jungle.

True, and just as times and test requirements change elsewhere, the
same will apply for ham licensing. My dad HAD nno choice but to
learn and take a drivers test using a manual 3 speed column shift
automobile. Today you get the license without any need for
knowledge of manual shifting. Once licensed you are free to
still drive a manual gearshift auto.

However, those who have never been required to take their driver's test using a manual gearbox automobile are much less likely to learn how to drive one, and as a result, the benefits and advantages of manual gearboxes (better fuel economy, lower air pollution as a result of smaller engines being required for a similar level of performance, lower maintenance costs compared to automatic transmissions, etc.) are lost forever. I am all for requiring new drivers to take a test in a manual gearbox car or light truck.

BTW I took my own driver's test when I was 16 years old, in my mother's 1966 Mercury station wagon that had an automatic transmission!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3578. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:03:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020515230328.29123.00002017@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42845

In article <3CE2BF7D.415B5C28@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>Sure there are, Brian. Morse has been sent and received by humans since
>the inception of radio. I'll wager you've never even SEEN an
>electro-writer.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Well, I won't be asking for a piece of *that* action! I do believe Brian
used to be a Weather specialist in the Air Force, and if so, considering
the time span of his career, I'm sure he's quite familiar with electro-
writers, indeed!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3579. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:03:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020515230328.29123.00002018@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42846

In article <AgfE8.5177$G%.147949779@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >True to form, your PCTA double standard kicked in. We
>> >expect nothing less from you.
>>
>> I surely hope not, Brian, since I *am* an admittedly card-carrying member
>> of the PCTA! At least I'll truthfully identify myself and my cause. And
>> let's face it -- it gives you NCTA's something to whine about, which is
>> what we PCTA's usually get from *you!*
>
>Well there you have it.

Brian:

Right -- there we have it. PCTA's are honest and up front, and the NCTA's whine. Thank you for this uncharacteristic admission of guilt.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3580. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:03:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020515230328.29123.00002019@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42901

In article <ELjE8.5255$oM3.152941898@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Larry, you're simply a liar. You judge Blacks on Busses, Welfare Mothers of
>Color with their hands out, Knuckle Dragging 4-Landers with Southern
>Accents, and No-Code Technicians. All people you don't even know. And
>its -your- way or the highway.
>
>Get over it.
>
>Brian

Brian:

You're right, I do judge them. I judge them because their behavior warrants a harsh judgment against them. I live in a world where there are readily definable absolutes, where the evidence which is readily at hand is not ignored in order to serve an agenda which states that all men were created with the right to equal outcomes. I don't live in your world of universally-applied gray areas, of benefits of the doubt given in absolutely every case and in perpetuity, and the politically-correct coddling of groups of people who were raised in a world of dependency and refuse to leave it, even though they way out is clearly available to them. So go ahead, whine away. It's what you do best, and what we expect of you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3581. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:03:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020515230329.29123.00002020@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42848

Ryan:

I was not aware that the United States Republican Party was in power
in Germany during the 1940's. I'm sure 6 million innocent Jews in
Europe would have wished that they were!

73 de Larry, K3LT

In article <abu34v7d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>
>Not defending the NCTA, but gee, but a group that also wants things a
>certain way, following a certain belief as long as it matches theirs, and to
>do certain things a certain way, in other words imposing a certain morality
>or choice of decisions sounds like the Republican party.... (reference
>Germany in early 40's) ("Do like I preach, not like I do" or "It's my way
>or the highway" mentality)
>
>I am neither aligned with the Republican or Democat party or what is
>referred to as left and right winged as far as I am concerned. Thinking
>that there is only two possibilities is closed and small mindedness. The
>political spectrum, as far as I am concerned is more like the spokes from a
>wheel as opposed to linear thinking.
>
>Ryan
>
> The NCTA, like
>> most liberals, don't seem to be interested in a fair and two-way
>> exchange of ideas. It's their way or the highway. I'm just giving as
>> I have received.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>

3582. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:03:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020515230330.29123.00002021@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 42847

In article <abu5amuun1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020514002110.16785.00002464@mb-fc.aol.com...
>> .... You can disagree
>> with me the whole day long, as long as you show the same respect
>> for my opinion as you demand that I have for yours. The NCTA, like
>> most liberals, don't seem to be interested in a fair and two-way
>> exchange of ideas. It's their way or the highway.
>
>Bzzzzt. Wrong!
>The formal exchange of ideas has been completed.
>The FCC has listend to both sides and made their decision regarding
>TEST requirements. Larry and anyone else is free to discuss
>their opinions regarding morse testing all they want.
>
>The ability to learn, use, encourage use, preach
>use is the same today as always. Nothing in the NCTA "agenda"
>opposes the learning and use of morse code.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Obviously you've never been shouted down at an ARRL Forum merely
for bringing up the subject of code testing requirements. Lucky you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3583. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:18:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE32500.C8DBC757@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42902

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I finally figured out Brian and Carl's problem. They just don't feel worth
> anything as humans. After all, all we ever did, or ever do, in their view, is
> emulate something technical that some other human invented. With that poor a
> feeling of selfworth, no wonder they can't actually DO anything.

Looks like you missed the point, Dick. Human progress is measured by how much
mundane stuff can be taken over by machines leaving humans with more leisure
time to do the things they enjoy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3584. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:22:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE325E3.62A45FEC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42903

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Such a situtation would create
> another illegal CB like band of 2m if hams were "kicked off" by
> the FCC.

But would necessarily be more localized than CB, at least at the
height of the sunspot cycle. The repeaters could be eliminated and
2m is not all that useful without repeaters. Most 2m simplex operation
is akin to a local phone call.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3585. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:27:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE3272D.9D03950A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42904

Mike Coslo wrote:
> Is Hellschrieber a digital mode, Cecil?

I don't know that much about it but I assume that the dots on the screen are ones and zeros which appear as a digital data stream.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3586. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:31:42 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <yKFE8.25312$Vm2.970841@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42905

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:b6FE8.1467$HE2.127389@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> >
> > You want to see the ultimate in raw stupidity, sit with your tuning
knob
> > trying to get the boops and beeps right and then have to tell the
software
> > it is SITOR not Baudot/Murray so you can watch it on a screen. Or
only
> > slightly less inane, tune to the display until it likes you.
> >
> > That is bad digital.
> >
>
> Not to cast asparagus on Joe Taylor (who has a Nobel prize in Physics
which
> makes him much brighter than me!), but his JT44 is the ultimate in
extreme
> specialization, designed to solve one single problem -- weak signals.
>
> This extreme focus places some significant limitations on the practical
use
> of his mode.
>
> It requires the computers at all stations involved to have their clocks
set
> within +/- 1 second of each other. It can only accept errors of -2 to
+4
> seconds to this standard. I don't know of any other digital mode which
even
> CARES what time, date, or year my computer clock is set at!
>
> It is hardwired to accept only messages of precisely 22 characters, and
all
> transmissions are exactly 25.1 seconds long, without variation, with 4.9
> seconds of mandatory "turn-around time", adding up to a nice even
> half-minute to send 22 characters at which time you are obliged to be
silent
> for a full half minute, even if the response from your correspondent is
> simply "R" (and 21 null characters of padding). In other words, it is

> slooooooooooowwwwwww -- max throughput under perfect conditions is 22
> characters in each direction (44 characters total) -- 9WPM under perfect
> conditions.
>
> It has horrendous overhead -- under perfect reception in the 135
> time-intervals it takes to send a message, only 16.3% of the time is
used to
> send the message, the remaining time intervals are devoted to
> synchronization and repetition. In other words, 83.7% of the
transmission
> time is overhead. There is no provision to trim back the overhead and
> increase the payload under good conditions, a feature of even the
dumbest
> digital protocols decades ago.
>
> Now tell me again how "right" this digital is! It looks lovely for very
> slow communications under extreme weak signal conditions with very
stringent
> requirements on computer clock synchronization. Beyond that narrow
focus,
> even a couple of 10WPM Morse operators would move more traffic.
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
> SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

Ain't no way I would consider it for HF or much of anything else except EME but for that purpose it is slicker than an eel in a bucket of castor oil. I am not so much enamoured of the outcome but of the approach, the management if you will. Clock setting is simple even if the Doctor is In sends people to a busted link and 43 channels at 10.766 Hz ain't exactly narrow.

BTW when I first heard of the Doctor is In column, I half expected Gene Scott to be in QST.

But the biggest thing to me is that it does adjust in the software for time and frequency which seems to me, other than thinking thru the problem as a whole, is what makes it an intelligent approach. If you gotta get the boops and beeps on freq, you are just using a relatively intelligent compooter as a big scoreboard.

3587. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 03:54:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE32D72.C060CF2E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42906

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I finally figured out Brian and Carl's problem. They just don't feel worth
> > anything as humans. After all, all we ever did, or ever do, in their view, is
> > emulate something technical that some other human invented. With that poor a
> > feeling of selfworth, no wonder they can't actually DO anything.
>
> Looks like you missed the point, Dick. Human progress is measured by how much
> mundane stuff can be taken over by machines leaving humans with more leisure
> time to do the things they enjoy.

That would be your interpretation of how human progress is measured.

Dave K8MN

3588. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 04:25:15 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <EE0B33050061EE50.AB2EFD3CB9F131A8.F0455A5BE6FB8FA7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42907

On 16 May 2002 00:06:48 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>The problem with that approach, Bill, is this: The usefulness of Morse is
>in the skill. Testing other things about Morse ("how many dits in H"?) is
>like testing on shift patterns and clutch types rather than manual transmission
>skill. ("Where is reverse on a 5 speed VW transmission?")

I've never driven a VW 5, but on their 4-speed ones, you'd better know
where reverse is before you get in :)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3589. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 05:12:22 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac0cp95tgm@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42919

I just though since the students typically get out of school in the first week of June, and it is about 3 weeks at least after, that there is definitely a chance that any promotional activity may get forgotten by then.... Just and idere.....

> Although FD has been "the fourth full weekend in June" for more than half a
> century, most of the hams I know think it's "the last full weekend in June",
> despite educational efforts by folks like me. In most years the two definitions
> are one and the same, but once in a while (like this year) there are five full
> weekends in June.
> End result is confusion and some no-shows. Maybe it should be the last weekend
> in June, or the first.
> --
>
> Historic note:
>
> For the first few years (1933-35?) there were actually two FDs per year - one
> in early June and another in late August. The late August one was not nearly so
> popular as the June outing, as was discontinued.
>

Now there is an idea! Or maybe the first or second week of school of the fall terms.... September is still fairly moderate in temperature and weather in general, even here in Michigan, and it would work great to tie this in with promotion of the ham radio classes that some clubs offer in the fall.

It has been stated many times, but we definitely need to promote amateur radio to people in the 30 'n" under categories.... You are the one that seems to post the information about license numbers. I wonder if age could some how be factored into those calculations. I can honestly guess that the overwhelming majority of hams are in the 50-70 year old age bracket, and over the next 20 years or so, we will lose alot of those hams to natural (and unnatural also) causes of death. This and the severe underpromotion of amateur radio will be the death of our hobby, not some silly arguements about testing.

I have talked with a couple of teenagers that just got licensed recently and they feel severly dis-illusioned. They say that there is no one to talk

to..... at least someone close to their age around here. Up until about 3 months ago, I WAS the youngest ham in our county, at 31 years old.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

3590. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 12:06:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020516080639.14079.00000020@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42909

In article <3CDFDE4A.3B5A7A3F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >> Dick, are you "for" or "against" digital experimentation by hams?
>> >
>> >Nope, that's much too obvious.
>>
>> It's a simple, direct question, Cecil. The fact that you and some others
>> get so upset by simple, direct questions with no tricks speaks
>> volumes.
>
>But the question does NOT address the argument.

Yes, it does.

>The real argument is:
>Was, "Well, there you have it", a positive or negative response to my
>suggestion that digital experimentation is a good thing?

No, it wasn't.

>That is the
>entire crux of the argument.

To you, but not to anyone else.

However, it doesn't matter. W0EX's answer, above, clearly shows that
"Well, there you have it" indicates agreement with digital experimentation
being a good thing. So, in that context, "Well, there you have it" is a
positive response.

>Do you want to settle the argument or
>mealy mouth your way out of it?

The arguments are settled, bot the real one and the one you made up.
W0EX thinks digital experimentation by hams is a good thing, and "Well,
there you have it" was a positive response in that context.

>Based on Dick's history of responses to my postings, I am 99 44/100
>percent sure that Dick responded negatively to my recommendation that
>hams do digital experimentation.

You are mistaken. Grow up a little bit and admit it, Cecil.

>> >It's a metaphor, Jim.
>>
>> It's an insult.
>
>Metaphores are insults?????

It's "metaphors" and that one was an insult.

>> >Don't you understand metaphors? It means that
>> >any public/governmental organization needs oversight other than the
>> >entrenched members of the service/society.
>>
>> It's just a steaming pile of [expletive deleted], like some of the other
>> stuff you post.
>
>Are you saying that public/governmental organizations don't need oversight?

Nope. I'm saying your statements are sometimes steaming piles of [expletive
deleted]. That's a metaphor for ya.
>
>> >> >More probable is allowing broad band digital signals
>> >> >in the phone bands.
>> >>
>> >> They are allowed there now - if they are voice or image.
>> >
>> >Data will someday be allowed in the phone bands.
>>
>> "Someday" could be 100 years from now.
>
>Could be next year.

Then K0HB's opinion will have made a difference.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3591. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 12:06:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020516080640.14079.00000022@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42908

In article <EE0B33050061EE50.AB2EFD3CB9F131A8.F0455A5BE6FB8FA7@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On 16 May 2002 00:06:48 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>The problem with that approach, Bill, is this: The usefulness of Morse is
>>in the skill. Testing other things about Morse ("how many dits in H"?) is
>>like testing on shift patterns and clutch types rather than manual
>transmission
>>skill. ("Where is reverse on a 5 speed VW transmission?")
>
>I've never driven a VW 5, but on their 4-speed ones, you'd better know
>where reverse is before you get in :)
>
Why? It's diagrammed right on top of the shift knob.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3592. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 12:06:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020516080640.14079.00000021@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 42910

In article <abv1r4$3el$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>IF you must test
>for a skill, then clearly you must have a skill test. But, the states
>don't care IF you blow out your clutch or gearbox at
>all, so they don't mandate manual shift testing as a skill test to drive at
>all.
>
My point is simply that if Morse is going to be tested, it needs to be tested
as a skill. You obviously agree on that point, so we can let it rest there.

>Back to what we think should be tested.

OK

I'd say there are really two points: what to test and how to test for it. For
example, safety seems to be a pretty common requirement to most folks,
and there are safety questions in the current exams. But the exams themselves
are given in such a way that someone can get all the safety questions wrong and
still pass. Not a good thing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3593. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 12:51:18 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE3AB46.A837D339@psu.edu>
Source record: 42911

Perhaps you derive your self worth from these social things, but not all do. People do not want to be around me for my sparkling personality, or my good looks. Although I'm no social recluse, and enjoy my contributions to society, my own self worth and self image are based upon my works. It means something to me that people can depend on me to get the job done.

- Mike KB3EIA -

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> You derive self worth from the application of technology? That is scarily
> funny on one hand, and eerily sad on another, like some unfortunate empty
> character from the mind of Kurt Vonnegut or James Barrie. I derive self
> worth from love given and received; from the values and social contributions
> that I've instilled in my offspring; from the sense of community and ethics
> with which I serve my employees and employer. There is no self-worth
> attached to my choice between using existing Amateur Radio operating modes
> or fiddling around with a new one.

3594. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 13:14:51 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE3B0CA.568EB8CC@psu.edu>
Source record: 42912

It uses OOK in a pattern similar to Morse to arrange black dots on
white to resemble letters. Early versions used tape, now a sound card
can send the results to your video card for display.

It isn't considered a digital mode, even though it uses OOK, because
all the interpretation is done from the images by the person reading the
results. They refer to it as a "fuzzy" mode.

But it is part of the reason that I do not look at CW Morse as a true
digital mode, and think of it as "fuzzy".

Admittedly, there are those who "officially" define it as a digital
mode. Personally I think this is to make it sound like OOK Morse is this
amazing thing that was so far ahead of it's time.

You have three states. State 1 would be a short burst, State 2 would be
a long burst, and state 3 would be nothing at all. The reciever must
infer exactly what states 1 and 2 are from the length of state 3. If any
of these three states are missing, the signal becomes meaningless,
either a series of long or short pulses, (of course, you can't tell if
they are long or short, because you have no reference) or they become
one single pulse. All the states carry critical information.

All of this probably has something to do with why computer programs
often have difficulty translating Morse CW. If it was truly a digital
signal, translation to text would be simple and precise. The only errors
would be on the part of the sender.

- Mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > Is Hellschrieber a digital mode, Cecil?
>
> I don't know that much about it but I assume that the dots on the screen are
> ones and zeros which appear as a digital data stream.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3595. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 13:24:55 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE3B327.B35B814@psu.edu>
Source record: 42913

It would be difficult to have a field month:

Setup and teardown can be pretty exhausting. Our club puts up a
portable tower, masts with a big dipole on it, and a number of other
antennas and stations. We start work as soon as allowed, and tear down
afterwards, which takes several more hours. We would have to drastically
curtail our setup (admittedly extensive) or only do one weekend of the 4.

My XYL simply wouldn't stand for losing me from Friday to Sunday
evening every weekend in June. She is happy with one weekend, so I don't
want to push it. 8^)

I suspect if we went to this sort of setup, it would actually harm
Field day, because of a dilution effect.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >I was discussing this recently with a ham....
> >
> >Should Field Day be rescheduled for a weekend closer to the times that
> >schools and colleges are still having classes? Something like the first
> >weekend of June instead?
>
> How about having "field month" on the four weekends in June. This shouldn't be
> much of a problem since most clubs make their own plans. I don't see any
> logistical problems with that. Attending more than one field day would allow
> for greater exposure to Amateur Radio activities.
>
> Also, multiple days would increase the number of attendees. Next field day will
> be my first Field Day and I would almost miss it because a relative scheduled a
> family event in June. Luckilly, the event was on another weekend.

3596. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 13:37:21 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE3B611.DEF419B5@psu.edu>
Source record: 42914

N2EY wrote:

> I agree with most of the above, too. However, the FCC tests these things for a
> reason. If they are not on the test, how can the FCC hold a ham responsible if
> he/she breaks the rules? It's my understanding that the FCC requires that the
> question pools contain questions on the regs - all the applicable regs - for
> just this reason. Perhaps K2ASP can speak to this aspect of testing.

Well, I understand the logic on their part, but if you don't get the particular question in the pool, then the pool and their logic don't work together.

> We should also consider what privs the licenses convey. I think the current
> Tech is simply inadequate from a safety standpoint, considering that it allows
> full 1500W power on all VHF/UHF, even if a new ham gets all the RF exposure
> questions wrong.

Yes, that is scary to me also. Even beyond the RF exposure, they should have some info on RF shocks. Until I got my first one, I thought "no big deal, at only 100 watts". Tis a big deal, and hurts.

Maybe a few more questions on RF safety would be very good.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3597. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 13:39:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE3B6AD.E95EB96A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42915

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Looks like you missed the point, Dick. Human progress is measured by how much
> > mundane stuff can be taken over by machines leaving humans with more leisure
> > time to do the things they enjoy.
>
> That would be your interpretation of how human progress is measured.

You're not one of those tree huggers like Al Gore, are you, who wants to
outlaw gasoline automobiles?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3598. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 13:41:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE3B6F6.9EED98A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42916

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
> I've never driven a VW 5, but on their 4-speed ones, you'd better know
> where reverse is before you get in :)

Why would you want to go in reverse before you get in? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3599. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 13:46:40 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE3B83F.DF50F9C1@psu.edu>
Source record: 42918

I presume you aren't serious! I'd hate to see a person who has no
knowledge of RF pumping out the full legal limit of RF power. Scary

Even for "shack on a belt types, they need to know things like "don't
presss the PTT button while the cat is playing with the rubber duckey antenna!"

- mike KB3EIA -

Vshah101 wrote:

> Therefore,
> (1) No knowledge of electronics is required for a Ham licence.
> A question pool test does not test this for sure, so this is unnecessary.
> (2) No knowledge of operating procedures is required for a Ham licence.
> A question pool test does not test this for sure, so this is unnecessary.
> (3)Some people, but not everyone needs to know Morse code.
> The Morse test requires you to understand Morse code, so this is neccessary for
> a licence class above Technician. Therefore, keep the Morse test, unless it can
> be proven that its removal would cause no harm. At any rate, Morse code is not
> needed for everyone, only those people that want to get a licence above the
> Technician class.

3600. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 13:48:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE3B8C6.87946B57@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42917

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >But the question does NOT address the argument.
>
> Yes, it does.

If you think that, you don't know what the argument is/was.

> >The real argument is:
> >Was, "Well, there you have it", a positive or negative response to my
> >suggestion that digital experimentation is a good thing?
>
> No, it wasn't.

Yes, it was. That's my entire argument. If that's not the argument, then
we have no argument.

> >That is the entire crux of the argument.
>
> To you, but not to anyone else.

Since that is my only argument why are you continuing to argue?

> However, it doesn't matter. W0EX's answer, above, clearly shows that
> "Well, there you have it" indicates agreement with digital experimentation
> being a good thing.

I'll believe it when you get Dick to say it. What you say about what Dick
said is just hearsay and not admissible. Why not let Dick speak for himself?

Dick, did your response (Well, there you have it) to my advocating of digital
experimentation really mean that you agree with me?

> W0EX thinks digital experimentation by hams is a good thing, and "Well,
> there you have it" was a positive response in that context.

That is not true and I'll bet you cannot get Dick to lie and say that's
true.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3601. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 14:04:29 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE3BC6D.431112A7@psu.edu>
Source record: 42921

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> I'd like to see some hands-on practical testing of basic ham skills.
> Something like "Here's some pieces of coax, a PL-259, a female
> BNC connector, a female N connector, and a female SMA
> connector, a soldering iron, and all other necessary tools. Pick
> any two connectors, and properly install them on the appropriate
> piece of coax (different types given to match the application usually
> associated with the respective connector)."

This one is interesting, and of course a problem. But let's see what we could do here.

The VE's could have a class in which they have the students get familiar with soldering equipment. have the person solder a few things together ala your suggestion. Give the applicant a batch of resistors, a multimeter, and after they read the color code and predict what values the resistors are, have them read the things with the multimeter. There can be other things like this. Simple stuff, keeping in mind that the techs are often at the bottom of the learning curve.

The applicant takes this portion of the testing at the class at which he or she attends. The VE/ instructor would verify that the applicant did okay on this portion of the testing. Now here is where I end up with a problem. In my case, I did all the studying and testing on my own, and took no classes. So I would have a problem here, unless the rules were arranged that I would have to take the class.

But it is still an intersting and needed part of the ham experience IMO.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3602. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 14:07:42 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE3BD2E.E5EA44B7@psu.edu>
Source record: 42922

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Looks like you missed the point, Dick. Human progress is measured by how much
> > > mundane stuff can be taken over by machines leaving humans with more leisure
> > > time to do the things they enjoy.
> >
> > That would be your interpretation of how human progress is measured.
>
> You're not one of those tree huggers like Al Gore, are you, who wants to
> outlaw gasoline automobiles?

Well, they are a bad idea you know! Automobiles should be metal and
rubber and stuff like that! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3603. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 14:12:29 UTC
From: Bill Hanrahan <hanrahan@kua.net>
Message-ID: <i8f7eus5429gorf9dg19bopshtri6c2tu5@4ax.com>
Source record: 42920

On Thu, 16 May 2002 00:34:04 GMT, "Kï¿½HB"
>In a not-so-long-ago thread here on rrap, there were folks (licensed Amateur
>Radio operators) adamantly opposed to the ARRL attempt to gain relief from
>antenna-unfriendly CC&R's. W5TIT comes to mind, but there were others. I'm
>drafting a letter to my congress-critters urging them to get behind the
>passage of this bill.
>
>(ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

Hans, I've only recently been reading rrap, so I'm not familiar with
the opposition to CC&R relief that you're referring to. I'm at a loss
as to what their reasoning in opposing CC&R relief could have been.

73, Bill, W1WH

3604. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 15:40:52 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8qQE8.3568$D41.316760@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42923

"Bill Hanrahan" <hanrahan@kua.net> wrote in message
news:i8f7eus5429gorf9dg19bopshtri6c2tu5@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 16 May 2002 00:34:04 GMT, "K�HB"
> >In a not-so-long-ago thread here on rrap, there were folks (licensed
Amateur
> >Radio operators) adamantly opposed to the ARRL attempt to gain relief
from
> >antenna-unfriendly CC&R's. W5TIT comes to mind, but there were others.
I'm
> >drafting a letter to my congress-critters urging them to get behind the
> >passage of this bill.
> >
> >(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
>
> Hans, I've only recently been reading rrap, so I'm not familiar with
> the opposition to CC&R relief that you're referring to. I'm at a loss
> as to what their reasoning in opposing CC&R relief could have been.
>
> 73, Bill, W1WH
>

Bill, with Kim there never was a lot of reasoning.

3605. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 16:40:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <15B9A7B3D079E71B.CE132E0D65318D12.E4060AC6BCD50889@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42924

On Thu, 16 May 2002 01:12:22 -0400, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:

>
>I just though since the students typically get out of school in the first
>week of June, and it is about 3 weeks at least after, that there is
>definitely a chance that any promotional activity may get forgotten by
>then.... Just and idere.....

It was an excellent thought--but the problem is, not all
schools are on the same schedule. Even in Michigan alone (you mention
being here as well) there are several different schedules. For
example, some colleges and Universities _do_ start classes the first
week of June--others (the one I teach at included) have already
started their Spring/Summer term--Winter ended the first week of May.
Still others (mostly those on a quarter system, versus a semester
system) won't start a new term until mid-June, or even later.

I _definitely_ agree with the concept of moving field day to a
different time. The concept of "fourth weekend/last weekend" _is_ one
that could confuse too many people. Setting it as the _last_ weekend
of a month (or the first, of course) would resolve that immediately
and, if June was still preferred, would do so with minimum
interruption to anyone's annual schedule.

>It has been stated many times, but we definitely need to promote amateur
>radio to people in the 30 'n" under categories.... You are the one that
>seems to post the information about license numbers. I wonder if age could
>some how be factored into those calculations. I can honestly guess that the
>overwhelming majority of hams are in the 50-70 year old age bracket, and
>over the next 20 years or so, we will lose alot of those hams to natural
>(and unnatural also) causes of death. This and the severe underpromotion of
>amateur radio will be the death of our hobby, not some silly arguements
>about testing.

I agree completely. While (obviously) some young people are
entering the ARS, the majority of them aren't attracted to it at all.
Without them, Ham radio is _not_ going to grow in the future.

>I have talked with a couple of teenagers that just got licensed recently and
>they feel severly dis-illusioned. They say that there is no one to talk
>to..... at least someone close to their age around here. Up until about 3
>months ago, I WAS the youngest ham in our county, at 31 years old.

That's one of the problems, but there are others as well.
Probably the most relevant among them is the use of the Internet. In

recent years, teens have taken to perceiving the net as a community (the same way many Hams view amateur radio, of course). They communicate using Internet web boards, IM, chat, video conferencing, and other similar real time or near real time tools. Admittedly, the same tools are available to Hams--although it's pretty hard to use fast scan TV (equivalent to video conferencing) to communicate with hams in other areas, due to bandwidth restraints. But many teens view the tools available to amateurs as actually much "cruder" than their own (i.e., a youth with a 768K cable modem or a high speed DSL line is unlikely to be impressed with HF packet or SSTV speeds), as well as much more expensive (try setting up an adequate HF station using new equipment as cheaply as anyone can set up a multimedia computer system), difficult to install and maintain (installing a computer today is as simple as taking it out of the box and plugging it in to the wall, the monitor, the speakers, and the telephone line or cable tv modem), and undependable. The fact that they are communicating by radio, versus hard wired connections, isn't terribly meaningful to most teens--particularly since they've grown up with cell phones which, essentially, do the same thing as a 2m rig and a repeater network, and do it both cheaply and w/o need for a license. Finally, youths see no reason to either study for an exam that only allows them to do the same thing they are doing on their computers already (from their perspective) or to censor themselves as to topic and (unfortunately today) language--both of which are necessary to good radio practice and neither of which is a major concern on the Internet. Tell a youth interested in a career in political science that he can talk to someone in, for example, China but must not become engaged in a discussion of the "benefits of capitalism over communism" or the "excesses of Mao and the Cultural Revolution" for example and, since he's been doing precisely that in Internet mailing lists and newsgroups for some time, he's likely to tell you you're nuts! The lack of regulation implicit in the Internet is a strong attraction for youths--even very intelligent, well spoken, and mature ones--since it allows them complete freedom of expression as well as the ability to experiment as much as they please with no concern for violating laws that are, in part, the result of International compromise.

We need to find new reasons for youths to be attracted to ham radio--and the way to do that is not to emphasize field day (which most non-hams have no interest in anyway) but to create opportunities for them to explore areas of radio they CAN'T explore on the Inet. For example, my son (18, a Junior in college, and an "Internet addict") could care less about talking on the radio--he's "worked" more countries in chat then I have on HF, and I'm a dx fan. On the other hand, when I showed him that it was possible to communicate with the Space Shuttle on the ham bands, to view sophisticated astronomical and meteorological images using fax modes, or carry a radio in a shirt pocket capable of talking world wide (in ideal conditions on 6m) even if you're miles from a power line or telephone connection, he showed more interest. Unfortunately, after listening to my communications on

the air, which (like most ham contacts) were far more oriented toward ham radio topics than toward topics of interest to a teen or young adult w/o a focus on radio, that interest was pretty hard to sustain.

We're still drawing a number of new hams from the ranks of our youths--but unlike the sixties and seventies (when the cb craze--back when it was still clean and communications were possible--was in full force) it isn't a "step up" for them to move to ham radio today--they can already do pretty much everything using other methods that we can do on the air. If we really want the numbers to increase, we need to focus on finding areas that will (1) appeal to large numbers of teens (electronics used to do so, but that interest has--for the most part--been replaced by an interest in computer science) and, (2) encourage experimentation in those areas to attract more experienced hams to interact with the newcomers--the surest way to encourage them to remain in the ARS instead of exploring it briefly and then going back to the Inet.

KE8HH, Rick

3606. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 16:59:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3B3E14B7BDB7D250.A050924D41C01AA6.D182CA432E4AFA5C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42925

On Thu, 16 May 2002 10:12:29 -0400, Bill Hanrahan <hanrahan@kua.net>
wrote:

>Hans, I've only recently been reading rrap, so I'm not familiar with
>the opposition to CC&R relief that you're referring to. I'm at a loss
>as to what their reasoning in opposing CC&R relief could have been.

Actually, it was based on a concept of contractual freedom.
Unlike laws and ordinances, CC&Rs are _voluntary_ limitations accepted
by the purchaser. You _can't_ "pass" a CC&R that is binding on anyone
after they have made their purchase--it can only be introduced prior
to sale. To many people, the concept of the government invalidating
those agreements is a clear threat to their right to enter into a
binding contract and is an infringement of the private sector.

While many have argued that in many areas it is impossible to
purchase a desirable home where no CC&Rs are in effect, the fact
remains that it IS possible to do so and even if it weren't that
wouldn't justify government intrusion. If, for example, no one chose
to open a fast serve restaurant in your community, it would certainly
not justify a government agency requiring full service restaurants to
open drive-thru windows and sell low cost food. While a home purchase
is far more important than the purchase of a Big Mac, the principle IS
the same. Why should the government have the right to limit the
restrictions YOU as seller place on a piece of property? If the buyer
isn't satisfied with them, he or she has every right to buy from
someone whose agreements are more compatible with their needs instead.

One argument never voiced here, btw, concerns non-hams. If a
person who is not a ham takes an interest in CB radio, for example, or
in shortwave radio, police scanners, or a similar area, he or she
would remain restrict by CC&R antenna limitations. To see his or her
neighbor granted an exception (by law) to those restrictions simply
because his/her interests are in ham radio instead of SWL is bound to
be angering to such an individual--and with good cause. As hams, we
may _claim_ that the ARS exists for emergency communications, and that
all hams are potential emergency communicators and thus should be
exempt from antenna restrictions. That claim, however, is hollow as
most of us know. There is a relatively small percentage of hams who
are sincerely interested in emergency communications (look at the
turn-out for disaster preparedness practices--it certainly doesn't
represent more than a small fraction of the licensed amateurs in any
given community) or in message handling--but for the most part hams
are hobbyists (claims to the contrary by a few members of this news
group not withstanding) who have no more (or less) interest in

emergency preparedness than anyone else in their community. Why should someone whose only interest is chasing dx or participating in contests receive special treatment by the government simply because his or her chosen medium is radio instead of the Internet?

Just a few thoughts as to what the "other side" may see as valid reasons to oppose the regulation.

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3607. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 17:00:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7BF75956AFE925D0.1C4AC945FC7A92D3.1B197F8B09AFE281@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42926

On Thu, 16 May 2002 15:40:52 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>Bill, with Kim there never was a lot of reasoning.

Isn't it a little tacky to keep knocking someone who isn't
present in the news group to defend herself?

KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3608. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 17:15:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <MORE8.2453$HE2.247579@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42927

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote

>
> Just a few thoughts as to what the "other side" may see as
> valid reasons to oppose the regulation.
>

In a democracy where majority rule exists, limits are
placed on the power of the majority. If the majority
would favor that certain individuals have their rights
subverted, then in the United States their rights are
defended by the US Constitution.

In the US today, the courts have decided that the
normal use of residential property includes amateur
radio antennas. Of course, deed restrictions can
limit what could ordinarily be considered normal use
of residential property. For instance, deed
restrictions on a tiny number of properties forbid the
consumption of alcohol on the property, with the
ownership of the property reverting to the seller if
alcohol is consumed on the property.

However, the trends in property development have
gone far beyond deed restrictions on a tiny number
of properties. The simple truth is that since about
1970 the number of new homes sold in the US by
developers that did not have blanket deed
restrictions placed on the property forbidding any
and all amateur radio antennas is approximately
ZERO. No new homes for amateur radio operators
whatsoever.

Is the reason for this because of majority rule? No.

Simply put, majority rule did not play any part in this.
In this case, competitive fervor made the decision.
The developers of homes and subdivisions
discovered that there was no limit that could be
placed on them that would prevent them from
adding restrictions to deeds.

Did the developers place these restrictions against
amateur radio antennas on these deeds because
they were interested in serving majority rule? No.

Did the developers consider the part played by
amateur radio in disasters and other times of stress
when these restrictions were created? No.

Did the developers consider the community
well-being when these restrictions were
created? No.

Did the developers limit their consideration to a
single issue -- the potential for increasing their
profits -- when these restrictions were created? Yes,
emphatically yes. Deed restrictions against amateur
radio antennas exist on virtually every home built
in the US for over 30 years for the simple reason
that the sellers of the properties believed that if
the early occupants of the developments erected
ham radio antennas that the sales of homes would
slow slightly, cutting into their profits.

Here's another view from a Florida ham. (KH2D/W4)

Well, how about this. Let's say we take away your drivers license
when you get to be sixty. Because "a group of land/homeowners"
in your neighborhood thinks you are too old and senile to drive.

Or how about if the Bored Of Directors in your neighborhood
decided that 15 mph was WAY to slow for a speed limit in your
subdivision, and change it to 95 ? Should they be allowed to do
that ?

Would you support that too ? I doubt it.

I don't think the CCR bill is about putting antennas where people
don't want antennas put. I think it's about people making 'rules'
they should not be allowed to make.

For example, the CCR's in my neighborhood say you are allowed to
have:

"....three dogs, two cats, two ducks." for pets.

So with your reasoning, I assume it's OK for a building contractor
(he wrote the rules, and he doesn't even live here) to decide that
none of the kids in the neighborhood are allowed to have hamsters,
turtles, frogs, or goldfish for pets ?

Guy next door to me has two kids. So when one of the kids gets
to be 8 years old and wants a hamster, should we tell him "Tuff.
Go buy another house someplace else if your kid wants a hamster" ?

I think if you do some checking, you'll find that the majority of CCR's
are not written by a "group of Home/Land-Owners, who for whatever
reason, have banded together". Around here, the builder writes and
files the CCR's with the local government before the houses are even
built, much less sold, in the hopes of adding some 'class' to his pressed

wood and cardboard houses and in turn increasing the value.

The line I like best in our CCR's is the one that says each house must have "a mailbox of wooden structure". I can't wait until the first guy on the Bored Of Directors complains about my little tiny antenna. Cuz when he does, 300 plastic and metal mailboxes are on the way to the dump, along with numerous turtles and goldfish :-)

I could have bought 3 acres of land and a nice mobile home in the boonies, but I didn't. I bought a house in a subdivision with a nice tiny lot and neighbors real close to me. There are other things to consider in life besides ham radio, like the convenience of shopping, schools, local medical facilities, personal safety, etc. Quality of life is more important to a few hams than a shoebox full of post cards. People have to live where they can afford to live. Not every ham who is 86 can take care of 3 acres and a moblie home, so you are saying it's OK we nix his hobby because of where he has to live ?

One of my neighbors like to bitch about a guy up the street with a boat in his driveway. The boat is worth about three times as much as my neighbors 3 cars are, brand new nice looking boat, but some people just need something to bitch about I guess.

I think the CCR bill is about whether or not the guy at Atlantic Builders, who built this house 6 years before I bought it, has the right to decide that I can't put up an antenna, my neighbors kid can't have a hamster, and everybody in the subdivision has to have a wooden mailbox even though he doesn't live (and has never lived) in the neighborhood.

Our system of law was not intended to be based on "rules" made by anybody who doesn't have anything better to do than make some....

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

3609. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 19:53:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gw7qbxe.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42928

On Thu, 16 May 2002 17:15:24 GMT, KØHB wrote:

>I think the CCR bill is about whether or not the guy at Atlantic
>Builders, who built this house 6 years before I bought it, has the
>right to decide that I can't put up an antenna, my neighbors kid
>can't have a hamster, and everybody in the subdivision has to have
>a wooden mailbox even though he doesn't live (and has never lived)
>in the neighborhood.

Well put, Hans.

The FCC wanted Congressional prodding - now they're going to
get it.

Of course PRB-1 has its weaknesses (not definite enough in
asserting exclusive jurisdiction) but it's the best that we
have to work with at present.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

3610. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 20:54:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE41C7F.DE7DECFE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42929

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Looks like you missed the point, Dick. Human progress is measured by how much
> > > mundane stuff can be taken over by machines leaving humans with more leisure
> > > time to do the things they enjoy.
> >
> > That would be your interpretation of how human progress is measured.
>
> You're not one of those tree huggers like Al Gore, are you, who wants to
> outlaw gasoline automobiles?

I said nothing about hugging trees, Al Gore or automobiles. You're 0
for 3. To many, human progress has little or nothing to do with the
number of devices invented in order to create leisure time.

Dave K8Mn

3611. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 20:57:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE41D36.1E9D11A4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42930

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 16 May 2002 15:40:52 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >Bill, with Kim there never was a lot of reasoning.
>
> Isn't it a little tacky to keep knocking someone who isn't
> present in the news group to defend herself?

You've got it wrong, Rick. Kim is tacky. You can once again assume the role of champion of Kim's honor if you like.

Dave K8MN

3612. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 20:59:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <ac16jfkki1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42931

Apparantly you have not operated anything other than the 'fun mode' on VHF.
A simple 10 element yagi and 10 watts can work several states on AM on 2
meters. How do I know? I did it back in the early sixties.

Now we have SSB and digital modes, including CW on V/Uhf. A modest SSB
setup can work out to 300 miles in most parts of this country.

Dan/W4NTI

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CE325E3.62A45FEC@IEEE.org...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Such a situtation would create
> > another illegal CB like band of 2m if hams were "kicked off" by
> > the FCC.
>
> But would necessarily be more localized than CB, at least at the
> height of the sunspot cycle. The repeaters could be eliminated and
> 2m is not all that useful without repeaters. Most 2m simplex operation
> is akin to a local phone call.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3613. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 21:38:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE426BF.145A145B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42932

Dave Heil wrote:
> To many, human progress has little or nothing to do with the
> number of devices invented in order to create leisure time.

"Is there all there is? Is that all there is? If that's all there
is, my friend, then let's keep dancing, let's break out the booze,
and have a ball, if that's all there is."
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

3614. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 21:40:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE42754.10332A91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42933

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> A modest SSB
> setup can work out to 300 miles in most parts of this country.

And that's a local call on my cellphone.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

3615. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 21:47:18 UTC
From: Bruce Burke <wb4yucXX@junoXX.com>
Message-ID: <GNVE8.10951$3U6.8807451@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 42934

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in
news:3B3E14B7BDB7D250.A050924D41C01AA6.D182CA432E4AFA5C@lp.airnews.net:
>
> Actually, it was based on a concept of contractual freedom.

that is something that should be a two-way street, yet try and remove oe of those things from the contract and watch what happens.

> Unlike laws and ordinances, CC&Rs are _voluntary_ limitations accepted
> by the purchaser.

You're forgetting that property is offered essentially as is, try and remove that clause from the contract and see if they'll sell it to you. There is nothing voluntary about it - other than to pass on the property entirely. Some feedom.

To many people, the concept of the government invalidating
> those agreements is a clear threat to their right to enter into a
> binding contract and is an infringement of the private sector.

What about the infringement of the landowner to use HIS property resonably as he sees fit? Doesn't it seem strange that we would allow some third party to dictate how we are going to live on a piece of property we own as a condition of the sale? It's the equivalent of buying a boat with a condition that you could only use it on the ocean when you live in Colorado. WHile I realize that local governments have all sorts of laws that control useage, at least they are always negotiable. Deed restrictions are not.

My personal opinion is that we have become so anti-social that instead of being reponsible to each other as neighbors about how our community looks, we would rather pass the buck to someone else to do it for us.

-Bruce, WB4YUC

3616. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-16 23:15:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <ac1ehl$8kp$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42935

How about sending me some apples along with those oranges...eh?

Dan/W4NTI

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CE42754.10332A91@IEEE.org...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > A modest SSB
> > setup can work out to 300 miles in most parts of this country.
>
> And that's a local call on my cellphone.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

3617. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 00:20:56 UTC
From: "Stephen C. Robbins" <srobbinsNOSPAMDUDES@netacc.net>
Message-ID: <3ce44cd4$1@news.netacc.net>
Source record: 42936

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020516080640.14079.00000021@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <abv1r4$3el$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
. But the exams themselves
> are given in such a way that someone can get all the safety questions
wrong and
> still pass. Not a good thing.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
Well Jim, that is when the "Darwin" syndrom takes over and the new hams who
don't know safety soon encounter overhead power lines, High Voltage on the
plate circuit, etc, etc and remove themselves from the ranks of ham radion
(in addition to the gene pool).

Steve
KC2JMD

3618. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 00:31:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <nbYE8.2953$Vq6.273748@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 42937

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote

> Why should someone whose only interest is chasing dx or
> participating in contests receive special treatment by the
> government simply because his or her chosen medium is
> radio instead of the Internet?

The FCC has pre-empted those CC&R's which prohibit outside
TV antennas. Why should someone who shoud someone be able
to put up a TV or satelite simply because his or her chosen
medium isn't cable?

--
(&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;) 73, de Hans, K0HB
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

3619. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:09:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tLYE8.2904$nI4.105952634@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42938

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020515230326.29123.00002015@mb-mu.aol.com...
> In article <zljE8.5238$iY2.151375929@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >He did hand me the two bare ends of 110vac wires one day after I
> >> >had gotten soaked by the rain. Shorty, if you're listening, I
> >> >apologize for being such a pain in the neck. And you were
> >> >instrumental in my choice of Electrical Engineering as a vocation.
> >> >--
> >> >cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >>
> >> Cecil:
> >>
> >> If I were you, I'd have had "Shorty" arrested for attempted murder.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >You would? First you'd have to get a LEO to take you seriously.
>
> Brian:
>
> If I called the police and stated that a co-worker had just handed
> my rain-soaked self live wires carrying 110 VAC, are you suggesting
> that the officer receiving the complaint wouldn't take it seriously?
> How much do you wanna bet my attorney could get him/her to take
> my complaint seriously? Any law enforcement officer who didn't take
> a complaint of an attempted homicide seriously wouldn't be making
> a very wise career move, at the very least! Fortunately, all of the
> cops I've ever known would handle such a complaint much more
> intelligently than YOU obviously would!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Now that you're done spitting, drooling, and slobbering, put Cecil in your
place making the phone call.

3620. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:12:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <KNYE8.2907$rG4.105825485@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42939

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020515230328.29123.00002018@mb-mu.aol.com...
> In article <AgfE8.5177$G%.147949779@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >True to form, your PCTA double standard kicked in. We
> >> >expect nothing less from you.
> >>
> >> I surely hope not, Brian, since I *am* an admittedly card-carrying
member
> >> of the PCTA! At least I'll truthfully identify myself and my cause.
And
> >> let's face it -- it gives you NCTA's something to whine about, which is
> >> what we PCTA's usually get from *you!*
> >
> >Well there you have it.
>
> Brian:
>
> Right -- there we have it. PCTA's are honest and up front, and the
> NCTA's whine. Thank you for this uncharacteristic admission of
> guilt.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Welp, there you have it again.

3621. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:13:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <POYE8.2909$wK4.106082644@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42940

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020515085505.00524.00012408@mb-md.aol.com...
> >Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> >electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
> >
> >73, Brian
>
> Brian, would you prefer being known as a Dumb Ass all of your life? At
least
> thats the way you appear to be.

Bruice, you're an idiot.

3622. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:16:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <GRYE8.2910$qK4.106076515@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42941

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CE278C0.101784F7@townsqr.com...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to
emulate >
> > a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> > >
> > > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would
appear
> > > that modems emulate humans.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem, humans
> > emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper tape.
> >
> > Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> > electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
> >
> > 73, Brian
>
> Lessee now....before humans domesticated the horse, they emulated horses
by
> walking around, but since they couldn't do it nearly as speedily, they
just had
> to learn to lasso the beasts....

If you say so. Are you and Bruice twin brothers?

> Before the wheel was invented, humans had to emulate one by rolling up in
a
> little ball to travel smoothly.....only worked on downhill grades, tho..

Ask Jack and Jill.

> Gosh I guess poor ol' humans were really emulating a gas engine, too. Had
to
> get their 'go' from somewhere.

Whatever are you talking about?

> Before stoves were invented humans had to emulate them by rubbing sticks
> together to make something burn.

?

> Before Tom Edison came along humans had to emulate a light bulb by using
that
> burning to see at night.

They set themselves on fire?

> I finally figured out Brian and Carl's problem. They just don't feel
worth
> anything as humans. After all, all we ever did, or ever do, in their view,
is
> emulate something technical that some other human invented. With that poor
a
> feeling of selfworth, no wonder they can't actually DO anything.

Dick, I feel worthwhile. You should try emulating a thinking human being
sometime. Soon.

3623. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:17:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QSYE8.2913$OJ4.106035382@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42942

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:abu122$9ti$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3CE278C0.101784F7@townsqr.com...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to
> emulate >
> > > a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> > > >
> > > > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would
> appear
> > > > that modems emulate humans.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem, humans
> > > emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper tape.
> > >
> > > Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> > > electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
> > >
> > > 73, Brian
> >
> > Lessee now....before humans domesticated the horse, they emulated
horses
> by
> > walking around, but since they couldn't do it nearly as speedily, they
> just had
> > to learn to lasso the beasts....
> >
> > Before the wheel was invented, humans had to emulate one by rolling up
in
> a
> > little ball to travel smoothly.....only worked on downhill grades, tho..
> >
> > Gosh I guess poor ol' humans were really emulating a gas engine, too.
Had
> to

> > get their 'go' from somewhere.
> >
> > Before stoves were invented humans had to emulate them by rubbing
sticks
> > together to make something burn.
> >
> > Before Tom Edison came along humans had to emulate a light bulb by using
> that
> > burning to see at night.
> >
> > I finally figured out Brian and Carl's problem. They just don't feel
> worth
> > anything as humans. After all, all we ever did, or ever do, in their
view,
> is
> > emulate something technical that some other human invented. With that
poor
> a
> > feeling of selfworth, no wonder they can't actually DO anything.
>
> The selfworth is there. The point is that as humans we have devised
> ways to eliminate the mundane and routine activities by creating
> the technology and the devices to do the same things humans
> did in a faster, more efficient, and literally untiring manner. THAT is
> where we derive the self worth.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Dick would rather soak hisself in kerosene and strike a match so that he
could read in the dark.

3624. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:17:52 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <_IYE8.11499$3U6.9843150@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 42943

Bruce Burke <wb4yucXX@junoXX.com> wrote in message
news:GNVE8.10951$3U6.8807451@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in
> news:3B3E14B7BDB7D250.A050924D41C01AA6.D182CA432E4AFA5C@lp.airnews.net:
> >
> > Actually, it was based on a concept of contractual freedom.
>
> that is something that should be a two-way street, yet try and remove oe
of
> those things from the contract and watch what happens.
>
> > Unlike laws and ordinances, CC&Rs are _voluntary_ limitations accepted
> > by the purchaser.
>
> You're forgetting that property is offered essentially as is, try and
> remove that clause from the contract and see if they'll sell it to you.
> There is nothing voluntary about it - other than to pass on the property
> entirely. Some feedom.
>
> To many people, the concept of the government invalidating
> > those agreements is a clear threat to their right to enter into a
> > binding contract and is an infringement of the private sector.
>
> What about the infringement of the landowner to use HIS property
> resonably as he sees fit? Doesn't it seem strange that we would allow some
> third party to dictate how we are going to live on a piece of property we
> own as a condition of the sale? It's the equivalent of buying a boat with
a
> condition that you could only use it on the ocean when you live in
> Colorado. WHile I realize that local governments have all sorts of laws
> that control useage, at least they are always negotiable. Deed
restrictions
> are not.
>
> My personal opinion is that we have become so anti-social that instead of
> being reponsible to each other as neighbors about how our community looks,
> we would rather pass the buck to someone else to do it for us.
>
> -Bruce, WB4YUC

Just my .02. I can see both sides of the argument--especially if one
happens not to be a
ham--but I tend to be extremely independent when it comes to *any* outside
entity telling me what I can do with my own property. Once I've paid for it,

the idea of some
blue-haired, busybody old lady telling me what I can erect, own, or keep in
my driveway
for as long as I shall live there just don't "git" it. So strongly do I
feel about it that, in order for someone to be able to do that, they must be
able to get around on the backside of my 12 ga. shotgun before I can get off
a round. Hehe! Now, having vented my spleen about CC&R contracts, the way
I handled it was to buy an older home. In so doing, I got, not only the
ability to put up all the antennas I want, but also a much better
built house in a very low crime, older neighborhood. I got real plaster
walls instead of
drywall. I got 2 X 12 floor and joist construction, same in the ceiling. I
got a floored attic, a full basement, 2 fireplaces, a garage-workshop, and,
again, nobody can tell me
that I cannot have a 100' tower (as long as I follow reasonable and prudent
safety rules
and city ordinances). At this point, there are no rules against antennas
and towers in my
town. I LOVE my real, red oak floors, knotty pine kitchen--and, of course,
my radio
shack down in the basement--cool in summer and cozy in winter with the wood
stove
a-simmerin'.

Jerry
K4KWH
>

3625. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:21:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BWYE8.2916$eN4.106250509@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42944

"K HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:xkEE8.1316$HE2.117110@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > The selfworth is there. The point is that as humans we have devised
> > ways to eliminate the mundane and routine activities by creating
> > the technology and the devices to do the same things humans
> > did in a faster, more efficient, and literally untiring manner. THAT is
> > where we derive the self worth.
> >
>
> You derive self worth from the application of technology?

And you derive self worth from calling people "Dump Hucks."

That is scarily
> funny on one hand, and eerily sad on another, like some unfortunate empty
> character from the mind of Kurt Vonnegut or James Barrie. I derive self
> worth from love given and received; from the values and social
contributions
> that I've instilled in my offspring; from the sense of community and
ethics
> with which I serve my employees and employer.

I'm sure you were very proud of your offspring's first utterance of "Dump
Huck" on the playground. You must have stood a little taller that day.

There is no self-worth
> attached to my choice between using existing Amateur Radio operating modes
> or fiddling around with a new one.

That's probably not true, but if you say so. Dick, Bruce and Larry sure
couldn't get away with making that statement.

3626. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:24:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1ZYE8.2919$PM4.106222830@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42945

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3CE29C42.96FFBF6B@townsqr.com...
>
>
> One thing more, Gadfly. You seem oblivious to the fact that every time
you open
> your yap you emulate a speech synthesizer. You know, one of those thingies
that
> always answer the phone these days giving you all sorts of options. Such
as
>
> "To exit ham radio without the door hitting you in the ass on your way
out, press
> one"!

You're an ass.

3627. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:26:35 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <f%YE8.2923$MO4.106350904@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42946

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CE32D72.C060CF2E@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I finally figured out Brian and Carl's problem. They just don't feel
worth
> > > anything as humans. After all, all we ever did, or ever do, in their
view, is
> > > emulate something technical that some other human invented. With that
poor a
> > > feeling of selfworth, no wonder they can't actually DO anything.
> >
> > Looks like you missed the point, Dick. Human progress is measured by how
much
> > mundane stuff can be taken over by machines leaving humans with more
leisure
> > time to do the things they enjoy.
>
> That would be your interpretation of how human progress is measured.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you must realize by now that we dispense with the "In my opinion...."
much of the time. Anyway, which are you? A modem emulator or an
electro-writer emulator?

3628. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:28:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <T0ZE8.2926$GP4.106410351@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42947

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CE41C7F.DE7DECFE@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Looks like you missed the point, Dick. Human progress is measured by
how much
> > > > mundane stuff can be taken over by machines leaving humans with more
leisure
> > > > time to do the things they enjoy.
> > >
> > > That would be your interpretation of how human progress is measured.
> >
> > You're not one of those tree huggers like Al Gore, are you, who wants to
> > outlaw gasoline automobiles?
>
> I said nothing about hugging trees, Al Gore or automobiles. You're 0
> for 3. To many, human progress has little or nothing to do with the
> number of devices invented in order to create leisure time.
>
> Dave K8Mn

How many? Are you one of those many? Do those many hold hands with Shirley
McClaine and look to the East while wishing for world peace?

3629. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:32:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <55ZE8.2928$wP4.106399975@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42948

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CE2BF7D.415B5C28@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to
emulate >
> > a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> > >
> > > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would
appear
> > > that modems emulate humans.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem, humans
> > emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper tape.
> >
> > Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> > electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
>
> Sure there are, Brian. Morse has been sent and received by humans since
> the inception of radio.

Not since the inception of Morse. Humans emulating modems can be dispensed
of. No need to bog yourself down with that stuff, unless you want to.

> I'll wager you've never even SEEN an
> electro-writer.

Why would you wager that, when I'm the one who introduced the term to the
thread?

Are you a sucker?

Brian

3630. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:42:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8eZE8.2935$4K4.106053818@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42949

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CE3142E.9000109@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>
> > Larry, you're simply a liar. You judge Blacks on Busses, Welfare
Mothers of
> > Color with their hands out, Knuckle Dragging 4-Landers with Southern
> > Accents, and No-Code Technicians. All people you don't even know. And
> > its -your- way or the highway.
> >
> > Get over it.
> >
> > Brian
>
> Brian, this slamming of fellow Hams: YOU need to get over it.
>
> de KR4AJ

Why?

Does Larry react to your question the same way he would have reacted to it if you had been a No Code Technician? No, and there is ample proof of that in the archives.

Does Larry treat people fairly? No.

Does Larry respect my opinions? No evidence of that - yet.

Does Larry seem interested in a fair and two-way exchange of ideas? No. Its his way or the highway - "Don't let the door hit you in the ass on your exit of amateur radio."

Meanwhile, you Dan, keep prolonging the hoax. Congrats. I guess you get to stand a little taller in Larry's eyes.

3631. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:43:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ifZE8.2936$XT4.106679484@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42950

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020515230328.29123.00002019@mb-mu.aol.com...
> In article <ELjE8.5255$oM3.152941898@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry, you're simply a liar. You judge Blacks on Busses, Welfare Mothers
of
> >Color with their hands out, Knuckle Dragging 4-Landers with Southern
> >Accents, and No-Code Technicians. All people you don't even know. And
> >its -your- way or the highway.
> >
> >Get over it.
> >
> >Brian
>
> Brian:
>
> You're right, I do judge them. I judge them because their behavior
> warrants a harsh judgment against them. I live in a world where there
> are readily definable absolutes, where the evidence which is readily at
> hand is not ignored in order to serve an agenda which states that all
> men were created with the right to equal outcomes. I don't live in your
> world of universally-applied gray areas, of benefits of the doubt given
> in absolutely every case and in perpetuity, and the politically-correct
> coddling of groups of people who were raised in a world of dependency
> and refuse to leave it, even though they way out is clearly available
> to them. So go ahead, whine away. It's what you do best, and what
> we expect of you.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

There you have it.

3632. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:46:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FhZE8.2939$eW4.106815787@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42851

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020515230330.29123.00002021@mb-mu.aol.com...
> In article <abu5amuun1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20020514002110.16785.00002464@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >> .... You can disagree
> >> with me the whole day long, as long as you show the same respect
> >> for my opinion as you demand that I have for yours. The NCTA, like
> >> most liberals, don't seem to be interested in a fair and two-way
> >> exchange of ideas. It's their way or the highway.
> >
> >Bzzzzt. Wrong!
> >The formal exchange of ideas has been completed.
> >The FCC has listend to both sides and made their decision regarding
> >TEST requirements. Larry and anyone else is free to discuss
> >their opinions regarding morse testing all they want.
> >
> >The ability to learn, use, encourage use, preach
> >use is the same today as always. Nothing in the NCTA "agenda"
> >opposes the learning and use of morse code.
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> Obviously you've never been shouted down at an ARRL Forum merely
> for bringing up the subject of code testing requirements. Lucky you.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You're probably telling the truth, here. Was your opinion Pro-Code Exam, or
No-Code Exam?

3633. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:46:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <miZE8.2940$kW4.106821740@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42852

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020515230324.29123.00002014@mb-mu.aol.com...
> In article <8bfE8.5172$9N.147575004@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Prove you said above 500 mhz.
>
> Brian:
>
> Prove I didn't. (Hi, Cecil!)
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Welp, there you have it. (Hi, Dick!)

3634. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 01:48:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xjZE8.2942$1W4.106802307@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42853

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020515085154.00524.00012406@mb-md.aol.com...
> Bubba Brian kiss my ASS

Welp, there you have it.

3635. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 02:00:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020516220045.15933.00000083@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 42854

In article <ac0cp95tgm@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>
>I have talked with a couple of teenagers that just got licensed recently and
>they feel severly dis-illusioned. They say that there is no one to talk
>to..... at least someone close to their age around here. Up until about 3
>months ago, I WAS the youngest ham in our county, at 31 years old.

Ryan:

Sooo, what were these lonely teen-aged hams proposing to *do* about
the fact they had "no one to talk to" ...other than whine about it? Were
they planning some sort of presentation to their classmates about
amateur radio, with a demonstration of HF voice, digital modes, and
maybe even some (heaven forbid) CW? Did these teen-aged hams
think of approaching a QSO with an older ham from a standpoint of
asking for his/her help with a technical issue, or just general knowledge-
gathering (assuming the "older" ham *has* the knowledge to give,
which may not necessarily be the case these days!)? Did these
teen-aged hams come to a local radio club meeting and introduce
themselves to their fellow hams and request their assistance in becoming
active participants on the local scene? (Hint: if they did arrive with
baggy pants, green hair, untied shoes, multiple body piercings and/or
tatoos, I surely hope they didn't expect to stay long!) Are these teen-aged
hams getting themselves involved with HF, or are they limiting themselves
to the handshack?

I think that teen-agers are just as capable of becoming active hams
now as they ever have been. It has always meant that they had to
and will have to interact with older hams. If these teen agers are
allowing their New-Age, dumbed-down culture get in their way of said
interaction, that's THEIR problem, not one of the older hams. There
is such a thing in this world as convention, and older people, older
hams in partucular, usually adhere to it. If these teen-aged hams are
expecting to present themselves as New Age punks and be given a
pass on it, they won't be attending very many radio club meetings
anywhere I've ever been a club member!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3636. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 02:00:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020516220047.15933.00000084@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 42855

In article <3CE3BC6D.431112A7@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> I'd like to see some hands-on practical testing of basic ham skills.
>> Something like "Here's some pieces of coax, a PL-259, a female
>> BNC connector, a female N connector, and a female SMA
>> connector, a soldering iron, and all other necessary tools. Pick
>> any two connectors, and properly install them on the appropriate
>> piece of coax (different types given to match the application usually
>> associated with the respective connector)."
>
> This one is interesting, and of course a problem. But let's see what we
>could do here.
>
> The VE's could have a class in which they have the students get
>familiar with soldering equipment. have the person solder a few things
>together ala your suggestion. Give the applicant a batch of resistors, a
>multimeter, and after they read the color code and predict what values
>the resistors are, have them read the things with the multimeter. There
>can be other things like this. Simple stuff, keeping in mind that the
>techs are often at the bottom of the learning curve.

Mike:

Technicians are at the "bottom" of the learning curve? I thought that
the name of that license class was supposed to imply technical knowledge,
as opposed to skill in any particular operating mode, and more
particularly, *not* Morse/CW, the testing requirements for which have
been eliminated over a decade ago. Even in the "olde days" of the
5 WPM Technician-class license, the intention of that class was to
give expanded privileges to people whose technical knowledge and
skill would be applied to the further use of the (then) relatively little
used VHF/UHF bands. This concept worked, up to a point, and the
Techs of the pre-No Code Technician-class license era did, in fact,
earn a place of respect in the amateur community through their
development of repeaters and weak-signal V/UHF modes. However,
they did this with the partnership of General, Advanced, and Extra class
licensees who also, in those times, had technical skills far in advance
of even the Extra-class amateurs being licesned under today's lowered
standards. The only difference then was that the Top 3 (General,
Advanced, and Extra) also had the ability to effectively employ the
Morse/CW mode at useful proficiency levels (13 - 20 WPM).

What has happened to the notion of "Technicians" being "technical?"
Why should testing for practical, hands-on technical skills be done
in the context of doing the testing at the end of the class where those

technical concepts were introduced for the very first time, which would be the case for the majority of the students? Also, what has happened to the long insisted-upon notion that Morse/CW skill and technical knowledge have nothing in common, and that technical skill was the most important of the two?

The historical rhetoric of the NCTA has been that technical knowledge and skill always trumps mode-specific operational skills (Morse/CW in particular)? Therefore, I believe that practical, hands-on testing for basic technical knowledge and skills directly related to the safe and efficient set-up and operation of an amateur radio station can, and must, be expected of even the entry-level radio amateur. Therefore it is perfectly acceptable to test for this skill as a means of determining an ARS licensing candidate's minimum qualification to *be* licensed.

I gained the technical knowledge and skills which led to my ultimate licensing after rather long experience as a general electronics hobbyist, experimenter, and SWL. At the time I did finally get a Novice license, it was predicted by my then Advanced-class YL "Elmer" that I was a well-qualified candidate for an amateur radio license with the knowledge I possessed coming in, and that I would shoot directly to the Extra class in minimal time and with relative ease. Fortunately for me, both predictions came true. I make a point of my own experience because I do not consider myself to be anything particularly special as a radio amateur, and never did. I'm just an average person with strictly AMATEUR (i.e. non-professional, can't make a dime from it) technical skill. At the time I took my Novice license test, I could perform a myriad of "hands on" technical tasks which were not required of me at ANY time, right through my upgrade to Amateur Extra. I did, however ,have to demonstrate proficiency in a valuable communications skill, that of Morse/CW operation. I saw that as a very logical and practical trade-off, once I overcame my objections to same, and realized I was just as capable of learning the Morse code as anyone else.

I believe that prospective hams today are just as capable of learning how to solder well, terminate coaxial cables with connectors, set up station equipment, and perform other technical tasks as I was at the time I ascended through the "ranks" under a much more comprehensive and challenging set of licensing requirements. Therefore, I would give them no "end of course" VE certifications. The would come in to the testing session with the knowledge and skills they already possessed, or had recently acquired, and be tested for them in a thoroughly fair and objective manner.

> The applicant takes this portion of the testing at the class at which
>he or she attends. The VE/ instructor would verify that the applicant
>did okay on this portion of the testing.

Already addressed, above.

>Now here is where I end up with
>a problem. In my case, I did all the studying and testing on my own, and

>took no classes. So I would have a problem here, unless the rules were
>arranged that I would have to take the class.

This is a perfect example of why my concept of having the "hands-on" skills testing be treated as a routine part of a standard VE session makes logical sense. A lot of hams are like we were -- self-training, as Part 97 says we are. I have absolutely no problem with "classes" geared toward teaching the technical skills required for licensing, but now, they would be complicated by the need for the students to demonstrate "hands-on" skill during the testing process, apart from the training classroom environment.

If, as the NCTA has always claimed, technical knowledge and skill is more important than mode-specific operational skill, then my ideas along these lines should be completely acceptable to them.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3637. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 02:02:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <6xZE8.2951$m05.107173958@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42856

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CE27077.4F7FBA20@psu.edu...
> I dunno Brian. All the arguments aside, I got to get my license. I
> don't mind working hard for my hobbies.

I've worked for everything I have. No rich relatives kicking off and
leaving me an estate, no lottery, no horse, ...

> I don't really have a problem with the CW requirements.

I do.

> At least they
> have some use. Let's try an excercise in getting rid of things we don't
> like or don't see a use for:

OK.

> My own pet peeve is the stupid frequency allocations. Why test for
> that? At my station, I have a nice chart from the ARRL with the
> bandplans on it. Get rid of 'em!

I also use a look up table for frequencies. But let's extend your idea a
little. I worked in a weather station. We probably had a hundred look up
tables (lut) under the plexiglass countertop. The luts were extremely handy
and referred to many times an hour. Then we had a severe storm, rain gushed
through a hole in the roof, and the forecast counter was destroyed along
with a lot of electronics. We had to evacuate to an alternate work site.
But there were no look up tables there.

> I also don't have much use for the inane questions about how long
> before a space station transmission you have to notify the authorities.
> And how long after. I'm not likely to ever do that mode of operation. It
> is a mode specific thing. Get rid of it!

I'm not likely to launch a satellite either. Good thing the FCC doesn't
require me to pass a "practical use" exam for that part.

> I'd rather see more questions involving calculations. My favorite part
> of the whole test. Set me down with a calculator or even a slide rule (
> am I the only person left who likes those things?) and a bunch of
> problems and I'm in hog heaven.

Fair enough. But are we adding something new or just the typical updating
of the question pool?

> Now let's ask other people what they don't like or have any use for.

Great.

> We'll get a lot of different answers. So many that you will find that
> eventually you might as well scrap the test altogether because someone
> somewhere doesn't like any part of the whole testing scheme.

Like we scrapped the Morse sending exam? The RTTY and SSTV practical exams?
This is where the Morse exam falls down. Name one other practical
examination by mode? Now name a mode that's use is mandatory.

> It was simple, I wanted to be a ham, so I did what was asked of me to
> become one. The tests were easy, the CW was not. Too bad for me there.
> But others had problems the other way around. That's life in the jungle.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA

Petitioning my government is also part of the jungle life.

3638. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 02:06:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <VAZE8.2954$o15.107240631@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42857

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0205151157.1c80866a@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<c5jE8.991$D41.87393@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > The June Q-Street in the world above 50 MHz has a description of JT44
> > which is designed for EME which epitomizes a decent approach to digital
> > communication. It is among other things self-adjusting between -2 and
+4
> > seconds in clock diff (mildly useful on an EME path) and a 600 Hz
> > frequency difference which is also damned useful for a method that
copies
> > below audibility.
>
> And it's just one tool in the toolbox of that software.
> >
> > Gee whiz, somebody thought it thru and used the available intelligence
for
> > something intelligent.
>
> Dig out QST for December, 2001 to see who that "somebody" is. One of
> those old-time 20 wpm code-tested Extras.....
>
> >Will miracles never cease.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, are you saying that if he weren't a 20wpm Examinee, then he wouldn't be smart or he wouldn't have designed JT44?

3639. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 02:08:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bCZE8.2955$M%4.107135027@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42858

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:abu3553d4v@enews3.newsguy.com...
> I was discussing this recently with a ham....
>
> Should Field Day be rescheduled for a weekend closer to the times that
> schools and colleges are still having classes? Something like the first
> weekend of June instead?

finals?

3640. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 02:12:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <RFZE8.2959$x05.107185426@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42859

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020515230327.29123.00002016@mb-mu.aol.com...
> > I don't really have a problem with the CW requirements. At least they
> > have some use. Let's try an excercise in getting rid of things we don't
> > like or don't see a use for:
>
> We can disagree as to the merits of CW testing. I'd have NO
> problem if CW was "tested" as a knowledge base related to the
> mode itself rather than a skill test to determine if someone can "copy"
> morse characters at a minimum speed.
>
> Bill:
>
> The effective use of the Morse/CW mode is nothing more and
> nothing less than an operational communications skill. Moreover,
> it is a skill which cannot be exploited by hams unless the operator
> acquires a minimum level of proficiency.

So an amateur couldn't use a look up table or use a computer to copy 5wpm?

3641. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 02:54:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CE47129.1EDE0DC3@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42860

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3CE3BC6D.431112A7@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >> I'd like to see some hands-on practical testing of basic ham skills.
> >> Something like "Here's some pieces of coax, a PL-259, a female
> >> BNC connector, a female N connector, and a female SMA
> >> connector, a soldering iron, and all other necessary tools. Pick
> >> any two connectors, and properly install them on the appropriate
> >> piece of coax (different types given to match the application usually
> >> associated with the respective connector)."
> > > This one is interesting, and of course a problem. But let's see what we
> >could do here.
> > > The VE's could have a class in which they have the students get
> >familiar with soldering equipment. have the person solder a few things
> >together ala your suggestion. Give the applicant a batch of resistors, a
> >multimeter, and after they read the color code and predict what values
> >the resistors are, have them read the things with the multimeter. There
> >can be other things like this. Simple stuff, keeping in mind that the
> >techs are often at the bottom of the learning curve.
>
> Mike:
>
> Technicians are at the "bottom" of the learning curve? I thought that
> the name of that license class was supposed to imply technical knowledge,
> as opposed to skill in any particular operating mode, and more
> particularly, *not* Morse/CW, the testing requirements for which have
> been eliminated over a decade ago.

True, the name is a big misnomer. Among those who I work with, being called a good technician is one of the biggest compliments to pay a person.

> What has happened to the notion of "Technicians" being "technical?"
> Why should testing for practical, hands-on technical skills be done
> in the context of doing the testing at the end of the class where those
> technical concepts were introduced for the very first time, which would
> be the case for the majority of the students?

I'm in basic agreement, but would like to get some people started in electronics. Seems for good or bad, we have the tech license at the bottom of the heap. An there are plenty of people taking it who need the exposure to simple electronics.

I suspect that with exposure, the new techs will discover that along
with yakking that actually knowing something about the radio biz might
be fun

> Also, what has happened
> to the long insisted-upon notion that Morse/CW skill and technical
> knowledge have nothing in common, and that technical skill was the
> most important of the two?

Dunno, but by this time, I have the firm opinion that the ARS testing
procedure should be something of a challenge to pass. I'm not talking
about needing an EE degree. I'm talking about the prospective amateur
needing to expend *effort* to get the license. The applicant should be
serious enough that they work at it.

That being said, I don't see a huge relation between Morse and
technical ability. I do see the Morse as a seriousness filter. And that
is okay by me.

Weoooo, I better put my flameproof suit on here! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

> The historical rhetoric of the NCTA has been that technical knowledge
> and skill always trumps mode-specific operational skills (Morse/CW
> in particular)? Therefore, I believe that practical, hands-on testing for
> basic technical knowledge and skills directly related to the safe and
> efficient set-up and operation of an amateur radio station can, and must,
> be expected of even the entry-level radio amateur. Therefore it is perfectly
> acceptable to test for this skill as a means of determining an ARS
> licensing candidate's minimum qualification to *be* licensed.
>
> I gained the technical knowledge and skills which led to my ultimate
> licensing after rather long experience as a general electronics
> hobbyist, experimenter, and SWL. At the time I did finally get a Novice
> license, it was predicted by my then Advanced-class YL "Elmer" that
> I was a well-qualified candidate for an amateur radio license with the
> knowledge I possessed coming in, and that I would shoot directly to
> the Extra class in minimal time and with relative ease. Fortunately for
> me, both predictions came true. I make a point of my own experience
> because I do not consider myself to be anything particularly special as
> a radio amateur, and never did. I'm just an average person with strictly
> AMATEUR (i.e. non-professional, can't make a dime from it) technical
> skill. At the time I took my Novice license test, I could perform a myriad
> of "hands on" technical tasks which were not required of me at ANY
> time, right through my upgrade to Amateur Extra. I did, however ,have
> to demonstrate proficiency in a valuable communications skill, that of
> Morse/CW operation. I saw that as a very logical and practical trade-off,
> once I overcame my objections to same, and realized I was just as
> capable of learning the Morse code as anyone else.
>
> I believe that prospective hams today are just as capable of learning
> how to solder well, terminate coaxial cables with connectors, set up

> station equipment, and perform other technical tasks as I was at the
> time I ascended through the "ranks" under a much more comprehensive
> and challenging set of licensing requirements. Therefore, I would give
> them no "end of course" VE certifications. The would come in to the
> testing session with the knowledge and skills they already possessed,
> or had recently acquired, and be tested for them in a thoroughly fair
> and objective manner.
>
> > The applicant takes this portion of the testing at the class at which
> >he or she attends. The VE/ instructor would verify that the applicant
> >did okay on this portion of the testing.
>
> Already addressed, above.
>
> >Now here is where I end up with
> >a problem. In my case, I did all the studying and testing on my own, and
> >took no classes. So I would have a problem here, unless the rules were
> >arranged that I would have to take the class.
>
> This is a perfect example of why my concept of having the "hands-on"
> skills testing be treated as a routine part of a standard VE session makes
> logical sense. A lot of hams are like we were -- self-training, as Part 97
> says we are. I have absolutely no problem with "classes" geared toward
> teaching the technical skills required for licensing, but now, they would
> be complicated by the need for the students to demonstrate "hands-on"
> skill during the testing process, apart from the training classroom
> environment.
>
> If, as the NCTA has always claimed, technical knowledge and skill is
> more important than mode-specific operational skill, then my ideas
> along these lines should be completely acceptable to them.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

3642. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 03:12:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ac1tlb$tf3$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42864

"K HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:xkEE8.1316$HE2.117110@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > The selfworth is there. The point is that as humans we have devised
> > ways to eliminate the mundane and routine activities by creating
> > the technology and the devices to do the same things humans
> > did in a faster, more efficient, and literally untiring manner. THAT is
> > where we derive the self worth.
> >
>
> You derive self worth from the application of technology?

Yes, why not. I enjoy my job and what it brings me.

> That is scarily
> funny on one hand, and eerily sad on another, like some unfortunate empty
> character from the mind of Kurt Vonnegut or James Barrie.

Huh?

> I derive self
> worth from love given and received; from the values and social
contributions
> that I've instilled in my offspring; from the sense of community and
ethics
> with which I serve my employees and employer.

Where did I say that I ONLY derive self worth from the technology?

> There is no self-worth
> attached to my choice between using existing Amateur Radio operating modes
> or fiddling around with a new one.

Sounds like a personal problem. To each his/her own.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3643. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 03:18:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ac1tlc$tf3$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42863

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020515230330.29123.00002021@mb-mu.aol.com...
> In article <abu5amuun1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20020514002110.16785.00002464@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >> .... You can disagree
> >> with me the whole day long, as long as you show the same respect
> >> for my opinion as you demand that I have for yours. The NCTA, like
> >> most liberals, don't seem to be interested in a fair and two-way
> >> exchange of ideas. It's their way or the highway.
> >
> >Bzzzzt. Wrong!
> >The formal exchange of ideas has been completed.
> >The FCC has listend to both sides and made their decision regarding
> >TEST requirements. Larry and anyone else is free to discuss
> >their opinions regarding morse testing all they want.
> >
> >The ability to learn, use, encourage use, preach
> >use is the same today as always. Nothing in the NCTA "agenda"
> >opposes the learning and use of morse code.
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> Obviously you've never been shouted down at an ARRL Forum merely
> for bringing up the subject of code testing requirements. Lucky you.

There are idiots on both sides of any issue. They actions of one person
on either side shouldn't be the defining aspect for the majority of
people who support or oppose any idea...unless the majority truly
exhibits the intolerance you claim.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3644. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 03:24:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE477D4.307A6AF4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42861

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CE32D72.C060CF2E@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > I finally figured out Brian and Carl's problem. They just don't feel
> worth
> > > > anything as humans. After all, all we ever did, or ever do, in their
> view, is
> > > > emulate something technical that some other human invented. With that
> poor a
> > > > feeling of selfworth, no wonder they can't actually DO anything.
> > >
> > > Looks like you missed the point, Dick. Human progress is measured by how
> much
> > > mundane stuff can be taken over by machines leaving humans with more
> leisure
> > > time to do the things they enjoy.
> >
> > That would be your interpretation of how human progress is measured.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, you must realize by now that we dispense with the "In my opinion...."
> much of the time. Anyway, which are you? A modem emulator or an
> electro-writer emulator?

I'm neither, Pipsquawk. Those devices may attempt emulating me. Of
course I've discounted for the obvious--that your comments are only your
opinion.

Dave K8MN

3645. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 03:27:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE4789E.BF8E938D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42862

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CE41C7F.DE7DECFE@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Looks like you missed the point, Dick. Human progress is measured by
> how much
> > > > > mundane stuff can be taken over by machines leaving humans with more
> leisure
> > > > > time to do the things they enjoy.
> > > >
> > > > That would be your interpretation of how human progress is measured.
> > >
> > > You're not one of those tree huggers like Al Gore, are you, who wants to
> > > outlaw gasoline automobiles?
> >
> > I said nothing about hugging trees, Al Gore or automobiles. You're 0
> > for 3. To many, human progress has little or nothing to do with the
> > number of devices invented in order to create leisure time.
> >
> > Dave K8Mn
>
> How many? Are you one of those many?

a) I believe there are 1,373,576,289 (give or take a few) and b) yes.

> Do those many hold hands with Shirley
> McClaine and look to the East while wishing for world peace?

In my opinion, no.

Dave K8MN

3646. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 03:34:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE47A34.6DC1F380@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42865

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CE2BF7D.415B5C28@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to
> emulate >
> > > a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> > > > >
> > > > > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would
> appear
> > > > that modems emulate humans.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem, humans
> > > > emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper tape.
> > > >
> > > > Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> > > > electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
> > >
> > > Sure there are, Brian. Morse has been sent and received by humans since
> > > the inception of radio.
> >
> Not since the inception of Morse. Humans emulating modems can be > dispensed of. No need
to bog yourself down with that stuff, unless > you want to.

Trying reading what I've written instead of searching for meaning
between the lines. I didn't write anything about the inception of
morse. I'm not a railroad telegrapher nor have I used American Morse.
(See "...since the inception of radio").

> > I'll wager you've never even SEEN an
> > electro-writer.
> >
> Why would you wager that, when I'm the one who introduced the term to the
> thread?

I didn't offer a wager based on your introduction of the term. I
wagered you've never seen one.

> Are you a sucker?

...apparently not.

Dave K8MN
"Modems try to emulate me but they haven't developed one which can smoke
a cigarette and sip iced tea."

3647. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 03:34:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ac1ttvcvb1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42866

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020515223834.24893.00000246@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Let's not get caught up in this too much. IF you must test
> >for a skill, then clearly you must have a skill test. But, the states
> >don't care IF you blow out your clutch or gearbox at
> >all, so they don't mandate manual shift testing as a skill test to drive
at
> >all.
>
> Therefore we should have no testing at all.

Not at all. My example was related to ONE skill that the state
does NOT test anymore. I did NOT say the rest of a driver's
license test should be eliminated. The analogy was strictly to
a "skill" test...aka Morse Test if you will.

> You should just have to attend 3
> days of classes and they should hand you a Technician, General, then Extra
> class licence.

You are grossly exagerating my point.

> Right now, we have a question pool. Many people passed the
> Technician test after a 1 day "licence in a day" class. Did they remember
the
> material the next day? Most likely not.

Maybe they do, maybe they don't. Do you have anything
but your opinion on that?

> Question pools do not prove you understand the material. Since, we do not
know
> for SURE that anyone knows the material and no harm has been done by
this, we
> should not require anyone to pass the tests to get the various licence
classes.
> They should just hand it to you after attending 3 days of classes.

This thread was opened for a discussion of what should be
on the test. It appears you don't seriously want to discuss
that.

> The Morse code test uses actual code tapes which you must copy, so in
order to
> pass the Morse code element, you have to understand Morse code to some

extent.
> Not everyone needs to know Morse code - only those that want to get a
licence
> above Technician.

But there's no NEED for morse to be able to operate HF.
The FCC believes that and the morse skill test will likly
be toast after 2003.

> Therefore,
> (1) No knowledge of electronics is required for a Ham licence.
> A question pool test does not test this for sure, so this is unnecessary.
> (2) No knowledge of operating procedures is required for a Ham licence.
> A question pool test does not test this for sure, so this is unnecessary.

Sorry, does not compute.

> (3)Some people, but not everyone needs to know Morse code.
> The Morse test requires you to understand Morse code, so this is
neccessary for
> a licence class above Technician.

The test is ONLY necessary because the FCC and international treaty
requires it. The FCC gave you and everyone else ample opportunity to
submit comments, arguments, whatever to justify morse and NONE
were deemed of sufficient merit to keep a code test at anything but
a minimum required to be compliant with the treaty.

> Therefore, keep the Morse test, unless it can
> be proven that its removal would cause no harm.

Sorry, that's not how it works. Rules, regulations and requirements
set by government require justification. The burden of proof is
on those that want to KEEP the regulation.

> At any rate, Morse code is not
> needed for everyone, only those people that want to get a licence above
the
> Technician class.

This too shall pass.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3648. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 03:50:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gw8clrg.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42867

On Thu, 16 May 2002 21:17:52 -0400, Jerry Oxendine wrote:

>Just my .02. I can see both sides of the argument--especially if one
>happens not to be a ham--but I tend to be extremely independent when
>it comes to *any* outside entity telling me what I can do with my own
>property. Once I've paid for it, the idea of some blue-haired,
>busybody old lady telling me what I can erect, own, or keep in my
>driveway for as long as I shall live there just don't "git" it.

C'mon, Jerry, there is a whole list of things that "others" tell you
what to do concerning your use of "your" land. Where you can get water
from and what quality it must be. Where and how you can dispose of
your sewage. Where and under what conditions you can get electrical
power, What businesses you can conduct on "your" land....and on and on.

>So strongly do I feel about it that, in order for someone to be able
>to do that, they must be able to get around on the backside of my 12
>ga. shotgun before I can get off a round. Hehe!

And I know a lot of LEOs and DAs who would just love to see you try
that...it's called "unacceptable behavior" in "my ceowd" and we
put people in uncomfortable places (with no ham radios) for that.

>Now, having vented my spleen about CC&R contracts, the way I handled
>it was to buy an older home.

How old is "old" ?

>In so doing, I got, not only the ability to put up all the antennas I
>want, but also a much better built house in a very low crime, older
>neighborhood. I got real plaster walls instead of drywall.

Is that 'sposed to be an "advantage"? Not to me...I've "done"
drywall work in major modificatons/additions to homes that I've
owned, and although I'm certainly not the craftsman in the field,
it's much easier for me to work with than the lath and plaster walls
that I grew up with and first learned to do electrical "old work" on.

> again, nobody can tell me that I cannot have a 100' tower (as long
>as I follow reasonable and prudent safety rules and city ordinances).

And you would deny the same enjoyment to other hams who want to
live in a good home of their own choosing. That's pretty selfish.

>At this point, there are no rules against antennas and towers in my
>town.

They're coming.my man, they're coming. The cellphone tower folks have been fighting that battle for years. The average city planner does not know, nor care about, the difference if we are not vigilant. Step one is to take the power to restrict same out of their hands. We call it "exclusice preemption" and sadly, PRB-1 doesn;t go that far. We have to bluff the local authorities and HOAs into thinking that it does. (That's MY soapbox.)

>I LOVE my real, red oak floors, knotty pine kitchen--and, of
>course, my radio shack down in the basement--cool in summer and cozy
>in winter with the wood stove a-simmerin'.

To each hus own. I prefer the chrome-and-glass modern look with laminate floors . We use the two working (but unused) fireplaces to display my wife's sculpture and floral arrangements. No ashes to clean up, no wood smoke fumes to cause emphysema, and the power company did an energy balance and proved to us that it's a negative heating factor, i.e. we lose more heat in taking in cold outside air than burning the wood provides.

Yo each his own.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3649. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 03:58:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ac1vab$17c$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42868

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020515230327.29123.00002016@mb-mu.aol.com...
> > I don't really have a problem with the CW requirements. At least they
> > have some use. Let's try an excercise in getting rid of things we don't
> > like or don't see a use for:
>
> We can disagree as to the merits of CW testing. I'd have NO
> problem if CW was "tested" as a knowledge base related to the
> mode itself rather than a skill test to determine if someone can "copy"
> morse characters at a minimum speed.
>
> Bill:
>
> The effective use of the Morse/CW mode is nothing more and
> nothing less than an operational communications skill.

Agreed.

> Moreover,
> it is a skill which cannot be exploited by hams unless the operator
> acquires a minimum level of proficiency.

Partially agree.

> The way this skill has
> been developed in the past is through a requirement to test for
> this skill at progressively higher skill levels, and an incentive to
> achieve these higher skill levels was increased privileges on
> the HF amateur bands.

You want a mandatory skill test ONLY as a means to generate
new recruits. That is NOT what the requirements are for.

> This system worked well for years, and
> resulted in an ARS which included a large number of licensees
> who could effectively exploit the CW mode. Now that the incentive
> is removed, the ability for hams to exploit the benefits and
> advantages of the Morse/CW mode will eventually disappear.

That is YOUR opinion. I strongly disagree. There will
be morse proponents and users for years to come.

> Is this a good thing for the ARS?

If morse does dry up and go away, I doubt there'd be any
great implication to the public or the ham community at large.

> > Now let's ask other people what they don't like or have any use for.
>
> Add electrical and RF safety as a priority for Tech. Add emergency
> communications concepts for all...different levels of knowledge
> and expectations for the different licenses.
>
> I'd like to see some hands-on practical testing of basic ham skills.
> Something like "Here's some pieces of coax, a PL-259, a female
> BNC connector, a female N connector, and a female SMA
> connector, a soldering iron, and all other necessary tools. Pick
> any two connectors, and properly install them on the appropriate
> piece of coax (different types given to match the application usually
> associated with the respective connector)."

Not gonna happen. It's both a pain to administer and
subject to too much "interpretation" as to what a satisfactory
final result might be. Frankly I've never been very good
a connectors myself...and I did plenty in the Navy.

> Next: "Here's a 2-meter HT with a fully-charged battery pack, the
> VFO memories reset, and the manufacturer's instruction manual.
> Program the memory channels for the following frequencies:
> 146.52 (simplex)
> 146.61 (-600 kHz offset)
> 147.180 (+600 kHz offset, CTCSS 156.7 hz. encode only)
> 145.21 (-600 kHz offset, CTCSS 77 hz, encode and decode)
> 147.540 (simplex)"

Ditto my last comments as to the practicality of such
a test.

> Next: "Draw a block diagram of a properly set up amateur HF
> station showing the following:
>
> An HF transceiver and power supply, microphone, and headset
> A multi-mode Terminal Node Controller
> A personal computer
> A sound card to computer interface unit for software-based digital modes
> An antenna
> A station ground
> A Morse code key or keyer/paddle combination"
> I could go on and on, but you get the idea.

Like it or not, the tests can NOT leave room for subjective
grading as to pass/fail.

> > We'll get a lot of different answers.
>
> I sure hope so. At least this becomes a positive discussion
> for a change.

Agreed.

> > So many that you will find that
> > eventually you might as well scrap the test altogether because someone
> > somewhere doesn't like any part of the whole testing scheme.
>
> I disagree. I think there will be significant concurrance.
>
> With the exception of practical hands-on knowledge testing as
> described above, I can't think of much that is currently on the
> tests with which I disagree, except that I obviously would also
> like to see the clock rolled back on the 13- and 20-WPM code
> test requirements.

We can only agree to disagree on that...but let's move on.

> > It was simple, I wanted to be a ham, so I did what was asked
> > of me to become one.
> > The tests were easy, the CW was not. Too bad for me there.
> > But others had problems the other way around. That's life in the jungle.
>
> True, and just as times and test requirements change elsewhere, the
> same will apply for ham licensing. My dad HAD nno choice but to
> learn and take a drivers test using a manual 3 speed column shift
> automobile. Today you get the license without any need for
> knowledge of manual shifting. Once licensed you are free to
> still drive a manual gearshift auto.
>
> However, those who have never been required to take their
> driver's test using a manual gearbox automobile are much less
> likely to learn how to drive one, and as a result, the benefits and
> advantages of manual gearboxes (better fuel economy, lower
> air pollution as a result of smaller engines being required for a
> similar level of performance, lower maintenance costs compared
> to automatic transmissions, etc.) are lost forever. I am all for
> requiring new drivers to take a test in a manual gearbox car or
> light truck.

Sounds like you want to mandate driver's choices.

> BTW I took my own driver's test when I was 16 years old, in my
> mother's 1966 Mercury station wagon that had an automatic
> transmission!

I took mine on a 57 Plymouth with auto...and as soon as I was
licensed I drove my own '50 Ford convertible with a 3 speed manual.
Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3650. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 04:02:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ac1vht$vk3$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42869

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CE3BC6D.431112A7@psu.edu...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > I'd like to see some hands-on practical testing of basic ham skills.
> > Something like "Here's some pieces of coax, a PL-259, a female
> > BNC connector, a female N connector, and a female SMA
> > connector, a soldering iron, and all other necessary tools. Pick
> > any two connectors, and properly install them on the appropriate
> > piece of coax (different types given to match the application usually
> > associated with the respective connector)."
>
> This one is interesting, and of course a problem. But let's see what we
> could do here.
>
> The VE's could have a class in which they have the students get
> familiar with soldering equipment. have the person solder a few things
> together ala your suggestion. Give the applicant a batch of resistors, a
> multimeter, and after they read the color code and predict what values
> the resistors are, have them read the things with the multimeter. There
> can be other things like this. Simple stuff, keeping in mind that the
> techs are often at the bottom of the learning curve.
>
> The applicant takes this portion of the testing at the class at which
> he or she attends. The VE/ instructor would verify that the applicant
> did okay on this portion of the testing. Now here is where I end up with
> a problem. In my case, I did all the studying and testing on my own, and
> took no classes. So I would have a problem here, unless the rules were
> arranged that I would have to take the class.
>
> But it is still an intersting and needed part of the ham experience IMO.

Here's another one of those little problems: Do we have
medical waivers for people who have any number of possible
ailments or disabilities: One arm, arthritis, lost fingers,
paralized arm, hand, etc?

Something to think about.
Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
-

3651. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 04:06:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020517000646.10400.00000037@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 42870

In article <MORE8.2453$HE2.247579@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Did the developers limit their consideration to a
>single issue -- the potential for increasing their
>profits -- when these restrictions were created? Yes,
>emphatically yes. Deed restrictions against amateur
>radio antennas exist on virtually every home built
>in the US for over 30 years for the simple reason
>that the sellers of the properties believed that if
>the early occupants of the developments erected
>ham radio antennas that the sales of homes would
>slow slightly, cutting into their profits.

I'm not sure if this is exactly correct.

It's my understanding that that deed restrictions usually say "no antennas", and do not specify what service the antennas are for.

It's also my understanding that one of the main driving forces behind the boilerplate was cable TV. The cable TV folks would wire new subdivisions for a "discount", secure in the knowledge that most people would sign up.

If the satellite TV folks can do it, so can we. And we should.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3652. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 04:06:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020517000648.10400.00000038@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 42871

In article <ac0cp95tgm@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>I just though since the students typically get out of school in the first
>week of June, and it is about 3 weeks at least after, that there is
>definitely a chance that any promotional activity may get forgotten by
>then.... Just and idere.....

Here in southeast PA, K-12 schools typically don't let out until June 15 or so.
In years where there are lots of snow days, the last day of school can come
even later.

But you do have a good point in that the school-radio connection can be lost
too easily.

>> Although FD has been "the fourth full weekend in June" for more than
>> half a century, most of the hams I know think it's "the last full weekend in
>>June", despite educational efforts by folks like me. In most years the two
>>definitions are one and the same, but once in a while (like this year) there
>>are five full weekends in June. End result is confusion and some no-shows.
>>Maybe it should be the last weekend in June, or the first.

>> Historic note:
>>
>> For the first few years (1933-35?) there were actually two FDs per year -
>>one in early June and another in late August. The late August one was not
>>nearly so popular as the June outing, as was discontinued.

>Now there is an idea! Or maybe the first or second week of school of the
>fall terms.... September is still fairly moderate in temperature and weather
>in general, even here in Michigan, and it would work great to tie this in
>with promotion of the ham radio classes that some clubs offer in the fall.

Perhaps what we need is a "Publicity Day", rather than having Field Day
try to serve all purposes.
>
>It has been stated many times, but we definitely need to promote amateur
>radio to people in the 30 'n" under categories....

I agree 100%. That's what the ARRL "Big Project" is about. Another
reason I'm a member. But that project is only one step.

>You are the one that seems to post the information about license numbers.

That's me.

>I wonder if age could some how be factored into those calculations.

I would do so if there were a reliable source of that info. The FCC has done the on-again off-again thing with DOB information, so there is no complete database of how old US hams are. Surveys and reports are often very inaccurate because they do not take representative samples. For example, although I'm a fairly active ham, I haven't been to a hamfest in several years, nor to a local club meeting in a year or so. It's not because I don't want to go,
but because family and work obligations prevent it.

>I can honestly guess that the
>overwhelming majority of hams are in the 50-70 year old age bracket, and
>over the next 20 years or so, we will lose alot of those hams to natural
>(and unnatural also) causes of death.

I'm 48, and been a ham 35 years in October.

>This and the severe underpromotion of
>amateur radio will be the death of our hobby, not some silly arguements
>about testing.

I agree 100%.
>
>I have talked with a couple of teenagers that just got licensed recently and
>they feel severly dis-illusioned. They say that there is no one to talk
>to..... at least someone close to their age around here. Up until about 3
>months ago, I WAS the youngest ham in our county, at 31 years old.

When I got started in 1967, I was the youngest ham I knew, for a long time. In my high school of 2400 or so boys, there were never more than a half dozen licensed hams. This was long before the 'net, video games, cell phones or even widespread cable TV. It didn't bother me that there was practically nobody my age to talk to on the air.

One of the things that attracted me to ham radio was the fact that on the air it did not matter what a person's age, gender, race, or socioeconomic status was. Hams' opinions of each other were based on operating skills and signal quality.

--

There are three basic reasons people become hams:

1) Technical interest in radio (building, experimenting, repair/restore, etc.)
2) Desire to communicate (ragchewing, public service, "honeydew", on-air community)
3) Fascination with radio operating (contesting, DXing, developing on-air skills)

Most hams' interest is a mixture of these three, and the mix can vary over time. But to
interest someone, or keep them interested, the mix must have things not available
elsewhere.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3653. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 04:49:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205162049.3da06dbd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42872

. . .

> Why should
> someone whose only interest is chasing dx or participating in contests
> receive special treatment by the government simply because his or her
> chosen medium is radio instead of the Internet?
>
Who would decide which hams are worthy of busting the CC&Rs and which
are not worthy? Nobody in there right minds would even try to inject
any complexities like that into any hobby regulation legislation. And
for one other predictable, simple, practical reason: Exclude the dxers
and contesters in the legislation for instance and they suddenly clump
together and run some quickie "emergency comms" drills on the machines
and bingo, they're "qualified" and the whole thing would be rendered
farcical.
>
>
> Just a few thoughts as to what the "other side" may see as
> valid reasons to oppose the regulation.
>
>
It's all simple downhome standard U.S. special-interests politics. One
of the primamry ARRL missions is to advance the special intersts of
the U.S. ham communuity and it's doing that right now with the CC&Rs
in legislative bodies bodies all over the country. They're doing what
we pay them to do. It's as American as Chebbys and apple pie. I'll bet
that if I reserched the matter the first attempt at special interests
lobbying probably popped up within a week after the first U.S.
Congress was convened. Or maybe even before the first session.
>
>
If the SWLs and CBers have a problem with it they need to quit whining
and pump their own money into their lobbying organizations and get
them on the job. I do not ship my dues to the ARRL to pay for
advancing their interests.
>
>
> 73 de KE8HH, Rick
>
>
w3rv

3654. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 06:21:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205162221.292f2866@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42873

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gw20a03.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On Mon, 13 May 2002 02:56:00 GMT, M Collinski wrote:
>
> >Probably a nice chunk out of 440 or 900 Mhz.
> >The downturn in the Technology Industry has
> >caused a lighten-up of industry pressure
> >to re-assign most of the ham freq's in the
> >UHF and SHF bands.
>
> And Henry Goldberg, the wireless industries' legal mouthpiece, is
> slowing down in his later years (aren't we all...)
>
> Whenever you see a Pizza contest between the ARRL and the
> wireless interests, you can be sure that Henry is involved on
> "their" side.
>
>
Might Henry be a friend of Lenny's or Squiggy's?
>
>
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
w3rv

3655. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 08:19:36 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <CDB726274AB6F52A.357F6F1CD6B31A4E.8570714C3E36DC94@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42874

On Thu, 16 May 2002 16:40:36 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> A modest SSB
>> setup can work out to 300 miles in most parts of this country.
>
>And that's a local call on my cellphone.

No, that's a no-long-distance-charges call on your cellphone. You're
still going to be paying for airtime.

Given the popularity of FRS, I suspect a lot of people would find uses
for 2m FM simplex, especially since they can easily get a 30-50W
mobile unit for about what a 5W GMRS HT costs.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3656. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 10:57:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE4E22F.CA6ED4AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42875

Mike Coslo wrote:
> Dunno, but by this time, I have the firm opinion that the ARS testing
> procedure should be something of a challenge to pass. I'm not talking
> about needing an EE degree. I'm talking about the prospective amateur
> needing to expend *effort* to get the license. The applicant should be
> serious enough that they work at it.

What about the graduate EE for whom the exam is effortless? What kind
of work should they have to do?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3657. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 11:18:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE4E702.C13D9BE1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42876

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> On Thu, 16 May 2002 16:40:36 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >> A modest SSB
> >> setup can work out to 300 miles in most parts of this country.
> > >
> > >And that's a local call on my cellphone.
>
> No, that's a no-long-distance-charges call on your cellphone. You're
> still going to be paying for airtime.

Maybe you missed the point. Why make an illegal transmission when one
can do the same thing on a cellphone for free (as long as one doesn't
exceed one's subscribed limits)? Are the rewards worth the risk?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3658. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 12:06:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020517080656.10400.00000041@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 42877

In article <3B3E14B7BDB7D250.A050924D41C01AA6.D182CA432E4AFA5C@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On Thu, 16 May 2002 10:12:29 -0400, Bill Hanrahan <hanrahan@kua.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Hans, I've only recently been reading rrap, so I'm not familiar with
>>the opposition to CC&R relief that you're referring to. I'm at a loss
>>as to what their reasoning in opposing CC&R relief could have been.
>
> Actually, it was based on a concept of contractual freedom.
>Unlike laws and ordinances, CC&Rs are _voluntary_ limitations accepted
>by the purchaser. You _can't_ "pass" a CC&R that is binding on anyone
>after they have made their purchase--it can only be introduced prior
>to sale. To many people, the concept of the government invalidating
>those agreements is a clear threat to their right to enter into a
>binding contract and is an infringement of the private sector.
>
> While many have argued that in many areas it is impossible to
>purchase a desirable home where no CC&Rs are in effect, the fact
>remains that it IS possible to do so and even if it weren't that
>wouldn't justify government intrusion.

I disagree.

The widespread use of boilerplate deed restrictions creates an effective
monopoly. The amount of available housing without such restrictions dwindles
because the restrictions are permanent. In many areas it is effectively
impossible to find properties for sale that are not restricted.

>If, for example, no one chose
>to open a fast serve restaurant in your community, it would certainly
>not justify a government agency requiring full service restaurants to
>open drive-thru windows and sell low cost food.

Not a valid analogy. Is there a community in America with no drive-thrus?
I think not.

Here's a valid analogy:

Suppose that 30 years ago a community decided to ban drive-thrus so
that the owners of local restaurants would not have to deal with the
competition. And suppose the ban was effected by means of deed
restrictions, which are singularly difficult to change. End result
would be no available real estate for drive-thrus.

>While a home purchase
>is far more important than the purchase of a Big Mac, the principle IS
>the same.

No, it isn't. Real estate is unique and non-portable.
In many areas there is no "new" real estate available - it's all been
"developed". Around here it is common for "old" houses to be bought
for the land and torn down so that "new" houses can be built - complete
with deed restrictions.

>Why should the government have the right to limit the
>restrictions YOU as seller place on a piece of property?

Because you are SELLING it. That means YOU won't own it any more.
Why should the seller's rights exceed the buyer's? Note that most
deed restrictions never expire and are nigh-impossible to change.

Would you support the right to deed restrictions that banned people
of certain races, religions, atheists/agnostics, gays, or the disabled?
I wouldn't.

>If the buyer
>isn't satisfied with them, he or she has every right to buy from
>someone whose agreements are more compatible with their needs instead.

If ands only if such a seller exists. They become rarer and rarer.

But the larger principle is this: Why should the seller of a property be able
to
impose arbitrary restrictions on an item being sold? Particularly when the
seller will have no interest in or responsibility to the buyer after the sale?

> One argument never voiced here, btw, concerns non-hams. If a
>person who is not a ham takes an interest in CB radio, for example, or
>in shortwave radio, police scanners, or a similar area, he or she
>would remain restrict by CC&R antenna limitations. To see his or her
>neighbor granted an exception (by law) to those restrictions simply
>because his/her interests are in ham radio instead of SWL is bound to
>be angering to such an individual--and with good cause.

Why? Those groups are perfectly capable of getting their own bills. The
satellite TV folks' exception only covers TV reception antennas - it doesn't
even extend to FM broadcast radio. Do you see lots of anger about that?

It is important to be clear about what the bill would do if passed. It would
NOT give hams blanket permission to violate deed restrictions or put up
any antenna they desire.

In most cases, what we're really talking about is being allowed to put up
a simple wire antenna or maybe a vertical. Or two. Yet in many areas
the rule is "no antennas" of any kind. That's simply unreasonable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3659. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 12:57:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE4FE4D.7A7474F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42878

N2EY wrote:
> In most cases, what we're really talking about is being allowed to put up
> a simple wire antenna or maybe a vertical. Or two. Yet in many areas
> the rule is "no antennas" of any kind. That's simply unreasonable.

Slightly different question - is it unreasonable for an apartment *owner*
to restrict antennas on his property?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3660. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 13:23:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205170523.15d2ca9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42879

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CE3B8C6.87946B57@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >But the question does NOT address the argument.
> >
> > Yes, it does.
>
> If you think that, you don't know what the argument is/was.

"If is for children, spinning daydreams". That's what you're
doing, Cecil.

W0EX and I,(plus many others),are on record as being FOR
"digital" experimentation by hams. That's as simple, honest
and direct as it gets.

I like primroses but I've seen enough for now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3661. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 14:10:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE50F3B.785EDDEF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42880

N2EY wrote:
> W0EX and I,(plus many others),are on record as being FOR
> "digital" experimentation by hams. That's as simple, honest
> and direct as it gets.

If that is true, then why did Dick respond negatively to my
suggestion that digital experimentation would be a good thing?
Methinks y'all speak with forked tongue.

When I said I would like to see as many hams experimenting
with digital systems as there were hams experimenting with
SSB in the late 50's, Dick replied, "Well, there you have it.
You don't know what you are talking about."

Jim, you may be able to rationalize that as a positive
statement, and if you can, you really have a talent for
delusions. In my book, "don't" is a negative.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

3662. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 14:48:26 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <59BBCB1D780EDE42.269760C338CD9FA5.35FE1AE918BF741E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42881

On Fri, 17 May 2002 06:18:26 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Maybe you missed the point. Why make an illegal transmission when one
>can do the same thing on a cellphone for free (as long as one doesn't
>exceed one's subscribed limits)? Are the rewards worth the risk?

Ask all those freebanders we hear every day.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3663. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 15:09:46 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <AE412A7AA428C472.7055291F7168CFF0.60F1C14CA996D40F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42882

On Thu, 16 May 2002 12:59:11 -0400, Rick Adams
<adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote:

> Actually, it was based on a concept of contractual freedom.
>Unlike laws and ordinances, CC&Rs are _voluntary_ limitations accepted
>by the purchaser.

"Voluntary" is hardly the word for it when they're mandatory on all
the houses available within a two-hour drive of your workplace.

>You _can't_ "pass" a CC&R that is binding on anyone
>after they have made their purchase--it can only be introduced prior
>to sale.

True for CC&Rs, but not for HOAs' rules, which are also a serious
problem.

>If, for example, no one chose
>to open a fast serve restaurant in your community, it would certainly
>not justify a government agency requiring full service restaurants to
>open drive-thru windows and sell low cost food.

Apples to oranges; nobody's being forced to do anything. They only
have to limit what they do to control others.

>Why should the government have the right to limit the
>restrictions YOU as seller place on a piece of property?

What right do you have to restrict anything on a piece of property
that you're voluntarily surrendering your interests in?

>To see his or her
>neighbor granted an exception (by law) to those restrictions simply
>because his/her interests are in ham radio instead of SWL is bound to
>be angering to such an individual--and with good cause.

Tech study guide: $10
Tech exam: $10
Coming to the realization that licenses (by definition, even) permit
you to do things that unlicensed people can't: Priceless

>As hams, we
>may _claim_ that the ARS exists for emergency communications, and that
>all hams are potential emergency communicators and thus should be
>exempt from antenna restrictions. That claim, however, is hollow as
>most of us know.

Really? Damn, I guess I should stop wasting my time and getting wet
for those SKYWARN callups.

>There is a relatively small percentage of hams who
>are sincerely interested in emergency communications (look at the
>turn-out for disaster preparedness practices--it certainly doesn't
>represent more than a small fraction of the licensed amateurs in any
>given community) or in message handling

"Licensed" and "active" are two different things. Since the licenses
are good for ten years, there are a lot of licensed corpses out there.
Personally, I wouldn't let them check into the nets if they wanted to.
Others can't afford to keep their rigs working, or don't bother to
maintain a VHF rig at all.

Of the people we hear on the two primary repeaters daily, I'd estimate
70% or better turn up for our local NTS nets at least once a week, and
participation in area ARES/RACES training nets is pretty high most of
the time.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3664. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 15:16:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE51EBD.970571F0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42883

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> >Maybe you missed the point. Why make an illegal transmission when one
> >can do the same thing on a cellphone for free (as long as one doesn't
> >exceed one's subscribed limits)? Are the rewards worth the risk?
>
> Ask all those freebanders we hear every day.

Which was my original point. Why freeband if you can't work skip?
I don't hear any freebanders not working skip.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

3665. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 15:21:57 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <6E005C6DDB10CE03.A8426F70AA38BE5D.98FC98FF2C255318@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42884

On Fri, 17 May 2002 03:50:45 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

> the power
> company did an energy balance and proved to us that it's a negative
> heating factor,

Oh, and I'm sure that's quite unbiased.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3666. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 15:27:44 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <F2FD2013B5E00ABE.F27AA7A448586E95.4F1DC6315599C87D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42885

On Fri, 17 May 2002 07:57:49 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In most cases, what we're really talking about is being allowed to put up
>> a simple wire antenna or maybe a vertical. Or two. Yet in many areas
>> the rule is "no antennas" of any kind. That's simply unreasonable.
>
>Slightly different question - is it unreasonable for an apartment *owner*
>to restrict antennas on his property?

That's a *completely* different question; an apartment owner isn't
transferring all interest in the property to a tenant.

Insofar as how it relates to broadcast receiving antennas, look at the
restrictions they are allowed to place on those; can you put up an 80m
dipole in an apartment without leaving the 'area designated for your
exclusive use?' It ain't going to fit on my balcony.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3667. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 15:50:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205170750.621707a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42886

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<abu3508d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020514072735.06141.00000646@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > In article <abogqm22t74@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> > <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
> >
> > >Those are the frequency bands where I have heard the most abusive,
> > >profane and just plain inconsiderate operation ever, that I have
> > >listened to on the shortwave reciever.
> >
> > A simple, direct answer to a simple, direct question. Thanks Ryan.
> >
> > What mode(s) were the abusive, profane and just plain inconsiderate
> > operators using?
>
> HF phone

That is what I suspected.

In my 35 years on the ham bands, I have found that abusive, profane and
inconsiderate behavior is practically nonexistent among amateur CW
operators. It's simply "not done". I understand the same is true of
"digital" modes like PSK31.

> > > Really makes me want to "cash in" my CSCE's and jump
> > >right on HF eh?
> >
> > Exactly.

> My enthusiasm for HF is not what it what it used to be. Me thinks I will
> stay a SWL'er like I originally was, for a while as far as that part of the
> spectrum is concerned.

I suggest that you don't restrict your opinion and experience of HF amateur
radio to what you hear on the 'phone subbands. CW and digital modes offer
a very different environment and experience.

> I can only speak for my local area, but I have never
> heard yet a full blown arguement, or profanity other than the occaisional
> use of the word "hell" (heard on 4 times in almost 2 years) and that was
> during a stressfull situation a person saw occur directly in front of them.
> (We all slip once in a while, no matter how perfect or prudent we think we
> are. Only one person that is that close to perfect and he's got a severe
> aversion to high places combined with nails!) Anything that I have heard
> that would be construed even in the most vague sense of an argument were of

> the debate format. One night there was me, and 3 others who wound up
> holding a debate on a particular subject, with four of us with clearly
> different opinions on the matter, and we all acted and operated in a way
> that would impress anyone. As far as that goes, whether or not we agreed
> with one another, we got along, and that is most important thing. And I
> also believe we all learned a few things from the debate. For the record,
> this was for over 3 hours the four of us held this debate in the
> "roundtable" format on a simplex 2 meter freq.

I wish it were that way everywhere, and on all bands. But there are "bad
apples" on all bands. Look up kg6iro on the ARRL website - not a nice story.

> There was another post with the past few days that sums up my feelings about
> operation..... get to know locally, and slowly but in a postive manner
> move outward. That also applies for my knowledge of ham radio.

That's not a bad approach at all.

> I met the
> requirements set forth at the time, and will never stop learning. That is
> the beauty of ham radio; there is so much damned stuff to learn, that you
> could never learn EVERYTHING in one lifetime.

I agree 100%. After 35 years I'm still learning new ham radio stuff every day.

--

One important difference about local vs. nonlocal radio is the possibility of
actually meeting the people involved. The folks one can reach on 2 meter simplex
or one of the local repeaters are, for the most part, one's neighbors. On HF,
the anonymity is much greater, and the possibility of actually meeting someone
in person much less. Some people behave poorly in such circumstances.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3668. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 16:11:25 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020517121125.19889.00000182@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 42887

I think this would be a good idea. Actually demonstate some techincal skills and operation skills, Morse code in addtion to a written test.

These days, these things are not required. Only some of the operational aspects, some basic antenna setup, knowledge of FCC rules are truly required. Amateur radio will not fall apart if there is no test on the technical part or a test of Morse code.

This is what should be the first licence class. Then, if you desire higher classes, you should be tested on the technical areas. Each licence class should have a practical demonstration required.

Lets not make Morse code required for those that do not want it.The technician, general, or extra class licence tests, do not test operational skills, and should stay that way. Operation certifications such as Morse, contest logging, emergency communicatios, could be included on an individual basis, but not as part of licence class structure (as Morse code is right now before you can upgrade above Technician).

Also, lets change the name of the licence classes. The name of Technician for the first licence class is not fitting to what is actually tested and required. Lets just call them basic, intermediate, advanced, extra.

>Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
>From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 5/16/2002 10:04 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3CE3BC6D.431112A7@psu.edu>
>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> I'd like to see some hands-on practical testing of basic ham skills.
>> Something like "Here's some pieces of coax, a PL-259, a female
>> BNC connector, a female N connector, and a female SMA
>> connector, a soldering iron, and all other necessary tools. Pick
>> any two connectors, and properly install them on the appropriate
>> piece of coax (different types given to match the application usually
>> associated with the respective connector)."
>
> This one is interesting, and of course a problem. But let's see what we
>could do here.
>
> The VE's could have a class in which they have the students get
>familiar with soldering equipment. have the person solder a few things
>together ala your suggestion. Give the applicant a batch of resistors, a
>multimeter, and after they read the color code and predict what values
>the resistors are, have them read the things with the multimeter. There

>can be other things like this. Simple stuff, keeping in mind that the
>techs are often at the bottom of the learning curve.
>
>
>
> The applicant takes this portion of the testing at the class at which
>he or she attends. The VE/ instructor would verify that the applicant
>did okay on this portion of the testing. Now here is where I end up with
>a problem. In my case, I did all the studying and testing on my own, and
>took no classes. So I would have a problem here, unless the rules were
>arranged that I would have to take the class.
>
> But it is still an intersting and needed part of the ham experience
IMO.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

3669. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 16:29:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE52FE6.D721B8D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42888

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >Slightly different question - is it unreasonable for an apartment *owner*
> >to restrict antennas on his property?
>
> That's a *completely* different question;

No, a completely different question would be, "Why do so many
people like chocolate ice cream?" :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

3670. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 16:45:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE533C3.162AA0BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42889

N2EY wrote:
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:

> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > What mode(s) were the abusive, profane and just plain inconsiderate
> > > operators using?
> >
> > HF phone
>
> That is what I suspected.
>
> In my 35 years on the ham bands, I have found that abusive, profane and
> inconsiderate behavior is practically nonexistent among amateur CW
> operators. It's simply "not done". I understand the same is true of
> "digital" modes like PSK31.

Of course, the digital modes, including CW, do not lend themselves
well to emotional outbursts. If I am angry enough to utter obscenities,
my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type on a
keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
the microphone. (Not that I personally would ever do something like that.)

CW doesn't change human behavior but, like a straight jacket, inhibits
certain forms of human behavior. Virtually all of those obscene HF phone
hams have passed a Morse code exam. It is simply extremely easier for any
ham who chooses such behavior to misbehave on phone rather than on CW.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

3671. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 17:31:01 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE53E55.5441372E@psu.edu>
Source record: 42890

CAM wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > Dunno, but by this time, I have the firm opinion that the ARS testing
> > procedure should be something of a challenge to pass. I'm not talking
> > about needing an EE degree. I'm talking about the prospective amateur
> > needing to expend *effort* to get the license. The applicant should be
> > serious enough that they work at it.
>
> What about the graduate EE for whom the exam is effortless? What kind
> of work should they have to do?

The Morse is some work, at least from my perspective. I won't paint this issue with too broad a brush. The written was pretty easy for me, the Morse was not. Others will have difficulty with one, both, or will find the whole thing easy. I like to look at it from the average persons perspective. While some people are genius's, they are in the minority.

Obviously we can't make things so difficult that the brightest and most knowledgeable have trouble passing. That would exclude most of the rest of us.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3672. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 18:37:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205171037.3ba088f0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42891

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<VAZE8.2954$o15.107240631@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0205151157.1c80866a@posting.google.com...
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:<c5jE8.991$D41.87393@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > > The June Q-Street in the world above 50 MHz has a description of JT44
> > > which is designed for EME which epitomizes a decent approach to digital
> > > communication. It is among other things self-adjusting between -2 and
> +4
> > > seconds in clock diff (mildly useful on an EME path) and a 600 Hz
> > > frequency difference which is also damned useful for a method that
> copies
> > > below audibility.
> >
> > And it's just one tool in the toolbox of that software.
> > >
> > > Gee whiz, somebody thought it thru and used the available intelligence
> for
> > > something intelligent.
> >
> > Dig out QST for December, 2001 to see who that "somebody" is. One of
> > those old-time 20 wpm code-tested Extras.....
> >
> > >Will miracles never cease.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim, are you saying that if he weren't a 20wpm Examinee, then he wouldn't be
> smart or he wouldn't have designed JT44?

Nope.

I'm simply saying:

Look at who is actually DOING the cutting-edge stuff in ham radio and letting
other hams know about it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3673. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 20:29:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205171229.64480192@posting.google.com>
Source record: 42892

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CE50F3B.785EDDEF@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > W0EX and I,(plus many others),are on record as being FOR
> > "digital" experimentation by hams. That's as simple, honest
> > and direct as it gets.
>
> If that is true,

"If is for children, spinning daydreams". Your own words, Cecil.

You're simply trying to avoid the actual argument and the fact
you've been proven incorrect. The primrose fertilizer is getting
quite deep.

All your base are belong to us, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3674. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 20:40:52 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE56AD3.AF1340D3@psu.edu>
Source record: 42893

N2EY wrote:

> In my 35 years on the ham bands, I have found that abusive, profane and
> inconsiderate behavior is practically nonexistent among amateur CW
> operators. It's simply "not done". I understand the same is true of
> "digital" modes like PSK31.

I can vouch for the gentlmanly aspect of PSK31 comms. Only time I ever saw anything less than polite was when one fellow was telling another to turn down his power and audio drive - apparently for the umpteenth time. But even then it was a simple admonishment.

But it does take some time to get used to the Euro-Hams calling you "dear"! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3675. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 20:46:43 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE56C32.4175D77F@psu.edu>
Source record: 42894

CAM wrote:

> Of course, the digital modes, including CW, do not lend themselves
> well to emotional outbursts. If I am angry enough to utter obscenities,
> my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type on a
> keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
> the microphone. (Not that I personally would ever do something like that.)

> CW doesn't change human behavior but, like a straight jacket, inhibits
> certain forms of human behavior. Virtually all of those obscene HF phone
> hams have passed a Morse code exam. It is simply extremely easier for any
> ham who chooses such behavior to misbehave on phone rather than on CW.

It's more than that on PSK31, tho'. I never hear anyone throwing up a carrier to interfere with anyone.

And the comparison to a straightjacket doesn't hold either, because I think we've all seen plenty of typed profanity in the newsgroups. And the reason that Morse doesn't lend itself to profanity or Yelling is that it just feels silly to tap that stuff out. I know, when I was learning to send, I tried it (off the air of course) and it just felt dumb.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3676. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 21:33:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <0HeF8.3490$IF1.124044465@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42895

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CE47A34.6DC1F380@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CE2BF7D.415B5C28@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to
> > emulate >
> > > > > a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would
> > appear
> > > > > that modems emulate humans.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem,
humans
> > > > emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper
tape.
> > > > >
> > > > > Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> > > > electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
> > > >
> > > > Sure there are, Brian. Morse has been sent and received by humans
since
> > > the inception of radio.
> > >
> > > Not since the inception of Morse. Humans emulating modems can be >
dispensed of. No need to bog yourself down with that stuff, unless > you
want to.
>
> Trying reading what I've written instead of searching for meaning
> between the lines. I didn't write anything about the inception of
> morse. I'm not a railroad telegrapher nor have I used American Morse.
> (See "...since the inception of radio").

Dave, you dispense with trying to read between the lines. Try reading -the-
lines.

Morse was conceived to be copied by a machine with a pen dragging along a
paper tape. Now don't try changing the subject again.

> > > I'll wager you've never even SEEN an
> > > electro-writer.
> >
> > Why would you wager that, when I'm the one who introduced the term to
the
> > thread?
>
> I didn't offer a wager based on your introduction of the term. I
> wagered you've never seen one.
>
> > Are you a sucker?
>
> ...apparently not.

How much do you want to wager?

> Dave K8MN
> "Modems try to emulate me but they haven't developed one which can smoke
> a cigarette and sip iced tea."

I'll bet you blow a lot of smoke, too.

3677. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 21:44:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE579B2.B86E7A76@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42896

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CE50F3B.785EDDEF@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > W0EX and I,(plus many others),are on record as being FOR
> > > "digital" experimentation by hams. That's as simple, honest
> > > and direct as it gets.
> >
> > If that is true,
>
> "If is for children, spinning daydreams". Your own words, Cecil.

The final act of someone who has lost the argument is to edit out almost
the entire posting.

Here's the posting that Dick made. It speaks for itself.

> CAM wrote:
> > Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams experimenting
> > with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the early
> > 1950's. There's almost no hardware design expertise necessary to buy a DSP
> > eval board and get to experimenting.

Dick responded:
> Well, there you have it. You don't even know what you're saying.

Good luck on convincing people that a sentence with "don't" in it is
really a positive response. It's not like you to try to defend an
indefensible position.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3678. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 21:50:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <IWeF8.3496$QP1.124648711@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42897

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CE579B2.B86E7A76@IEEE.org...

> Good luck on convincing people that a sentence with "don't" in it is
> really a positive response. It's not like you to try to defend an
> indefensible position.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cronyism allows it.

3679. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 22:33:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <KyfF8.2814$275.146246960@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42898

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message
news:abp4l6$45a$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> What about 6 meters? Not much commercial demand for that is there?
>
> As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO).
They
> wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to
VHF
> repeaters lately? See my point.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Dan, the repeaters were vacated prior to HF being made "easier to get."

3680. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 22:50:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CE58952.5BC3AD49@adelphia.net>
Source record: 42899

That's kind of off the subject, but since you throw that in what do we do with people who have ADD? And if they have something like ADD *and* one of these other problems, should they be exempted from everything?

- Mike KB3EIA -

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Here's another one of those little problems: Do we have
> medical waivers for people who have any number of possible
> ailments or disabilities: One arm, arthritis, lost fingers,
> paralized arm, hand, etc?
>
> Something to think about.
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
> -

3681. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 23:21:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <GfgF8.7068$UZ7.207680857@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42900

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020516220045.15933.00000083@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <ac0cp95tgm@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >
> >I have talked with a couple of teenagers that just got licensed recently
and
> >they feel severly dis-illusioned. They say that there is no one to talk
> >to..... at least someone close to their age around here. Up until about
3
> >months ago, I WAS the youngest ham in our county, at 31 years old.
>
> Ryan:
>
> Sooo, what were these lonely teen-aged hams proposing to *do* about
> the fact they had "no one to talk to" ...other than whine about it? Were
> they planning some sort of presentation to their classmates about
> amateur radio, with a demonstration of HF voice, digital modes, and
> maybe even some (heaven forbid) CW? Did these teen-aged hams
> think of approaching a QSO with an older ham from a standpoint of
> asking for his/her help with a technical issue, or just general knowledge-
> gathering (assuming the "older" ham *has* the knowledge to give,
> which may not necessarily be the case these days!)? Did these
> teen-aged hams come to a local radio club meeting and introduce
> themselves to their fellow hams and request their assistance in becoming
> active participants on the local scene? (Hint: if they did arrive with
> baggy pants, green hair, untied shoes, multiple body piercings and/or
> tatoos, I surely hope they didn't expect to stay long!) Are these
teen-aged
> hams getting themselves involved with HF, or are they limiting themselves
> to the handshack?
>
> I think that teen-agers are just as capable of becoming active hams
> now as they ever have been. It has always meant that they had to
> and will have to interact with older hams. If these teen agers are
> allowing their New-Age, dumbed-down culture get in their way of said
> interaction, that's THEIR problem, not one of the older hams. There
> is such a thing in this world as convention, and older people, older
> hams in partucular, usually adhere to it. If these teen-aged hams are
> expecting to present themselves as New Age punks and be given a
> pass on it, they won't be attending very many radio club meetings
> anywhere I've ever been a club member!
>

> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Well there you have it.

3682. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 23:29:35 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zngF8.7075$P5.207875306@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43001

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CE4E22F.CA6ED4AC@IEEE.org...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > Dunno, but by this time, I have the firm opinion that the ARS testing
> > procedure should be something of a challenge to pass. I'm not talking
> > about needing an EE degree. I'm talking about the prospective amateur
> > needing to expend *effort* to get the license. The applicant should be
> > serious enough that they work at it.
>
> What about the graduate EE for whom the exam is effortless? What kind
> of work should they have to do?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I think this is the part where they get spanked with a cricket bat, then
say, "Thank you sir, may I have another?"

3683. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 23:53:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE597D7.A3F36017@earthlink.net>
Source record: 43002

```
Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CE47A34.6DC1F380@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3CE2BF7D.415B5C28@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want to
> > > emulate >
> > > > > > a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It would
> > > appear
> > > > > > > that modems emulate humans.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem,
> humans
> > > > > > emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper
> tape.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating an
> > > > > > electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure there are, Brian. Morse has been sent and received by humans
> since
> > > > > the inception of radio.
> > > >
> > > > Not since the inception of Morse. Humans emulating modems can be >
> dispensed of. No need to bog yourself down with that stuff, unless > you
> want to.
> > >
> > > Trying reading what I've written instead of searching for meaning
> > > between the lines. I didn't write anything about the inception of
> > > morse. I'm not a railroad telegrapher nor have I used American Morse.
> > > (See "...since the inception of radio").
```

>
> Dave, you dispense with trying to read between the lines. Try reading -the-
> lines.

I did just that, Brian. It is obvious that you have no point.

> Morse was conceived to be copied by a machine with a pen dragging along a
> paper tape. Now don't try changing the subject again.
>
> > > > I'll wager you've never even SEEN an
> > > > electro-writer.
> > >
> > > Why would you wager that, when I'm the one who introduced the term to
> the
> > > thread?
> >
> > I didn't offer a wager based on your introduction of the term. I
> > wagered you've never seen one.
> >
> > > Are you a sucker?
> >
> > ...apparently not.
>
> How much do you want to wager?

What's it worth to you?

> > Dave K8MN
> > "Modems try to emulate me but they haven't developed one which can smoke
> > a cigarette and sip iced tea."
>
> I'll bet you blow a lot of smoke, too.

I don't inhale.

Dave K8MN

3684. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-17 23:53:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE59811.58093BBF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 43003

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CE50F3B.785EDDEF@IEEE.org>...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > W0EX and I,(plus many others),are on record as being FOR
> > > > "digital" experimentation by hams. That's as simple, honest
> > > > and direct as it gets.
> > >
> > > If that is true,
> > >
> > "If is for children, spinning daydreams". Your own words, Cecil.
>
> The final act of someone who has lost the argument is to edit out almost
> the entire posting.
>
> Here's the posting that Dick made. It speaks for itself.
>
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Speaking for me, I would like to see as many present day hams experimenting
> > > with digital modes as there were hams experimenting with SSB in the early
> > > 1950's. There's almost no hardware design expertise necessary to buy a DSP
> > > eval board and get to experimenting.
>
> Dick responded:
> > Well, there you have it. You don't even know what you're saying.
>
> Good luck on convincing people that a sentence with "don't" in it is
> really a positive response. It's not like you to try to defend an
> indefensible position.

"Don't forget to write."

Dave K8MN

3685. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 00:06:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020517200639.03813.00000057@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 43004

In article <AE412A7AA428C472.7055291F7168CFF0.60F1C14CA996D40F@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On Thu, 16 May 2002 12:59:11 -0400, Rick Adams
><adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote:
>
>> Actually, it was based on a concept of contractual freedom.
>>Unlike laws and ordinances, CC&Rs are _voluntary_ limitations accepted
>>by the purchaser.
>
>"Voluntary" is hardly the word for it when they're mandatory on all
>the houses available within a two-hour drive of your workplace.

Exactly. Real estate is not portable.
>
>>You _can't_ "pass" a CC&R that is binding on anyone
>>after they have made their purchase--it can only be introduced prior
>>to sale.
>
>True for CC&Rs, but not for HOAs' rules, which are also a serious
>problem.

There is also the business of finding out what the restrictions are in the
first place. Of course everyone should find them BEFORE signing anything,
but in some areas it's mighty difficult to get to the actual CC&Rs.
>
>>If, for example, no one chose
>>to open a fast serve restaurant in your community, it would certainly
>>not justify a government agency requiring full service restaurants to
>>open drive-thru windows and sell low cost food.
>
>Apples to oranges; nobody's being forced to do anything. They only
>have to limit what they do to control others.

I agree 100%. Deed restrictions are about stopping people from doing things.
>
>>Why should the government have the right to limit the
>>restrictions YOU as seller place on a piece of property?
>
Particularly if the seller will bear absolutely no responsibility for the sold
property, and the restriction is unchangeable and never expires?

>What right do you have to restrict anything on a piece of property
>that you're voluntarily surrendering your interests in?

Bingo.
>
>>To see his or her
>>neighbor granted an exception (by law) to those restrictions simply
>>because his/her interests are in ham radio instead of SWL is bound to
>>be angering to such an individual--and with good cause.

The SWL has options:

1) Get a ham license and claim the antennas are amateur radio antennas.
2) Get the SWL organizations to follow the ARRL's lead

>Tech study guide: $10
>Tech exam: $10
>Coming to the realization that licenses (by definition, even) permit
>you to do things that unlicensed people can't: Priceless

HAW! I love that one! Can I use it?

>>As hams, we
>>may _claim_ that the ARS exists for emergency communications, and that
>>all hams are potential emergency communicators and thus should be
>>exempt from antenna restrictions. That claim, however, is hollow as
>>most of us know.
>
>Really? Damn, I guess I should stop wasting my time and getting wet
>for those SKYWARN callups.

Traffic nets, public service comms, etc. Just because some hams don't do it
doesn't mean there is no value in it.

There is also the educational aspect.
>
>>There is a relatively small percentage of hams who
>>are sincerely interested in emergency communications (look at the
>>turn-out for disaster preparedness practices--it certainly doesn't
>>represent more than a small fraction of the licensed amateurs in any
>>given community) or in message handling
>
>"Licensed" and "active" are two different things. Since the licenses
>are good for ten years, there are a lot of licensed corpses out there.
>Personally, I wouldn't let them check into the nets if they wanted to.
>Others can't afford to keep their rigs working, or don't bother to
>maintain a VHF rig at all.

>Of the people we hear on the two primary repeaters daily, I'd estimate
>70% or better turn up for our local NTS nets at least once a week, and
>participation in area ARES/RACES training nets is pretty high most of
>the time.

That's good.

But most important of all, any ham could become interested in emergency
comms in the future - maybe even as a result of having a decent antenna.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3686. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 00:44:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gw9yfai.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43005

On Fri, 17 May 2002 10:21:57 -0500, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>> the power
>> company did an energy balance and proved to us that it's a negative
>> heating factor,
>
>Oh, and I'm sure that's quite unbiased.

The bias would have been on our side - they would have loved to sell
us the heating power to make up the loss.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3687. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 02:12:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <nMiF8.1402$xF1.1364@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43006

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> That's kind of off the subject, but since you throw that in what do we
> do with people who have ADD? And if they have something like ADD *and*
> one of these other problems, should they be exempted from everything?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > Here's another one of those little problems: Do we have
> > medical waivers for people who have any number of possible
> > ailments or disabilities: One arm, arthritis, lost fingers,
> > paralized arm, hand, etc?
> >
> > Something to think about.
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK

Unfortunately, there are some folks who will be unable to qualify for a license. Sometimes you just can't do some of the things you want to. For example, I'm physically unable to qualify for the local amateur baseball team. I'll get over it.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3688. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 02:20:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020517222010.14911.00000199@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 43007

In article <FhZE8.2939$eW4.106815787@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Bill:
>>
>> Obviously you've never been shouted down at an ARRL Forum merely
>> for bringing up the subject of code testing requirements. Lucky you.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>You're probably telling the truth, here. Was your opinion Pro-Code Exam, or
>No-Code Exam?

Brian:

What do YOU think? I was shouted down by a size 22 No-code Tech YL who's first reaction was "Oh GAWWWWD No!" the first time I mentioned code testing requirements, and gave a Betty Davis-like shrew tirade before I could finish my second sentence. This quickly degenerated to personal attacks from a few of her supporters. Hugh Turnbull's only remark: "Well, what about the digital modes? They're the future of ham radio!" Kay Craigie just stood up at the front of the room and allowed the NCTA-YL shrew to take control of the forum, making it a personal attack against me, with all of the classic NCTA bromides, and made no attempt to restore order to the meeting and allow me to even get my own comments all the way out. I had intended to ask them (the ARRL officials) what they were doing to support their 1993 BoD resolution to support code testing in any future proceedings on amateur license testing. I never got an answer to my question. It was the ugliest public scene I've ever witnessed, and the ARRL has been irrepairably damaged in my esteem, and my personal relationship with Turnbull and Craigie has been strained, ever since. This occurred at the ARRL Maryland State Convention at the Timonium, MD hamfest, May, 1995.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3689. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 02:37:54 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CE5BE82.2070000@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43008

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>
>>Brian, this slamming of fellow Hams: YOU need to get over it.
>>
>>de KR4AJ
>>
>
> Why?
>
> Does Larry react to your question the same way he would have reacted to it
> if you had been a No Code Technician?

No, if it were a no-code tech he probably would have needed to stick to
one-syllable words.

> No, and there is ample proof of that
> in the archives.
>
> Does Larry treat people fairly?

Should everyone in the world be treated the same? Are you a communist?

>
> Does Larry respect my opinions?

Absolutely, assuming said opinions are rational.

>
> Does Larry seem interested in a fair and two-way exchange of ideas?

Anybody who participates in this ng would be, that is as long as they
pass the muster of advanced class or extra class consideration.

> Its his way or the highway - "Don't let the door hit you in the ass on your
> exit of amateur radio."

You seem to have a problem communicating with certain people. do you
have it in for advanced and extras?

>
> Meanwhile, you Dan, keep prolonging the hoax.

What hoax? This appears to be a delusion. Ask yourself Brian, why would
I try to play a hoax on you? Besides, it would be too easy to pull off a
hoax on a simple no-code tech.

73

3690. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 12:49:04 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <527563DA45A58713.BA7FE6F755ADBE93.C3CD7C82B5DFB700@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43009

On 18 May 2002 00:06:39 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>There is also the business of finding out what the restrictions are in the
>first place. Of course everyone should find them BEFORE signing anything,
>but in some areas it's mighty difficult to get to the actual CC&Rs.

IMO, this is something that needs to be addressed by the individual
states; require the seller to provide a copy of *all* restrictions
before the sale is completed. Void them if it isn't done.

>>Tech study guide: $10
>>Tech exam: $10
>>Coming to the realization that licenses (by definition, even) permit
>>you to do things that unlicensed people can't: Priceless
>
>HAW! I love that one! Can I use it?

Of course.

>But most important of all, any ham could become interested in emergency
>comms in the future - maybe even as a result of having a decent antenna.

I hear a few people from time to time mention that they don't check
into the Late Net regularly because they can't have a good antenna at
home. Considering that:
a) it's 2m
b) I can usually hit that repeater on vacation from 90mi out with a
J-pole up at 15ft
c) at least one of our once-or-twice-a-week crowd has a good signal
from 45mi out with a mobile halfwave
they aren't needing a 27-element yagi on a 190ft tower, they just need
a way to get their HOA to let them put a groundplane on the roof.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
Net Manager, DFW Late Traffic Net
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3691. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 14:03:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <WatF8.7485$Jp3.219802815@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43010

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020517080656.10400.00000041@mb-fm.aol.com...

> Not a valid analogy. Is there a community in America with no drive-thrus?
> I think not.

It might help reduce imported oil if there were.

3692. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 14:07:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020518100708.19574.00000045@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 43011

In article <GNVE8.10951$3U6.8807451@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, Bruce Burke
<wb4yucXX@junoXX.com> writes:

>Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in
>news:3B3E14B7BDB7D250.A050924D41C01AA6.D182CA432E4AFA5C@lp.airnews.net:
>>
>> Actually, it was based on a concept of contractual freedom.
>
>that is something that should be a two-way street, yet try and remove oe of
>those things from the contract and watch what happens.

In most cases the seller is powerless to remove them, too. Deed restrictions
are intentionally designed to be almost un-removable.
>
>> Unlike laws and ordinances, CC&Rs are _voluntary_ limitations accepted
>> by the purchaser.

Not true. Consider this: "Laws and ordinances are 'voluntary', too - if you
don't like them, don't live where they apply." That's what you're saying, in
effect.

>You're forgetting that property is offered essentially as is, try and
>remove that clause from the contract and see if they'll sell it to you.
>There is nothing voluntary about it - other than to pass on the property
>entirely. Some feedom.

Exactly.

>>To many people, the concept of the government invalidating
>> those agreements is a clear threat to their right to enter into a
>> binding contract and is an infringement of the private sector.

Was the TV antenna preemption right or wrong?
>
>What about the infringement of the landowner to use HIS property
>resonably as he sees fit? Doesn't it seem strange that we would allow some
>third party to dictate how we are going to live on a piece of property we
>own as a condition of the sale? It's the equivalent of buying a boat with a
>condition that you could only use it on the ocean when you live in
>Colorado.

Good analogy, with an added feature that the boat builder has no connection
with you after you buy the boat - yet you must still follow his rules, as must
anyone you sell the boat to.

>WHile I realize that local governments have all sorts of laws
>that control useage, at least they are always negotiable. Deed restrictions

>are not.

That is the #1 key point. Laws, codes, and zoning are all changeable, and exceptions are granted every day. Why should a deed restriction be above the law?
>
>My personal opinion is that we have become so anti-social that instead of
>being reponsible to each other as neighbors about how our community looks,
>we would rather pass the buck to someone else to do it for us.
>
Good point. Here's another: Many people simply accept the restrictions because it is simply too much hassle to avoid them. The builders put them in as boilerplate, without really thinking. ("We've always done it this way") and once they are in place they are all but unbreakable.

And they do not allow for changes in technology or the way we live.

There was a case in California where deed restrictions required that all roofs be covered with either wood (cedar or pine shakes) or clay tile (very expensive). Almost all houses in that area had wood covered roofs.

Then it was discovered that the wood roofs were a major fire hazard in the dry season. Sparks and embers from a nearby fires would cause it to spread much faster because the dry wood roof caught fire very easily. Replacing with tile was a huge financial burden on the homeowners. End result was that the deed restrictions were preempted and other roofing materials permitted. Was this a good decison, or should the homeowners have been forced to replace with the expensive tile? (Note: Nobody was forced to replace a good roof. The rules were about re-roofing.)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3693. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 14:08:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BftF8.7486$lr3.219908278@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43012

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:527563DA45A58713.BA7FE6F755ADBE93.C3CD7C82B5DFB700@lp.airnews.net...
> On 18 May 2002 00:06:39 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >There is also the business of finding out what the restrictions are in
the
> >first place. Of course everyone should find them BEFORE signing anything,
> >but in some areas it's mighty difficult to get to the actual CC&Rs.
>
> IMO, this is something that needs to be addressed by the individual
> states; require the seller to provide a copy of *all* restrictions
> before the sale is completed. Void them if it isn't done.
>
> >>Tech study guide: $10
> >>Tech exam: $10
> >>Coming to the realization that licenses (by definition, even) permit
> >>you to do things that unlicensed people can't: Priceless
> >
> >HAW! I love that one! Can I use it?
>
> Of course.
>
> >But most important of all, any ham could become interested in emergency
> >comms in the future - maybe even as a result of having a decent antenna.
>
> I hear a few people from time to time mention that they don't check
> into the Late Net regularly because they can't have a good antenna at
> home. Considering that:
> a) it's 2m
> b) I can usually hit that repeater on vacation from 90mi out with a
> J-pole up at 15ft
> c) at least one of our once-or-twice-a-week crowd has a good signal
> from 45mi out with a mobile halfwave
> they aren't needing a 27-element yagi on a 190ft tower, they just need
> a way to get their HOA to let them put a groundplane on the roof.

Ventenna is a great idea for that situation. It still violates the rules,
but only if someone notices.

3694. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 14:11:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kitF8.7488$ah3.219304125@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43013

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CE597D7.A3F36017@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CE47A34.6DC1F380@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3CE2BF7D.415B5C28@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:3CE1D6DA.333E1558@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > CW requires a human modem. That's fine for those who want
to
> > > > emulate >
> > > > > > > > a modem. It should be as optional as is any other mode.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > CW use was around long before the modem was developed. It
would
> > > > appear
> > > > > > > > that modems emulate humans.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave, it wouldn't appear that way at all. Prior to the modem,
> > humans
> > > > > > > emulated an electro-writer, scratching dits and dahs on a paper
> > tape.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Would you prefer to be known as emulating a modem, or emulating
an
> > > > > > > electro-writer? Your choice. There are no other alternatives.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Sure there are, Brian. Morse has been sent and received by humans
> > since
> > > > > > the inception of radio.
> > > > >
> > > > > Not since the inception of Morse. Humans emulating modems can be >
> > dispensed of. No need to bog yourself down with that stuff, unless >
you

> > want to.
> > >
> > > Trying reading what I've written instead of searching for meaning
> > > between the lines. I didn't write anything about the inception of
> > > morse. I'm not a railroad telegrapher nor have I used American Morse.
> > > (See "...since the inception of radio").
> > >
> > Dave, you dispense with trying to read between the lines. Try
reading -the-
> > lines.
>
> I did just that, Brian. It is obvious that you have no point.

You changed the subject. That's the obvious part.

> > Morse was conceived to be copied by a machine with a pen dragging along
a
> > paper tape. Now don't try changing the subject again.
> > >
> > > > > I'll wager you've never even SEEN an
> > > > > electro-writer.
> > > > >
> > > > Why would you wager that, when I'm the one who introduced the term
to
> > the
> > > > > thread?
> > > >
> > > I didn't offer a wager based on your introduction of the term. I
> > > wagered you've never seen one.
> > >
> > > > Are you a sucker?
> > >
> > > ...apparently not.
> > >
> > How much do you want to wager?
> >
> What's it worth to you?

How much do you have?

> > > Dave K8MN
> > > "Modems try to emulate me but they haven't developed one which can
smoke
> > > a cigarette and sip iced tea."
> > >
> > I'll bet you blow a lot of smoke, too.
> >
> I don't inhale.
> >
> Dave K8MN

Ha! He really did change how the nation thinks and behaves.

3695. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 14:18:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <6ptF8.7489$iv3.220151877@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43014

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CE5BE82.2070000@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> >
> >>Brian, this slamming of fellow Hams: YOU need to get over it.
> >>
> >>de KR4AJ
> >>
> >
> > Why?
> >
> > Does Larry react to your question the same way he would have reacted to
it
> > if you had been a No Code Technician?
>
>
> No, if it were a no-code tech he probably would have needed to stick to
> one-syllable words.

Well there you have it. Its obvious that you two rehearsed this.

> > No, and there is ample proof of that
> > in the archives.
> >
> > Does Larry treat people fairly?
>
> Should everyone in the world be treated the same? Are you a communist?

Are you some kind of funny guy?

> > Does Larry respect my opinions?
>
> Absolutely, assuming said opinions are rational.
>
Always.
>
> > Does Larry seem interested in a fair and two-way exchange of ideas?
>
> Anybody who participates in this ng would be, that is as long as they
> pass the muster of advanced class or extra class consideration.

Well, there you have it.

> > Its his way or the highway - "Don't let the door hit you in the ass on
your
> > exit of amateur radio."
>
> You seem to have a problem communicating with certain people. do you
> have it in for advanced and extras?

Those were Larry's words, not mine. You would be hearing them straight from
him had you been a Technician. Its just more of the PCTA double-standard.
As an Advanced with 12+ years of experience, you get a pass for asking one
of the most basic questions in amateur radio.

> > Meanwhile, you Dan, keep prolonging the hoax.
>
> What hoax? This appears to be a delusion. Ask yourself Brian, why would
> I try to play a hoax on you? Besides, it would be too easy to pull off a
> hoax on a simple no-code tech.

The hoax is that an Advanced would ask such a silly question, then Larry
answers it with a straight face. I'm still not buying it. You two cooked
this up.

Why? Why do people troll?

3696. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 14:23:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1utF8.7492$Mv3.220179759@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43015

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020517222010.14911.00000199@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <FhZE8.2939$eW4.106815787@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Bill:
> >>
> >> Obviously you've never been shouted down at an ARRL Forum merely
> >> for bringing up the subject of code testing requirements. Lucky you.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >You're probably telling the truth, here. Was your opinion Pro-Code Exam,
or
> >No-Code Exam?
>
> Brian:
>
> What do YOU think? I was shouted down by a size 22 No-code Tech
> YL who's first reaction was "Oh GAWWWWD No!" the first time I
> mentioned code testing requirements, and gave a Betty Davis-like
> shrew tirade before I could finish my second sentence. This
> quickly degenerated to personal attacks from a few of her supporters.
> Hugh Turnbull's only remark: "Well, what about the digital modes?
> They're the future of ham radio!" Kay Craigie just stood up at the
> front of the room and allowed the NCTA-YL shrew to take control of
> the forum, making it a personal attack against me, with all of the
> classic NCTA bromides, and made no attempt to restore order to
> the meeting and allow me to even get my own comments all the
> way out. I had intended to ask them (the ARRL officials) what they
> were doing to support their 1993 BoD resolution to support code
> testing in any future proceedings on amateur license testing. I never
> got an answer to my question. It was the ugliest public scene I've
> ever witnessed, and the ARRL has been irrepairably damaged in
> my esteem, and my personal relationship with Turnbull and Craigie
> has been strained, ever since. This occurred at the ARRL Maryland
> State Convention at the Timonium, MD hamfest, May, 1995.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Well there you have it. You know Larry, you've come on here with that same
size 22 YL attitude concerning no-code Technicians. Luckily, you're not
able to monopolize the group as she did, as we each get to have our say.

If you had to do the 1995 ARRL Maryland State Convention ARRL Forum again, how would you have handled it differently?

3697. How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 14:28:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pytF8.7494$vt3.220037472@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43016

Lack of money on my part.

3698. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 17:41:07 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <TmwF8.22985$D41.614412@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43017

>> Mike, KB3EIA, wrote:
>> That's kind of off the subject, but since
>> you throw that in what do we do with people
>> who have ADD? And if they have something
>> like ADD *and* one of these other problems,
>> should they be exempted from everything?

> Hans, K0HB, wrote:
> Unfortunately, there are some folks who
> will be unable to qualify for a license.
> Sometimes you just can't do some of the
> things you want to. For example, I'm
> physically unable to qualify for the
> local amateur baseball
> team. I'll get over it.

Awwww...

There is a qualitative difference between
a private baseball club that chooses
not to place you on its team and, say, a
governmental agency that grants licenses to
play baseball in public parks. That agency
would be hard-pressed to justify denying
a "baseball license" to someone in a
wheelchair simply because they never make
it to first on a base hit.

You guys just don't get it. *Every* licensing
requirement must be related to a clearly
enunciated regulatory purpose. This is the
basis of the deregulation process, of getting
the government, with it arbitrary rules and
regulations, off the backs of the citizenry.
This process was started by President Reagan
and, despite efforts by the Clintonistas to
hijack it and inject their liberal social-
engineering goals, continues to this day.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3699. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 17:42:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020518134204.01877.00000572@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 43018

>Lack of money on my part.
>

I thought Mcdonalds payed you guys good

3700. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 17:53:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <SywF8.4023$8t.2258@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43019

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote

>
> You guys just don't get it. *Every* licensing
> requirement must be related to a clearly
> enunciated regulatory purpose.
>

Are you saying that someone who is deficient in mathematics due to a learning disorder, poor study habits, or ADD, ought to get a free pass on the technical qualifications for an Amateur Radio license?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3701. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 18:10:15 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <93838ea5090a8c9b007eef8095454e3e.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43020

Hans, you are so good at getting to the point, perhaps you can help me
and interecede on my behalf with the University of Rochester. I simply
do NOT have enough spare neurons left in my brain after many years of
beer blasts and think that they should issue me a degree so I could
practice brain surgery. Please use the 'mashed brain' defense for this
issue.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

ps - if you can't do this, the FCC issues licenses for FM broadcasting.
That would be my next choice if you can't convince the U of R.

"Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:SywF8.4023$8t.2258@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net

>
> "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote
>
>
> >
> > You guys just don't get it. *Every* licensing
> > requirement must be related to a clearly
> > enunciated regulatory purpose.
> >
>
> Are you saying that someone who is deficient in mathematics due to a
> learning disorder, poor study habits, or ADD, ought to get a free pass on
> the technical qualifications for an Amateur Radio license?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3702. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 18:55:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <nsxF8.3251$g82.163736722@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43021

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:TmwF8.22985$D41.614412@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

> You guys just don't get it. *Every* licensing
> requirement must be related to a clearly
> enunciated regulatory purpose.

This is why I think (for Dave: "In my opinion") incentive licensing was
such a bad idea. The knowledge that is required to operate CW effectively
and safely at 28100khz isn't applicable to operate CW at 28099khz. Bah!
Its completely arbitrary.

This is the
> basis of the deregulation process, of getting
> the government, with it arbitrary rules and
> regulations, off the backs of the citizenry.
> This process was started by President Reagan
> and, despite efforts by the Clintonistas to
> hijack it and inject their liberal social-
> engineering goals, continues to this day.
>
>
>
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona

Jeb, thanks for putting it so succinctly.

3703. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 18:56:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <WtxF8.3255$4R2.166313158@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43022

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:93838ea5090a8c9b007eef8095454e3e.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Hans, you are so good at getting to the point, perhaps you can help me
> and interecede on my behalf with the University of Rochester. I simply
> do NOT have enough spare neurons left in my brain after many years of
> beer blasts and think that they should issue me a degree so I could
> practice brain surgery. Please use the 'mashed brain' defense for this
> issue.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> ps - if you can't do this, the FCC issues licenses for FM broadcasting.
> That would be my next choice if you can't convince the U of R.

Perhaps they could issue you a license for assisted suicides.

3704. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 18:58:20 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gvxF8.3260$RS2.166402292@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43023

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020518134204.01877.00000572@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >Lack of money on my part.
>
> I thought Mcdonalds payed you guys good

Nope, its not even good food. Its not even fast. And its often wrong, even after the "manager" checks it.

So why aren't you at Dayton?

3705. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 19:50:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020518155058.15865.00000514@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 43024

>So why aren't you at Dayton?
>

I have no desire to see a bunch of CBers

3706. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 22:09:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020518180919.00518.00000055@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 43025

Two reasons:

1) Lack of time
2) Lack of money

73 de Jim, N2EY

3707. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 23:38:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwbohuk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43026

On Sat, 18 May 2002 14:08:34 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>Ventenna is a great idea for that situation. It still violates the rules,
>but only if someone notices.

Same thing for a 75 foot tower with stacked monobander beams....,.

I always advise folks to look for restrictions that say "no <choose
your item> may be installed without permission of the Association".

Then at least you have negotiation room.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

3708. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 23:38:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwbotrl.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43027

Everyone seemed to ask: So why aren't you at Dayton?

If I would have missed the family doings this weekend I would have had
to go into the Federal Witness Protection Program.

(stolen from Riley Hollingsworth)

And most important, I seem to have misplaced your Visa Card number
to charge it to.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3709. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 23:38:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwbp1ym.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43028

On Sat, 18 May 2002 07:49:04 -0500, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>On 18 May 2002 00:06:39 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>There is also the business of finding out what the restrictions are in the
>>first place. Of course everyone should find them BEFORE signing anything,
>>but in some areas it's mighty difficult to get to the actual CC&Rs.
>
>IMO, this is something that needs to be addressed by the individual
>states; require the seller to provide a copy of *all* restrictions
>before the sale is completed. Void them if it isn't done.

The two states with whose real-property laws I am familiar
(Oregon and California) both require the seller to disclose any
CC&Rs, HOA Rules, or known defects of certain types which
pertain to the property within five days of acceptance of
offer, and there is an additional five day contingency after
disclosure in which the buyer can back out of the deal and get
his deposit back.

When we were looking at homes in metro Portland OR three years
ago, the Realtor would call her office on the cellphone and
have her assistant get a copy of any encumbrances (easements,
CC&Rs, and HOA Rules) pertaining to a property we liked from
the area's major title company which maintained copies for all
the developments in the area, The assistant would get the copy
by fax, and was instructed what to look for in terms of antenna
restrictions. We knew whether the house was worth considering
within an hour. In two cases the seller actually had a copy of
the CC&Rs on site, as was the case when we boight and sold our
condo apartment in California.

Then I would get involved in the detailed legal analysis of the
local ordinances and the encumbrances. If you are not really
qualified to do this analysis yourself, get the advice of a
qualified attorney. A home purchase is usually the largest
single investment that folks make.

If you are a League member, ARRL Volunteer Counsels will give
you an initial consultation without charge. That's a good time
to have the paperwork looked over for potential land mines.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3710. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-18 23:49:40 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020518194940.13629.00000385@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 43029

>>So why aren't you at Dayton?
>>
>
>I have no desire to see a bunch of CBers

At Dayton?!

Mark

3711. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 00:10:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <w3CF8.7898$NT5.229158023@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43030

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020518155058.15865.00000514@mb-ba.aol.com...
> >So why aren't you at Dayton?
> >
>
> I have no desire to see a bunch of CBers

Bruce, do go and change the subject. We were talking about McDonalds!

3712. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 00:11:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <05CF8.7899$IR5.229028964@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43031

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwbotrl.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>
> Everyone seemed to ask: So why aren't you at Dayton?
>
> If I would have missed the family doings this weekend I would have had
> to go into the Federal Witness Protection Program.
>
> (stolen from Riley Hollingsworth)
>
> And most important, I seem to have misplaced your Visa Card number
> to charge it to.

Phil, here, let me post it:

xxxx nnnn oooo 2222, exp.: yy/mm

Brian

3713. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 00:30:04 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CE6F20C.F7FA797C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43032

I'm not that rabid a fan of ham radio..... :-)

Brian P Burke wrote:

> Lack of money on my part.

3714. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 00:34:50 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205190034230.10023-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43033

On 18 May 2002, WA8ULX wrote:
>>Lack of money on my part.
>
> I thought Mcdonalds payed you guys good

That response only shows that having money and having an adequate education are completely separate.

3715. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 00:40:29 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205190037180.10023-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43034

On Sat, 18 May 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
>I'm not that rabid a fan of ham radio..... :-)
>
>Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>> Lack of money on my part.

Fan: n. A person who is a fanatical. [Abbreviated form of "fanatic."]

Fan: n. A device to blow air by use of a propeller or spinning blades.

With the way this newsgroup's posts are, some must wonder if there's any hidden relationship between these words in this context, especially where hot air is involved..... :-)

3716. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 02:07:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020518220708.13422.00000105@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 43038

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gwbp1ym.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

> The two states with whose real-property laws I am familiar
> (Oregon and California) both require the seller to disclose any
> CC&Rs, HOA Rules, or known defects of certain types which
> pertain to the property within five days of acceptance of
> offer, and there is an additional five day contingency after
> disclosure in which the buyer can back out of the deal and get
> his deposit back.

Here in PA, I had to specifically ask to see the deed restrictions before making an offer. My RE attorney had to dig them up from the files at the county seat. Even though this house is more than 50 years old, it has a page and a half of fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing against antennas, though, but a tower might
be difficult, as it may be considered a "structure" due to its permanent nature. In
fact, I do not know of any amateur radio towers in Radnor Township. Kinda odd, considering that Radnor was the home of Charlie Stewart.

Termite and radon testing must be done and such info is usually provided as part of the original package. Many sellers get a licensed home inspector to go over the house (costs about $300 and is worth every penny).

It would be very easy for someone to buy a house here and think they knew what they were getting, yet be in complete ignorance of deed restrictions. Many non-hams I know have no idea what deed restrictions are.

> Then I would get involved in the detailed legal analysis of the
> local ordinances and the encumbrances. If you are not really
> qualified to do this analysis yourself, get the advice of a
> qualified attorney. A home purchase is usually the largest
> single investment that folks make.

Good advice for anyone.
>
> If you are a League member, ARRL Volunteer Counsels will give
> you an initial consultation without charge. That's a good time
> to have the paperwork looked over for potential land mines.
>
Yup.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3717. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 02:07:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020518220721.23618.00000180@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43035

In article <9f4bfe89.0205171037.3ba088f0@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>> Jim, are you saying that if he weren't a 20wpm Examinee, then he wouldn't
>be
>> smart or he wouldn't have designed JT44?
>
>Nope.
>
>I'm simply saying:
>
>Look at who is actually DOING the cutting-edge stuff in ham radio and letting
>other hams know about it.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Brian:

Since Jim wouldn't say it, I will. Now, go ahead and make something of it, punk!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3718. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 02:07:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020518220721.23618.00000179@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43037

In article <KyfF8.2814$275.146246960@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO).
>They
>> wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to
>VHF
>> repeaters lately? See my point.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>
>Dan, the repeaters were vacated prior to HF being made "easier to get."

Brian:

The repeaters were vacated as a result of the Non-code tested HT-slinger Kerchunka-Punks getting on them and demanding to be regarded as Real Hams™ in spite of the fact that they have little or nothing in common with their 13- and 20-WPM code tested betters in the ARS, who consistently display superior technical knowledge and operational skill as radio amateurs. I, for one, have pretty much relegated 2-meters FM to the background of my ham radio experience, and prefer instead to enjoy HF digital modes and, of course, CW. Of course, for those of you "hams" for whom 2-meters FM is the be-all and end-all, I can understand your frustration!

Now, punk -- go ahead and make something of THAT!

(Why do I feel another scathing "Well there you have it" coming on?)

73 de Larry, K3LT

3719. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 02:07:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020518220722.23618.00000181@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43036

In article <ac1vht$vk3$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>Here's another one of those little problems: Do we have
>medical waivers for people who have any number of possible
>ailments or disabilities: One arm, arthritis, lost fingers,
>paralized arm, hand, etc?
>

Bill:

Good question. Here's the short, simple answer: No. No medical
waivers. There is no guarantee stamped on our heads at birth that we
will be able to do anything and everything we want to do, and we're
simply going to have to come to the realization that amateur radio
is included among the list of things that aren't for everyone. If this
is in any way incorrect, I want the federal government to fully
compensate me for the career as a military and commercial airline
pilot I never had as a result of my eyesight.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3720. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 02:49:39 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tbl71l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42963

> It was an excellent thought--but the problem is, not all
> schools are on the same schedule. Even in Michigan alone (you mention
> being here as well) there are several different schedules. For
> example, some colleges and Universities _do_ start classes the first
> week of June--others (the one I teach at included) have already
> started their Spring/Summer term--Winter ended the first week of May.
> Still others (mostly those on a quarter system, versus a semester
> system) won't start a new term until mid-June, or even later.

I was thinking the first or second weekend may be a little easier. Also, as
you stated, some of the colleges having summer courses would be actually
good to capture in the promotional activities.

>
> I _definitely_ agree with the concept of moving field day to a
> different time. The concept of "fourth weekend/last weekend" _is_ one
> that could confuse too many people. Setting it as the _last_ weekend
> of a month (or the first, of course) would resolve that immediately
> and, if June was still preferred, would do so with minimum
> interruption to anyone's annual schedule.
>
> >It has been stated many times, but we definitely need to promote amateur
> >radio to people in the 30 'n" under categories.... You are the one that
> >seems to post the information about license numbers. I wonder if age
could
> >some how be factored into those calculations. I can honestly guess that
the
> >overwhelming majority of hams are in the 50-70 year old age bracket, and
> >over the next 20 years or so, we will lose alot of those hams to natural
> >(and unnatural also) causes of death. This and the severe underpromotion
of
> >amateur radio will be the death of our hobby, not some silly arguements
> >about testing.
>
> I agree completely. While (obviously) some young people are
> entering the ARS, the majority of them aren't attracted to it at all.
> Without them, Ham radio is _not_ going to grow in the future.
>

Right.... it is a generational thing. The last thing a teenager wants to
hear about is some old-fart hams talking about their incontinence problems
and other health issues. (as well as most others too)

> >I have talked with a couple of teenagers that just got licensed recently
and

> >they feel severly dis-illusioned. They say that there is no one to talk
> >to..... at least someone close to their age around here. Up until about
3
> >months ago, I WAS the youngest ham in our county, at 31 years old.
>
> That's one of the problems, but there are others as well.
> Probably the most relevant among them is the use of the Internet. In
> recent years, teens have taken to perceiving the net as a community
> (the same way many Hams view amateur radio, of course). They
> communicate using Internet web boards, IM, chat, video conferencing,
> and other similar real time or near real time tools. Admittedly, the
> same tools are available to Hams--although it's pretty hard to use
> fast scan TV (equivalent to video conferencing) to communicate with
> hams in other areas, due to bandwidth restraints. But many teens view
> the tools available to amateurs as actually much "cruder" than their
> own (i.e., a youth with a 768K cable modem or a high speed DSL line is
> unlikely to be impressed with HF packet or SSTV speeds), as well as
> much more expensive (try setting up an adequate HF station using new
> equipment as cheaply as anyone can set up a multimedia computer
> system), difficult to install and maintain (installing a computer
> today is as simple as taking it out of the box and plugging it in to
> the wall, the monitor, the speakers, and the telephone line or cable
> tv modem), and undependable. The fact that they are communicating by
> radio, versus hard wired connections, isn't terribly meaningful to
> most teens--particularly since they've grown up with cell phones
> which, essentially, do the same thing as a 2m rig and a repeater
> network, and do it both cheaply and w/o need for a license. Finally,
> youths see no reason to either study for an exam that only allows them
> to do the same thing they are doing on their computers already (from
> their perspective) or to censor themselves as to topic and
> (unfortunately today) language--both of which are necessary to good
> radio practice and neither of which is a major concern on the
> Internet. Tell a youth interested in a career in political science
> that he can talk to someone in, for example, China but must not become
> engaged in a discussion of the "benefits of capitalism over communism"
> or the "excesses of Mao and the Cultural Revolution" for example and,
> since he's been doing precisely that in Internet mailing lists and
> newsgroups for some time, he's likely to tell you you're nuts! The
> lack of regulation implicit in the Internet is a strong attraction for
> youths--even very intelligent, well spoken, and mature ones--since it
> allows them complete freedom of expression as well as the ability to
> experiment as much as they please with no concern for violating laws
> that are, in part, the result of International compromise.
>

Well, the internet is allways the whipping post when in comparison to
amateur radio. I beleive that there is a good selection of prospective
students in both junior high, high school and colleges/universities. Some
naysayers here may say that all in those categories are drunken/drug
doing/tattoed/pierced/punk rockers/gang members or any other combination of

the "bad kid" category, and some are, but there is a ton that aren't. After all, who the hell are these kids getting on the honor rolls? Guess if old-farts can blanket-blame all youth, I guess the youth can do the same?

> We need to find new reasons for youths to be attracted to ham
> radio--and the way to do that is not to emphasize field day (which
> most non-hams have no interest in anyway) but to create opportunities
> for them to explore areas of radio they CAN'T explore on the Inet. For
> example, my son (18, a Junior in college, and an "Internet addict")
> could care less about talking on the radio--he's "worked" more
> countries in chat then I have on HF, and I'm a dx fan. On the other
> hand, when I showed him that it was possible to communicate with the
> Space Shuttle on the ham bands, to view sophisticated astronomical and
> meteorological images using fax modes, or carry a radio in a shirt
> pocket capable of talking world wide (in ideal conditions on 6m) even
> if you're miles from a power line or telephone connection, he showed
> more interest. Unfortunately, after listening to my communications on
> the air, which (like most ham contacts) were far more oriented toward
> ham radio topics than toward topics of interest to a teen or young
> adult w/o a focus on radio, that interest was pretty hard to sustain.
>

True. The main fact is MORE needs to be done. I am struggling to try to attend the 500 plus schools in the 3 county area I live in, with little to no help from other hams. I am very comfortable in the public speaking arena, but am seriously lacking in the equipment category, which I believe would be important to kind of "plant a bug" in some of these potential candidates.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

3721. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:11:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020518231128.23618.00000184@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43043

In article <nMiF8.1402$xF1.1364@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>
>Unfortunately, there are some folks who will be unable to qualify for a
>license. Sometimes you just can't do some of the things you want to.

Hansl:

Shame on you for even thinking such a thing! Don't you know that amateur radio has to be all-inclusive, diverse, and all things to all people? Doesn't your radio club join hands around the campfire and sing "Kumbuya" at the end of each meeting?

>For
>example, I'm physically unable to qualify for the local amateur baseball
>team.

Horrors! I think you should immediately notify the ACLU, CORE, the United Nations, the NBA, and Queen Noor, and get them to accept you as you are for what you are, regardless of your "challenges" which make it impossible to meet their unfair and obviously unjustified requirements!

>I'll get over it.

Wrong attitude. You'll never get anywhere in AmeriKa thinking like that!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3722. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:11:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020518231129.23618.00000186@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43041

In article <WtxF8.3255$4R2.166313158@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Hans, you are so good at getting to the point, perhaps you can help me
>> and interecede on my behalf with the University of Rochester. I simply
>> do NOT have enough spare neurons left in my brain after many years of
>> beer blasts and think that they should issue me a degree so I could
>> practice brain surgery. Please use the 'mashed brain' defense for this
>> issue.
>>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim AA2QA
>>
>> ps - if you can't do this, the FCC issues licenses for FM broadcasting.
>> That would be my next choice if you can't convince the U of R.
>
>Perhaps they could issue you a license for assisted suicides.

Brian:

Bad idea. What Dr. Jim, Brain Surgeon should do is give a free
lobotomy to anyone who wants to become a ham, to make them
better qualified in light of the Post-Restructuring testing requirements.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3723. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:11:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020518231129.23618.00000185@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43044

In article <3CE58952.5BC3AD49@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>
> That's kind of off the subject, but since you throw that in what do we
>do with people who have ADD? And if they have something like ADD *and*
>one of these other problems, should they be exempted from everything?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

Sure. After all, we have learned over the years from the code/no-code
testing debate is that amateur radio MUST be inclusive, environmentally-
friendly, tolerant, touchy-feely, harmonious with nature, non-ozone
depleting, diverse, etc. etc. etc. I think all African- and Native-Americans
should be immediately granted Amateur Extra-class licenses, as the
government owes it to them in reparation for past offenses committed
upon their "peoples." (Right about here is where we hear from Brian.)

73 de Larry, K3LT

3724. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:11:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020518231130.23618.00000188@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43039

In article <pytF8.7494$vt3.220037472@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Lack of money on my part.
>

No lack of money on my part, just lack of time available to take off from making same.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3725. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:11:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020518231130.23618.00000187@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43042

In article <SywF8.4023$8t.2258@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>
>Are you saying that someone who is deficient in mathematics due to a
>learning disorder, poor study habits, or ADD, ought to get a free pass on
>the technical qualifications for an Amateur Radio license?
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

Well, if anyone out there *does* think this to be the case, they're too late -- JY1 is now SK, so they can't whine to him to get him to interfere in the internal domestic policies of our government.

Ooops -- just fergot, JY1's XYL, who is a queen and a ham by marriage, is still out there somewhere. Maybe someone can whine to her, and get the written tests abolished through the diplomatic meddling process started by her late OM, and enabled by the administration of President Bush 41. I'm sure Secretary of State Colon Polyp is up to the challenge.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3726. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:11:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020518231131.23618.00000189@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43040

In article <1utF8.7492$Mv3.220179759@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Well there you have it. You know Larry, you've come on here with that same
>size 22 YL attitude concerning no-code Technicians. Luckily, you're not
>able to monopolize the group as she did, as we each get to have our say.
>
>If you had to do the 1995 ARRL Maryland State Convention ARRL Forum again,
>how would you have handled it differently?

Brian:

I don't know that I *would* have handled it differently. However, I would hope that should Craigie and Turnbull also be there, that *they* would handle the situation much differently, indeed!

BTW -- my "attitude" toward No-Code Technicians is based entirely on THEIR attitude and behavior. They want an easy way into the ARS, with full privileges granted for drastically reduced effort made in the licensing
process, and a demand that they be accepted as full-fledged hams in spite of having significantly less technical knowledge and operational skill in all areas of the hobby. Their demands are based on liberal, New Age concepts of "inclusiveness" and "acceptance," while they sternly reject anything that resembles the conventional wisdom regarding the need to learn and gain privileges through progressive skill development and testing.

Make something of that, PUNK.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3727. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:15:07 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tbm81l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42962

>
> Sooo, what were these lonely teen-aged hams proposing to *do* about
> the fact they had "no one to talk to" ...other than whine about it? Were
> they planning some sort of presentation to their classmates about
> amateur radio, with a demonstration of HF voice, digital modes, and
> maybe even some (heaven forbid) CW?

I am sure that they may hopefully get into that. They are recent licensees as of this late winter/spring. I am sure once they are more comfortable with the hobby they may be able to positively promote the hobby.

Did these teen-aged hams
> think of approaching a QSO with an older ham from a standpoint of
> asking for his/her help with a technical issue, or just general knowledge-
> gathering (assuming the "older" ham *has* the knowledge to give,
> which may not necessarily be the case these days!)?

I am sure that would not be a problem if they required assistance. But not all amateur QSO's are about technical stuff. Simple rag-chewing is enjoyable also on a non-busy area of frequencies once in a while. I am sure that a kid still dealing with acne and the hormones does not want to hear about incontinence problems, hemmoroids, and other geriatric related issues. It is simply a generational thing. After all, in your case even, you probably prefer to relate to people you can relate to. (whomever that may be......)

Did these
> teen-aged hams come to a local radio club meeting and introduce
> themselves to their fellow hams and request their assistance in becoming
> active participants on the local scene? (Hint: if they did arrive with
> baggy pants, green hair, untied shoes, multiple body piercings and/or
> tatoos, I surely hope they didn't expect to stay long!)

Actually yes, and they attending our spring round of classes. They were the nephews of a ham that died recently. They are sort of his legacy.

I am sure based on your description listed above that EVERY teen or 20something MUST be dressed like that in your eyes. And of course every person over 40 must dress like those genetic-defectives I see on the golf courses every day during the spring or summer. Surprise, surprise, there is a ton of good kids, the ones we need to address, in the educational system that are the ones making the honor rolls (or at least in the 3.0GPA and above groups) that are achieving in other categories in life. Never stated that we should address the bad kids.

Are these teen-aged
> hams getting themselves involved with HF, or are they limiting themselves
> to the handshack?
>

Well... based on a teens available income, I am sure that the HT is a
starting point, and once either they have earned enough to purchase a HF
system, they probably will. I cannot speculate more than that about the
future. I can only guesstimate.

> I think that teen-agers are just as capable of becoming active hams
> now as they ever have been. It has always meant that they had to
> and will have to interact with older hams.

True.... but if there is hardly any reference point to learn that the hobby
exists, how can they become hams? Had I never gotten into SWLing or Scanner
Monitoring as a hobby, I would probably never have gotten into the hobby
either, and would not have been aware of it. I learned about ham radio from
this angle, not the typical CB direction that all new hams *MUST* have come
from, according to the "old school: hams.

If these teen agers are
> allowing their New-Age, dumbed-down culture get in their way of said
> interaction, that's THEIR problem, not one of the older hams. There
> is such a thing in this world as convention, and older people, older
> hams in partucular, usually adhere to it.

I am sure the kids I am referring to have no problem with following rules
and procedure as it is now, or if we were to time-warp back to the day of
when you were a kid. These are not the "bad kids" that you seem to group
all in one pile. These are ones that are doing good, get involved, and just
want someone to talk to even ten years close to thier age at least once in a
while.

If these teen-aged hams are
> expecting to present themselves as New Age punks and be given a
> pass on it, they won't be attending very many radio club meetings
> anywhere I've ever been a club member!

Understood, as I agree also. Where did you come up with the idea that these
two guys MUST be punks? These are two clean-cut, 3 point something GPA type
of kids. Of course again, it is the weak way to easily lump people into
categories to make ones self feel better.

Ryan KC8PMX

3728. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:16:56 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tbn91l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42956

>
> > I think that teen-agers are just as capable of becoming active hams
> > now as they ever have been. It has always meant that they had to
> > and will have to interact with older hams. If these teen agers are
> > allowing their New-Age, dumbed-down culture get in their way of said
> > interaction, that's THEIR problem, not one of the older hams. There
> > is such a thing in this world as convention, and older people, older
> > hams in partucular, usually adhere to it. If these teen-aged hams are
> > expecting to present themselves as New Age punks and be given a
> > pass on it, they won't be attending very many radio club meetings
> > anywhere I've ever been a club member!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Well there you have it.
>
>

Unfortunately Larry is of the set that no one will ever measure up to him, even if the others achieve more than him at some point in their lives. And of course it is soooo easy to lump others into categories when a person is so filled with hate.

Ryan

3729. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:40:05 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tbp01l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42952

>
> Here in southeast PA, K-12 schools typically don't let out until June 15
or so.
> In years where there are lots of snow days, the last day of school can
come
> even later.
>
> But you do have a good point in that the school-radio connection can be
lost
> too easily.

Depending on the location in Michigan, some schools get out in the single digit dates of June, and some in the teen dates in June.

>
> >> Although FD has been "the fourth full weekend in June" for more than
> >> half a century, most of the hams I know think it's "the last full
weekend in
> >>June", despite educational efforts by folks like me. In most years the
two
> >>definitions are one and the same, but once in a while (like this year)
there
> >>are five full weekends in June. End result is confusion and some
no-shows.
> >>Maybe it should be the last weekend in June, or the first.
>
> >> Historic note:
> >>
> >> For the first few years (1933-35?) there were actually two FDs per
year -
> >>one in early June and another in late August. The late August one was
not
> >>nearly so popular as the June outing, as was discontinued.
>
> >Now there is an idea! Or maybe the first or second week of school of the
> >fall terms.... September is still fairly moderate in temperature and
weather
> >in general, even here in Michigan, and it would work great to tie this in
> >with promotion of the ham radio classes that some clubs offer in the
fall.
>
> Perhaps what we need is a "Publicity Day", rather than having Field Day
> try to serve all purposes.

That should be every day. Clubs and of course individuals need to work harder on this. I am still trying to assemble a group of hams together for this purpose, but there is this lethargy recently, that needs to change. In other words, with alot of these people, you couldn't light a fire under their ass with a 1000 gallons of gasoline. There is a little over 500 schools in the tri-county area in which I am in, and I have this lofty goal, that we could encourage at least ONE new ham from each of these schools. Now that may be much to expect one student out of 300-500 students to get licensed per year, but I believe it is a beneficial goal. That would make 500 (or more) new hams within the Mid-Michigan area alone per year. Kinda a crazy thought eh? I just need a little help in the equipment category for the presentations.... I am very comfortable in the public speaking side of the presentation, and in fact, I am doing a presentation to about 300 or so law enforcement/ems/fire personell in June with the hopes of getting some of these people, albeit not necessarily of the youth set, but definitely of the mentality and training that would make them a positive asset to our hobby. (They are accustomed to recieving training and of course following rules.)

> >It has been stated many times, but we definitely need to promote amateur
> >radio to people in the 30 'n" under categories....
>
> I agree 100%. That's what the ARRL "Big Project" is about. Another
> reason I'm a member. But that project is only one step.
>

> >You are the one that seems to post the information about license numbers.
>
> That's me.
>
> >I wonder if age could some how be factored into those calculations.
>
> I would do so if there were a reliable source of that info. The FCC has
done
> the on-again off-again thing with DOB information, so there is no complete
> database of how old US hams are. Surveys and reports are often very
> inaccurate because they do not take representative samples. For example,
> although I'm a fairly active ham, I haven't been to a hamfest in several
years,
> nor to a local club meeting in a year or so. It's not because I don't want
to
> go,
> but because family and work obligations prevent it.

Understood, but it would be neat to see, and would back up some peoples statements that are merely a guess or an averaging at this point.

>
> >I can honestly guess that the
> >overwhelming majority of hams are in the 50-70 year old age bracket, and
> >over the next 20 years or so, we will lose alot of those hams to natural
> >(and unnatural also) causes of death.
>

> I'm 48, and been a ham 35 years in October.

Well... a "teenager" in the hobby eh? :)

>
> >This and the severe underpromotion of
> >amateur radio will be the death of our hobby, not some silly arguements
> >about testing.
>
> I agree 100%.
> >
> >I have talked with a couple of teenagers that just got licensed recently
and
> >they feel severly dis-illusioned. They say that there is no one to talk
> >to..... at least someone close to their age around here. Up until about
3
> >months ago, I WAS the youngest ham in our county, at 31 years old.
>
> When I got started in 1967, I was the youngest ham I knew, for a long
time.
> In my high school of 2400 or so boys, there were never more than a half
> dozen licensed hams. This was long before the 'net, video games, cell
> phones or even widespread cable TV. It didn't bother me that there was
> practically nobody my age to talk to on the air.
>

Understood, as stated in other responses, it would be nice for these people
to have someone to talk to even within a ten year spread close to their
age..... From what they say.

> One of the things that attracted me to ham radio was the fact that on the
air
> it did not matter what a person's age, gender, race, or socioeconomic
status
> was. Hams' opinions of each other were based on operating skills and
signal
> quality.
>

Since when has this happened..... I see that to be the opposite from all
that I have heard. Not necessarily from all-out slanderous comments but
there is definitely a clear case of that from the various areas I have
traveled in Michigan, and locally. Granted, this is my local area, not
necessarily yours.

> --
>
> There are three basic reasons people become hams:
>
> 1) Technical interest in radio (building, experimenting, repair/restore,
etc.)
> 2) Desire to communicate (ragchewing, public service, "honeydew", on-air

> community)
> 3) Fascination with radio operating (contesting, DXing, developing on-air
> skills)
>
> Most hams' interest is a mixture of these three, and the mix can vary over
> time. But to
> interest someone, or keep them interested, the mix must have things not
> available
> elsewhere.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Agreed.

Ryan KC8PMX

3730. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:41:52 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tbq11l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42957

Honest and up front? Every last one of them?

> Right -- there we have it. PCTA's are honest and up front, and the
> NCTA's whine. Thank you for this uncharacteristic admission of
> guilt.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

3731. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:44:12 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tbr21l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42954

Hmm... close parallel..... Pat Buchanan. He's a Republican. Pretty damned close to the same thinking. It was an analogy of sorts, not necessarily a statement of fact.

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20020515230329.29123.00002020@mb-mu.aol.com...
> Ryan:
>
> I was not aware that the United States Republican Party was in power
> in Germany during the 1940's. I'm sure 6 million innocent Jews in
> Europe would have wished that they were!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
> In article <abu34v7d4v@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Not defending the NCTA, but gee, but a group that also wants things a
> >certain way, following a certain belief as long as it matches theirs, and to
> >do certain things a certain way, in other words imposing a certain morality
> >or choice of decisions sounds like the Republican party.... (reference
> >Germany in early 40's) ("Do like I preach, not like I do" or "It's my way
> >or the highway" mentality)
> >
> >I am neither aligned with the Republican or Democat party or what is
> >referred to as left and right winged as far as I am concerned. Thinking
> >that there is only two possibilities is closed and small mindedness. The
> >political spectrum, as far as I am concerned is more like the spokes from a
> >wheel as opposed to linear thinking.
> >
> >Ryan
> >
> > The NCTA, like
> >> most liberals, don't seem to be interested in a fair and two-way
> >> exchange of ideas. It's their way or the highway. I'm just giving as
> >> I have received.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT

> >>
>
>

3732. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 03:52:03 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tbs31l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42953

>
> Should everyone in the world be treated the same? Are you a communist?

Should you be able to harm another? (i.e. assault) I don't think so... That is treating people the same, saying that no one should be hurting another.... Can provide other examples of how others should be treated the same, or equally that by that statement above I guess would make a person a communist using that kind of logic.

>
>
> >
> > Does Larry respect my opinions?
>
>
> Absolutely, assuming said opinions are rational.
>

No matter who they come from.... Opinions are like A$$holes... and everyone has one, and they usually stink.

Ryan

3733. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 04:04:43 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CE7245B.8090707@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43045

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> The hoax is that an Advanced would ask such a silly question, then Larry
> answers it with a straight face. I'm still not buying it. You two cooked
> this up.
>
> Why? Why do people troll?

No hoax, no trol.

I'm trying to remember...N0IMD...did you used to hang around 14.313?

de KR4AJ

N0IMD [USA] Lookups: 90
Brian P Burke
430 Longview St
Pickerington OH 43147
USA

Email: n0imd@arrl.net

KA0ZFY: Jan 87-Jun 87- thanks to the AKSARBEN ARC, N0IMD: all after Jun
87, HL9ACT: Oct 88-Oct 89, /KH2: Nov 89-Nov 91, /9: Jan 92-May 00, /T5:
Dec 92-Jan 93, /8: all after Jun 00

Uncle: Lawrence Geary, W8MJB/SK
Add/Update biography for N0IMD

<http://www.qrz.com/gifs/qrzcom150.gif>

3734. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 04:06:58 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tbu41l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42951

> I suggest that you don't restrict your opinion and experience of HF
amateur
> radio to what you hear on the 'phone subbands. CW and digital modes offer
> a very different environment and experience.

Maybe the digital modes may appeal to me, but I find no other amount of enjoyment in morse code. Jumping through whatever hoops to meet the testing requirements at the time of testing I have absolutely no problem with, but that does not mean I *must* enjoy it either. Come to think of it, the digital modes are about the same as why I do not like the internet other than for a research tool. I just do not care for internet chat rooms because simple fonts are the same cold impersonal way of communication, where no emotion, inflection or feeling is really inputted into the message. Text versus dits and dahs. I would much rather hear a persons voice. 90% of my operation is usually in public service/emergency applications, and the other 10% is the occaisional rag chewing while in the truck going somewhere. At least with voice you can tell the feeling behind the message. After all, except for a few emoticons, can you tell if I am postive about this message here? Or if I was "saying" it with a smile in my voice if I was actually talking and not typing. About the only chatting per se I like is either through email or newsgroups, which is like public email.... in my eyes. Kinda like writing letters but using a different medium to do so.

>
> > I can only speak for my local area, but I have never
> > heard yet a full blown arguement, or profanity other than the
occaisional
> > use of the word "hell" (heard on 4 times in almost 2 years) and that
was
> > during a stressfull situation a person saw occur directly in front of
them.
> > (We all slip once in a while, no matter how perfect or prudent we think
we
> > are. Only one person that is that close to perfect and he's got a severe
> > aversion to high places combined with nails!) Anything that I have
heard
> > that would be construed even in the most vague sense of an argument were
of
> > the debate format. One night there was me, and 3 others who wound up
> > holding a debate on a particular subject, with four of us with clearly
> > different opinions on the matter, and we all acted and operated in a way
> > that would impress anyone. As far as that goes, whether or not we
agreed
> > with one another, we got along, and that is most important thing. And I
> > also believe we all learned a few things from the debate. For the

record,
> > this was for over 3 hours the four of us held this debate in the
> > "roundtable" format on a simplex 2 meter freq.
>
> I wish it were that way everywhere, and on all bands. But there are "bad
> apples" on all bands. Look up kg6iro on the ARRL website - not a nice
story.
>

I am sure there will always be some bad apples, but hopefully that can be
kept to a minimum. Once in a while one slips through and makes us look bad.

> > There was another post with the past few days that sums up my feelings
about
> > operation..... get to know locally, and slowly but in a postive manner
> > move outward. That also applies for my knowledge of ham radio.
>
> That's not a bad approach at all.
>
> > I met the
> > requirements set forth at the time, and will never stop learning. That
is
> > the beauty of ham radio; there is so much damned stuff to learn, that
you
> > could never learn EVERYTHING in one lifetime.
>
> I agree 100%. After 35 years I'm still learning new ham radio stuff every
day.
>
> --
>
> One important difference about local vs. nonlocal radio is the possibility
of
> actually meeting the people involved. The folks one can reach on 2 meter
simplex
> or one of the local repeaters are, for the most part, one's neighbors. On
HF,
> the anonymity is much greater, and the possibility of actually meeting
someone
> in person much less. Some people behave poorly in such circumstances.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Ryan

3735. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 04:09:32 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tbv51l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42958

> In my 35 years on the ham bands, I have found that abusive, profane and
> > inconsiderate behavior is practically nonexistent among amateur CW
> > operators. It's simply "not done". I understand the same is true of
> > "digital" modes like PSK31.
>
> Of course, the digital modes, including CW, do not lend themselves
> well to emotional outbursts. If I am angry enough to utter obscenities,
> my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type on a
> keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
> the microphone. (Not that I personally would ever do something like that.)

What about even to detect whether a person is saying something with a "smile in their voice" or sarcasm, or inquistiveness, or any of the other general emotions that are not of the outburst kind that integral to basic communication?

Ryan

>
> CW doesn't change human behavior but, like a straight jacket, inhibits
> certain forms of human behavior. Virtually all of those obscene HF phone
> hams have passed a Morse code exam. It is simply extremely easier for any
> ham who chooses such behavior to misbehave on phone rather than on CW.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

3736. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 04:13:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE72684.E4336715@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43046

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Good question. Here's the short, simple answer: No. No medical
> waivers. There is no guarantee stamped on our heads at birth that we
> will be able to do anything and everything we want to do, and we're
> simply going to have to come to the realization that amateur radio
> is included among the list of things that aren't for everyone. If this
> is in any way incorrect, I want the federal government to fully
> compensate me for the career as a military and commercial airline
> pilot I never had as a result of my eyesight.

You are again confusing the requirements of a vocation with limiting
citizens' access to public property which was K7JEB's point. For instance,
if amateur radio operators were required to have 20/20 vision, it would
quickly be declared to be an unreasonable requirement. When access to
public property by citizens is involved, the requirements must be
reasonable and rejustifiable over time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3737. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 04:17:39 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tc061l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43050

Working a double shift (sat eve/sun morn) and also had a class on saturday morning from 8am-4pm. My 3rd shift employer always plans their graduation ceremonies on the same weekend as Dayton and I know neither Dayton or my employer is gonna change weekends merely because I want them too.

I am sure the lack of funds to make the trip enjoyable is another factor too.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message news:pytF8.7494$vt3.220037472@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> Lack of money on my part.
>
>

3738. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 04:20:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE7281E.AA233C4B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43047

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> BTW -- my "attitude" toward No-Code Technicians is based entirely on
> THEIR attitude and behavior.

"But officer, I had no choice. She made me beat her up!"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3739. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 05:07:32 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tc171l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42959

Only if it harms the property. I see nothing wrong with the ability to set up a portable antenna that does not create any damage to the property. In my own specific case, I cannot even have one of those "dish network" mini satellite dishes as an option to cable tv. Rules state absolutely no antennas whatsoever and no transmitting radios either. Guess I am in deep trouble with the cordless phone eh?

The only exception I have gotten from my landlord is that I mounted a thru-the-glass antenna and told him when he finally noticed it that it is an antenna for my fire department scanner/pager and he let that one drop for now. Little does he know it is actually connected to my HT when I am home. (shhh... it's a secret :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

>
> Slightly different question - is it unreasonable for an apartment *owner*
> to restrict antennas on his property?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3740. Re: Technician Classification or ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 05:14:49 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tc281l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43048

> > My own pet peeve is the stupid frequency allocations. Why test for
> > that? At my station, I have a nice chart from the ARRL with the
> > bandplans on it. Get rid of 'em!

I agree slightly on this issue. As far as which specific allocations of which licensee can use within the bands may not be important, I do believe that knowing which specific band is which is still important.

As far as that goes, as long as you know which bands you can operate via a chart can be looked up easily while operating, the real knowledge is knowing about the theory portions of the test of knowing exactly how wide a signal is, so that a person does not transmit out of band, or outside of their privileges. That is more important than rout memorization of frequency allocations which can easily be referenced from a band allocation chart.

3741. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 05:35:32 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tc391l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42961

>
> Add electrical and RF safety as a priority for Tech. Add emergency
> communications concepts for all...different levels of knowledge
> and expectations for the different licenses.

Agreed.... safety needs to be stressed in all levels of licensure.
Hopefully it reduces the amounts of calls that me and the brotherhood of
firefighters and medics have to respond to.
As far as emergency communications, I also believe there should be alot more
knowledge there too. Message handling, Traffic systems, etc.

>
> I'd like to see some hands-on practical testing of basic ham skills.
> Something like "Here's some pieces of coax, a PL-259, a female
> BNC connector, a female N connector, and a female SMA
> connector, a soldering iron, and all other necessary tools. Pick
> any two connectors, and properly install them on the appropriate
> piece of coax (different types given to match the application usually
> associated with the respective connector)."

Not that hard of a feat....

>
> Next: "Here's a 2-meter HT with a fully-charged battery pack, the
> VFO memories reset, and the manufacturer's instruction manual.
> Program the memory channels for the following frequencies:
>
> 146.52 (simplex)
>
> 146.61 (-600 kHz offset)
>
> 147.180 (+600 kHz offset, CTCSS 156.7 hz. encode only)
>
> 145.21 (-600 kHz offset, CTCSS 77 hz, encode and decode)
>
> 147.540 (simplex)"

Piece of cake with the owners manual, except for the manual I have for the
Heathkit HW24HT (made by Standard I believe) which does not follow any of
the formats that Icom, Kenwood, Yeasu, Alinco, etc. I can, and have
programmed both mobiles and HTs for alot of different models, and I seems
rather simple. The Heathkit one is a real pain in the a** though.

>
> Next: "Draw a block diagram of a properly set up amateur HF
> station showing the following:

>
> An HF transceiver and power supply, microphone, and headset
>
> A multi-mode Terminal Node Controller
>
> A personal computer
>
> A sound card to computer interface unit for software-based digital modes
>
> An antenna
>
> A station ground
>
> A Morse code key or keyer/paddle combination"
>
> I could go on and on, but you get the idea.

Piece of cake also. It is simple schematic thinking. Just like
understanding a plumbing system, or pump operations on a fire truck.

>
> > We'll get a lot of different answers.
>
> I sure hope so. At least this becomes a positive discussion
> for a change.
>
> > So many that you will find that
> > eventually you might as well scrap the test altogether because someone
> > somewhere doesn't like any part of the whole testing scheme.
>
> I disagree. I think there will be significant concurrance.

That would be the "easy way out" to scrap a test like that.

>
> With the exception of practical hands-on knowledge testing as
> described above, I can't think of much that is currently on the
> tests with which I disagree, except that I obviously would also
> like to see the clock rolled back on the 13- and 20-WPM code
> test requirements.

And I believe as long as the morse code is being tested as a "operating
skill" all other modes of operating transmissions should be tested as well.
Voice and digital both as well as morse code.

>
> > It was simple, I wanted to be a ham, so I did what was asked
> > of me to become one.
> > The tests were easy, the CW was not. Too bad for me there.
> > But others had problems the other way around. That's life in the jungle.
>
> True, and just as times and test requirements change elsewhere, the

> same will apply for ham licensing. My dad HAD nno choice but to
> learn and take a drivers test using a manual 3 speed column shift
> automobile. Today you get the license without any need for
> knowledge of manual shifting. Once licensed you are free to
> still drive a manual gearshift auto.
>

Saw one of those column shifters years ago, and it freaked my out a little at first. Was so conditioned to think that any kind of manual transmission stick shift must belong on the floor. Thought the guy was trying to screw up his automatic transmission! :)

Ryan

3742. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 05:38:50 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tc401l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42960

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CE3BC6D.431112A7@psu.edu...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > I'd like to see some hands-on practical testing of basic ham skills.
> > Something like "Here's some pieces of coax, a PL-259, a female
> > BNC connector, a female N connector, and a female SMA
> > connector, a soldering iron, and all other necessary tools. Pick
> > any two connectors, and properly install them on the appropriate
> > piece of coax (different types given to match the application usually
> > associated with the respective connector)."
>
> This one is interesting, and of course a problem. But let's see what we
> could do here.
>
> The VE's could have a class in which they have the students get
> familiar with soldering equipment. have the person solder a few things
> together ala your suggestion. Give the applicant a batch of resistors, a
> multimeter, and after they read the color code and predict what values
> the resistors are, have them read the things with the multimeter. There
> can be other things like this. Simple stuff, keeping in mind that the
> techs are often at the bottom of the learning curve.
>
>

Not necessarily.... there may be some test appplicants who would normally be
able to take the extra test with fair results, but the rules say you must
have to take the tech and general written also. Think the questions from
the tech should be added to the general exam, and the questions for the
extra include all of the questions from the tech and general. If the extra
class is the top rung, there should be no problem with answering those
questions again, and would prove that the knowledge had still remained.

Ryan

3743. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 05:44:21 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tc511l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 42955

I am still a strong believer that the names of the license classes need to be renamed to something like this:

1st Class Amateur Radio License-----> Current Extra Class
2nd Class Amateur Radio License----->Current General Class
3rd Class Amatuer Radio License------>Current Technician Class with code.
4th Class Amatuer Radio License------>Current Technician Class without code.

As far as the novice, old tech and advanced class, I do not know where they may fit in this but this may denote a better representation than our current titles for the license classes.

Ryan KC8PMX

> Technicians are at the "bottom" of the learning curve? I thought that
> the name of that license class was supposed to imply technical knowledge,
> as opposed to skill in any particular operating mode, and more
> particularly, *not* Morse/CW, the testing requirements for which have
> been eliminated over a decade ago.

3744. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 05:54:35 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ac7tc721l16@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43049

And you have a cellphone? Turned mine off after I got my ticket. The few calls I was making were about the same I am making on the autopatch. I.E. going to be a little late or similar short messages. Anything else can wait till I get to a payphone. The only exception to this is the use of 911 that is supposed to be mandatory on all cellphones even if the normal service is off. There has been quite a few times where I was in an area where I did not know how to bring up the autopatch for a repeater in an area that I did not frequent OR there wasn't any hams around to relay a call. Then it helped for making a call to the authorities. Still have the stupid thing in the truck, but only keep it as a backup under that guise.

Ryan
KC8PMX

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CE42754.10332A91@IEEE.org...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > A modest SSB
> > setup can work out to 300 miles in most parts of this country.
>
> And that's a local call on my cellphone.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

3745. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 13:01:38 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <AD890075E57D49D5.470937689F512C2E.F52C60806346ADF5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 42964

On Sun, 19 May 2002 01:07:32 -0400, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:

>Only if it harms the property. I see nothing wrong with the ability to set
>up a portable antenna that does not create any damage to the property. In
>my own specific case, I cannot even have one of those "dish network" mini
>satellite dishes as an option to cable tv.

Better recheck that one; that's exactly what the existing exemptions
are for.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3746. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 13:26:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE7A7EF.34D3201C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42965

KC8PMX wrote:
> What about even to detect whether a person is saying something with a "smile
> in their voice" ...

....
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3747. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 13:30:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE7A8F5.858D2542@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42966

KC8PMX wrote:
> And you have a cellphone? Turned mine off after I got my ticket. The few
> calls I was making were about the same I am making on the autopatch. I.E.
> going to be a little late or similar short messages. Anything else can wait
> till I get to a payphone. The only exception to this is the use of 911 that
> is supposed to be mandatory on all cellphones even if the normal service is
> off. There has been quite a few times where I was in an area where I did
> not know how to bring up the autopatch for a repeater in an area that I did
> not frequent OR there wasn't any hams around to relay a call. Then it
> helped for making a call to the authorities. Still have the stupid thing in
> the truck, but only keep it as a backup under that guise.

If the VHF/UHF ham bands were removed from the ARS and sold to another service,
would you continue to transmit on those bands illegally? That was the question.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3748. "The Smoking Gun?"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 13:35:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE7AA2B.E3389E50@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42967

From the latest issue of "America's 1st Freedom":

"A Manitoba man who registered his Weller soldering gun as a firearm
to protest restrictive Canadian gun laws could face a jail term. ...
According to the "Ottawa Citizen", the Canadian Firearms Centre has
turned the case over to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3749. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 14:48:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020519104830.20095.00000548@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 42968

>If the VHF/UHF ham bands were removed from the ARS and sold to another
>service,
>would you continue to transmit on those bands illegally?

Why would anybody, know one uses them now as is.

3750. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 16:19:29 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <v8jfeucc0jldkbttj5uqrr0hbajci6f1m2@4ax.com>
Source record: 42969

I still argue for, and will continue to argue for, amateur radio licenses patterned after the aviation certificates.

The basic certificate is "STUDENT". The STUDENT can operate anything they wish with the accompanyment OR permission of the INSTRUCTOR. You want to get into the game? Take some instruction. Get the instructor to believe you are good enough to "solo" with your own equipment with the restrictions the instructor imposes to keep you from harming yourself or anybody else.

When the INSTRUCTOR thinks you are ready, he signs you off to take a WRITTEN and PRACTICAL test. You have your choice of several tens of thousands of qualified examiners to pick from. The examiners, in turn, came from the ranks of tens of thousands of hours and tens of hundreds of students as an instructor. In my 40 years as an instructor, I've never heard of ONE case of a corrupt examiner, so don't hand me any of that corruption bushwa.

So now you have a PRIVATE pilot AIRPLANE SINGLE-ENGINE LAND certificate. What does that allow you to do? More important, what does that NOT allow you to do? Take each of the words:

PRIVATE means I can't charge for my services.
AIRPLANE means I can't pilot gliders, helicopters, blimps, or anything other than airplanes.
SINGLE-ENGINE means I can't fly airplanes with more than one engine
LAND means I can't fly seaplanes.

Now, if I want any of those restrictions removed, I take the appropriate test to show I'm competent in the equipment.

How would we implement this?

Amateur radio operator, low power, voice might be a start.

Low power restricts you to (arbitrarily) 50 watts
Voice restricts you to any of the voice modes.

You want high power? You want video? You want CW? You want ???? Get thee to an instructor and practice the mode under the watchful eye of a teacher. When your instructor feels you are ready, get thee to an examiner and pass the appropriate written and practical test.

You can argue with categories, classes, and types if you wish, but the fundamental argument is a STUDENT becomes competent with an INSTRUCTOR and is tested on the competency by an EXAMINER before (s)he is allowed to use the privileges of the rating by themselves.

Jim

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

3751. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 18:06:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020519140634.19574.00000084@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 42970

In article <AD890075E57D49D5.470937689F512C2E.F52C60806346ADF5@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On Sun, 19 May 2002 01:07:32 -0400, "KC8PMX"
><kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:
>
>>Only if it harms the property. I see nothing wrong with the ability to set
>>up a portable antenna that does not create any damage to the property. In
>>my own specific case, I cannot even have one of those "dish network" mini
>>satellite dishes as an option to cable tv.
>
>Better recheck that one; that's exactly what the existing exemptions
>are for.

Nope. The existing exemptions apply to homeowners, not renters.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3752. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 19:06:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE7F7BF.8BCED166@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42971

Jim Weir wrote:
> I still argue for, and will continue to argue for, amateur radio licenses
> patterned after the aviation certificates.

Where's the life-and-death need for that in amateur radio? The requirements
for citizens to gain access to public property must be rational and reasonable.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3753. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 19:27:30 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <iuufeu09c5cj4n66ldk3k3icrdouhoc273@4ax.com>
Source record: 42972

There's no life and death need for that, nor for twelve years of school, nor for recurrent training for a real estate or an insurance broker license, nor for a lot of the stuff that we do today.

It just makes a hell of a lot of sense to insure that people are competent in a field that has the potential for death (high voltage and such) and creating a public nuisance with a mis-tuned kilowatt before turning them loose to wreak their havoc.

Or do you not believe in education?

Jim

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->Jim Weir wrote:
->> I still argue for, and will continue to argue for, amateur radio licenses
->> patterned after the aviation certificates.
->
->Where's the life-and-death need for that in amateur radio? The requirements
->for citizens to gain access to public property must be rational and
reasonable.

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

3754. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 19:59:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE80404.B5CC10CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 42973

Jim Weir wrote:
> It just makes a hell of a lot of sense to insure that people are competent in a
> field that has the potential for death (high voltage and such) and creating a
> public nuisance with a mis-tuned kilowatt before turning them loose to wreak
> their havoc.
>
> Or do you not believe in education?

I do believe in education, particularly for people who use "insure" for "ensure".
I reckon the Bible was right about moats and specks.

I obtained virtually all my technical knowledge after I obtained all amateur
frequency/power privileges in 1952 at the ripe old age of 14. If the system
is broken now, it was broken way back in the early 50's. Because of my early
ignorance, the world gained an Electrical Engineer - not a bad outcome.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3755. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 21:17:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020519171745.19574.00000086@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 42974

In article <ac7tbp01l16@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Depending on the location in Michigan, some schools get out in the single
>digit dates of June, and some in the teen dates in June.

There is probably even greater variation nation-wide. End result is that we
don't want to have FD competing with graduation, the prom, or final exams.
That pretty much eliminates the first two or three weekends.

>> Perhaps what we need is a "Publicity Day", rather than having Field Day
>> try to serve all purposes.
>
>That should be every day. Clubs and of course individuals need to work
>harder on this.

Sure. But what I'm talking about is an organized activity, across the country.

>I am still trying to assemble a group of hams together for
>this purpose, but there is this lethargy recently, that needs to change. In
>other words, with a lot of these people, you couldn't light a fire under
>their ass with a 1000 gallons of gasoline.

Sure.

You have to remember that many hams are already overcommitted to work,
family, school, church, etc.

>There is a little over 500
>schools in the tri-county area in which I am in, and I have this lofty goal,
>that we could encourage at least ONE new ham from each of these schools.
>Now that may be much to expect one student out of 300-500 students to get
>licensed per year, but I believe it is a beneficial goal. That would make
>500 (or more) new hams within the Mid-Michigan area alone per year. Kinda a
>crazy thought eh?

Not crazy at all.

>I just need a little help in the equipment category for
>the presentations.... I am very comfortable in the public speaking side of
>the presentation, and in fact, I am doing a presentation to about 300 or so
>law enforcement/ems/fire personell in June with the hopes of getting some of
>these people, albeit not necessarily of the youth set, but definitely of the
>mentality and training that would make them a positive asset to our hobby.
>(They are accustomed to recieving training and of course following rules.)

I think the most basic question is, "why aren't these folks hams already?"
If the reason is simply that they don't know ham radio exists, then

pubicity is the answer. But there may be other reasons that are
harder to address.

>> >It has been stated many times, but we definitely need to promote amateur
>> >radio to people in the 30 'n" under categories....
>>
>> I agree 100%. That's what the ARRL "Big Project" is about. Another
>> reason I'm a member. But that project is only one step.

>> >You are the one that seems to post the information about license numbers.
>>
>> That's me.
>>
>> >I wonder if age could some how be factored into those calculations.
>>
>> I would do so if there were a reliable source of that info. The FCC has
>done
>> the on-again off-again thing with DOB information, so there is no complete
>> database of how old US hams are. Surveys and reports are often very
>> inaccurate because they do not take representative samples. For example,
>> although I'm a fairly active ham, I haven't been to a hamfest in several
>years,
>> nor to a local club meeting in a year or so. It's not because I don't want
>to
>> go,
>> but because family and work obligations prevent it.
>
>Understood, but it would be neat to see, and would back up some peoples
>statements that are merely a guess or an averaging at this point.

To really be meaningful, the info would have to be indexed against the
population's
ages. On average, Americans today are living longer and having fewer children.
That has definite effects on lots of things.
>
>> >I can honestly guess that the
>> >overwhelming majority of hams are in the 50-70 year old age bracket, and
>> >over the next 20 years or so, we will lose alot of those hams to natural
>> >(and unnatural also) causes of death.
>>
>> I'm 48, and been a ham 35 years in October.
>
>Well... a "teenager" in the hobby eh? :)

Novice at age 13, Advanced at 14, Extra at 16. Would've done it earlier but
did not have the info. Once I found out what ham radio was there was no
stopping
me. Nobody around here was "recruiting" hams then, either.

> >This and the severe underpromotion of
>> >amateur radio will be the death of our hobby, not some silly arguements
>> >about testing.

>>
>> I agree 100%.
>> >
>> >I have talked with a couple of teenagers that just got licensed recently
>and
>> >they feel severly dis-illusioned. They say that there is no one to talk
>> >to..... at least someone close to their age around here. Up until about
>3
>> >months ago, I WAS the youngest ham in our county, at 31 years old.
>>
>> When I got started in 1967, I was the youngest ham I knew, for a long
>time.
>> In my high school of 2400 or so boys, there were never more than a half
>> dozen licensed hams. This was long before the 'net, video games, cell
>> phones or even widespread cable TV. It didn't bother me that there was
>> practically nobody my age to talk to on the air.
>>
>
>Understood, as stated in other responses, it would be nice for these people
>to have someone to talk to even within a ten year spread close to their
>age..... From what they say.

All depends on why they became hams in the first place. If the "magic" of radio
itself is not enough attraction, they are not going to stick around.
>
>> One of the things that attracted me to ham radio was the fact that on the
>> air it did not matter what a person's age, gender, race, or socioeconomic
>> status was. Hams' opinions of each other were based on operating skills and
>> signal quality.
>
>Since when has this happened..... I see that to be the opposite from all
>that I have heard. Not necessarily from all-out slanderous comments but
>there is definitely a clear case of that from the various areas I have
>traveled in Michigan, and locally. Granted, this is my local area, not
>necessarily yours.

It is still pretty much the case around here. It is very much the case with the
hams I meet on CW. Having an FT-1000, big beams and all the trimmings
won't make you a good CW op. This may be what causes some folks to
hate the mode so much - the skills and accomplishments cannot be
bought, and cannot be gotten from a book.

>> --
>>
>> There are three basic reasons people become hams:
>>
>> 1) Technical interest in radio (building, experimenting, repair/restore,
>etc.)
>> 2) Desire to communicate (ragchewing, public service, "honeydew", on-air
>> community)
>> 3) Fascination with radio operating (contesting, DXing, developing on-air

>> skills)
>>
>> Most hams' interest is a mixture of these three, and the mix can vary over
>> time. But to
>> interest someone, or keep them interested, the mix must have things not
>> available elsewhere.

>Agreed.

Point is, if somebody isn't interested in "radio for its own sake", they
probably
won't want to be hams. If they are interested in radio as a means to an end,
rather than an end in itself, they will be hams only until another method of
meeting that end appears.

I remember when a bunch of ham spouses got licenses in order to do
the "honeydew" thing via the repeaters and autopatch. Nothing wrong with
that - almost all were good hams and some became more involved. But
when cellphones got cheaper than HTs, those who only used it for
"honeydew" were gone.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3756. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 21:19:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CE816EE.F061E874@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42975

>
>
> Did these
> > teen-aged hams come to a local radio club meeting and introduce
> > themselves to their fellow hams and request their assistance in becoming
> > active participants on the local scene? (Hint: if they did arrive with
> > baggy pants, green hair, untied shoes, multiple body piercings and/or
> > tatoos, I surely hope they didn't expect to stay long!)
>
> Actually yes, and they attending our spring round of classes. They were the
> nephews of a ham that died recently. They are sort of his legacy.
>
> I am sure based on your description listed above that EVERY teen or
> 20something MUST be dressed like that in your eyes. And of course every
> person over 40 must dress like those genetic-defectives I see on the golf
> courses every day during the spring or summer. Surprise, surprise, there is
> a ton of good kids, the ones we need to address, in the educational system
> that are the ones making the honor rolls (or at least in the 3.0GPA and
> above groups) that are achieving in other categories in life. Never stated
> that we should address the bad kids.

No problem with the "bad" kids if they are the "good-bad" kind, but
not "evil"....... :-) Ham radio might be just what they need.....

3757. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 21:24:27 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CE8180A.4540EFDD@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42976

KC8PMX wrote:

> I am still a strong believer that the names of the license classes need to
> be renamed to something like this:
>
> 1st Class Amateur Radio License-----> Current Extra Class
> 2nd Class Amateur Radio License----->Current General Class
> 3rd Class Amatuer Radio License------>Current Technician Class with code.
> 4th Class Amatuer Radio License------>Current Technician Class without code.

What does it matter what the names are? It could be:

top dog = extra
2nd banana = general
3rd banana = tech
etc.

3758. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 21:33:18 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CE81A1D.E6A13C38@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 42977

>
>
> Now, if I want any of those restrictions removed, I take the appropriate test to
> show I'm competent in the equipment.

Thing here is that if you try to fly something you're not competent in
handling, you'll crash possibly killing yourself, your passengers and
people on the ground. So it makes sense to be examined for every
kind of thing you can do in the air.

But in radio, if you don't do packet or RTTY correctly, noone dies.
As long as you know the rules and bandplans, the worst that
happens is some QRM. So no real need to be examined for
everything you can do *on* the air.

3759. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 21:59:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_eVF8.8255$Ax3.245619872@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42978

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020518220721.23618.00000179@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <KyfF8.2814$275.146246960@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> As for 2 meters, don't bet on keeping it. The FCC has a plan (IMHO).
> >They
> >> wanted to clear out VHF, so they made the HF easier to get....listen to
> >VHF
> >> repeaters lately? See my point.
> >>
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >Dan, the repeaters were vacated prior to HF being made "easier to get."
>
> Brian:
>
> The repeaters were vacated as a result of the Non-code tested HT-
> slinger Kerchunka-Punks getting on them and demanding to be
> regarded as Real HamsT in spite of the fact that they have little or
> nothing in common with their 13- and 20-WPM code tested betters
> in the ARS, who consistently display superior technical knowledge
> and operational skill as radio amateurs. I, for one, have pretty much
> relegated 2-meters FM to the background of my ham radio
> experience, and prefer instead to enjoy HF digital modes and, of
> course, CW. Of course, for those of you "hams" for whom 2-meters
> FM is the be-all and end-all, I can understand your frustration!
>
> Now, punk -- go ahead and make something of THAT!
>
> (Why do I feel another scathing "Well there you have it" coming on?)
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Well there you have it. And what is scathing about that? Jim thinks its an ambiguous term that can be thought of as something positive, even when uttered by the most negative amateur on RRAP. Cronyism.

Anyway, there you have it. Fair Larry has spoken. Others think the internet might have had something to do with most hams vacating the repeaters. Personally, I think there is something to your idea that there is, or was, a lot of "controversy" on the repeaters which has pretty much got both sides avoiding it. But of course, its not as one sided as Fair Larry portrays. Recall the incident of 2x2 Curt in St Louis blasting a new ham on his first QSO. Just amazing.

That and the internet.

73, Brian

3760. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:00:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <vgVF8.8256$AA3.245792096@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42979

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020519104830.20095.00000548@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >If the VHF/UHF ham bands were removed from the ARS and sold to another
> >service,
> >would you continue to transmit on those bands illegally?
>
> Why would anybody, know one uses them now as is.

Bruce, I just got back from Dayton - didn't see you there. You said it was
just a bunch of CBers so I missed you.

3761. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:02:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FhVF8.8257$Gc3.244380891@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42980

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020518231129.23618.00000186@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <WtxF8.3255$4R2.166313158@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Hans, you are so good at getting to the point, perhaps you can help me
> >> and interecede on my behalf with the University of Rochester. I simply
> >> do NOT have enough spare neurons left in my brain after many years of
> >> beer blasts and think that they should issue me a degree so I could
> >> practice brain surgery. Please use the 'mashed brain' defense for this
> >> issue.
> >>
> >> 73 from Rochester, NY
> >> Jim AA2QA
> >>
> >> ps - if you can't do this, the FCC issues licenses for FM broadcasting.
> >> That would be my next choice if you can't convince the U of R.
> >
> >Perhaps they could issue you a license for assisted suicides.
>
> Brian:
>
> Bad idea. What Dr. Jim, Brain Surgeon should do is give a free
> lobotomy to anyone who wants to become a ham, to make them
> better qualified in light of the Post-Restructuring testing requirements.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

A labotomy is a good idea. It will help intelligent new amateurs put up
with the likes of you.

3762. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:04:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <akVF8.8258$%B3.245880848@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42981

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020518231128.23618.00000184@mb-dh.aol.com...

> Wrong attitude. You'll never get anywhere in AmeriKa thinking like
> that!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Just back from a clan meeting?

3763. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:05:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <6lVF8.8260$wz3.245736815@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42982

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020518220722.23618.00000181@mb-dh.aol.com...

> If this
> is in any way incorrect, I want the federal government to fully
> compensate me for the career as a military and commercial airline
> pilot I never had as a result of my eyesight.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

That's not why you weren't a pilot.

3764. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:09:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <boVF8.8261$Vy3.245696807@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42983

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020518220708.13422.00000105@mb-mb.aol.com...

> Here in PA, I had to specifically ask to see the deed restrictions before
> making an offer. My RE attorney had to dig them up from the files at the
county
> seat. Even though this house is more than 50 years old, it has a page and
a
> half of fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing against antennas, though,
but a
> tower might
> be difficult, as it may be considered a "structure" due to its permanent
> nature. In
> fact, I do not know of any amateur radio towers in Radnor Township. Kinda
odd,
> considering that Radnor was the home of Charlie Stewart.

If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than cement, it
might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
asphalt are not.

3765. Re: Digital Done right

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:11:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BqVF8.8262$CD3.245983282@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42984

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020518220721.23618.00000180@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <9f4bfe89.0205171037.3ba088f0@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >> Jim, are you saying that if he weren't a 20wpm Examinee, then he
wouldn't
> >be
> >> smart or he wouldn't have designed JT44?
> >
> >Nope.
> >
> >I'm simply saying:
> >
> >Look at who is actually DOING the cutting-edge stuff in ham radio and
letting
> >other hams know about it.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Brian:
>
> Since Jim wouldn't say it, I will. Now, go ahead and make something
> of it, punk!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, dispense with the "punk" stuff. You sound like an even bigger idiot
saying it.

OK, we have two old time 20WPM examinees here. What cutting edge stuff are
either of you doing?

3766. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:13:47 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <vsVF8.8264$iz3.245722211@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42985

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:ac7tbn91l16@enews3.newsguy.com...
> >
> > > I think that teen-agers are just as capable of becoming active hams
> > > now as they ever have been. It has always meant that they had to
> > > and will have to interact with older hams. If these teen agers are
> > > allowing their New-Age, dumbed-down culture get in their way of said
> > > interaction, that's THEIR problem, not one of the older hams. There
> > > is such a thing in this world as convention, and older people, older
> > > hams in partucular, usually adhere to it. If these teen-aged hams are
> > > expecting to present themselves as New Age punks and be given a
> > > pass on it, they won't be attending very many radio club meetings
> > > anywhere I've ever been a club member!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > Well there you have it.
> >
> >
>
> Unfortunately Larry is of the set that no one will ever measure up to him,
> even if the others achieve more than him at some point in their lives.
And
> of course it is soooo easy to lump others into categories when a person is
> so filled with hate.
>
> Ryan

Can you imagine Fair Larry a guidance counselor at school? More like a
parole officer with a chewed up stick.

3767. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:22:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020519182230.01889.00000851@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 42986

>It will help intelligent new amateurs put up
>with the likes of you.

That would be different, an intelligent new Ham.

3768. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:23:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xBVF8.8274$Tx3.245639371@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42987

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CE7245B.8090707@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>
> > >
> > > The hoax is that an Advanced would ask such a silly question, then Larry
> > > answers it with a straight face. I'm still not buying it. You two
cooked
> > > this up.
> > >
> > > Why? Why do people troll?
>
>
> No hoax, no trol.
>
> I'm trying to remember...N0IMD...did you used to hang around 14.313?
>
> de KR4AJ

No Dan, never did. I wasn't authorized those frequencies until recently.
But if you're tring to recall my callsign on 14.313, you must have at least
done some listening there - probably on CW - Ha! You might even know that
a maritime net was held on that frequency in the Pacific.

I did operate and listen to 28.313 for maritime check-ins and traffic while
on Guam. I would pass the reports to other hams who had access to 14.313
maritime net. Lotsa fun.

3769. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:32:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YJVF8.8284$NL3.246481049@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42989

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020518231131.23618.00000189@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <1utF8.7492$Mv3.220179759@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Well there you have it. You know Larry, you've come on here with that
same
> >size 22 YL attitude concerning no-code Technicians. Luckily, you're not
> >able to monopolize the group as she did, as we each get to have our say.
> >
> >If you had to do the 1995 ARRL Maryland State Convention ARRL Forum
again,
> >how would you have handled it differently?
>
> Brian:
>
> I don't know that I *would* have handled it differently. However, I would
> hope that should Craigie and Turnbull also be there, that *they* would
> handle the situation much differently, indeed!
>
> BTW -- my "attitude" toward No-Code Technicians is based entirely on
> THEIR attitude and behavior.

It appears to be a vicious circle. They say the same about you.

> They want an easy way into the ARS,
> with full privileges granted for drastically reduced effort made in the
> licensing
> process,

Larry, they're smarter than you. When told to do something irrelevent, they
ask, "why?" When they attain the knowledge to operate on this frequency,
and are told that another amateur authorization a mere 1khz lower in
frequency is off-limits to them, they ask, "why?" You simply accepted it
and asked, "How high?"

The FCC made a grave mistake in allowing incentive licensing to get started,
let alone allowing it in this century.

and a demand that they be accepted as full-fledged hams in
> spite of having significantly less technical knowledge and operational
> skill in all areas of the hobby.

They are full fledged hams. The FCC says so. When they have the same
number of years experience in the service as you do, they will know at least

as much as you know. Thats just how it works.

> Their demands are based on liberal,
> New Age concepts of "inclusiveness" and "acceptance," while they
> sternly reject anything that resembles the conventional wisdom regarding
> the need to learn and gain privileges through progressive skill
development
> and testing.

Larry, they'll progress or won't progress. What's it to you? Did 100% of
your graduating class progress? Doubt it.

> Make something of that, PUNK.

Where did you pick up this prison language? Eeewww. Never mind.

3770. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:32:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mKVF8.8286$HG3.246172019@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42988

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CE7281E.AA233C4B@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > BTW -- my "attitude" toward No-Code Technicians is based entirely on
> > THEIR attitude and behavior.
>
> "But officer, I had no choice. She made me beat her up!"
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Wonder where Natasha is?

3771. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:36:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <UNVF8.8290$DM3.246534245@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42990

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020518231130.23618.00000188@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <pytF8.7494$vt3.220037472@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Lack of money on my part.
> >
>
> No lack of money on my part, just lack of time available to take off
> from making same.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Well Larry, as it would turn out my 8 year old really wanted to go. So we made the trip and spent a casual couple of hundred.

3772. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:37:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <VOVF8.8292$%L3.246495356@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42991

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:ac7tc061l16@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Working a double shift (sat eve/sun morn) and also had a class on saturday
> morning from 8am-4pm. My 3rd shift employer always plans their graduation
> ceremonies on the same weekend as Dayton and I know neither Dayton or my
> employer is gonna change weekends merely because I want them too.
>
> I am sure the lack of funds to make the trip enjoyable is another factor
> too.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR

Finish school and life will get better.

3773. Re: "The Smoking Gun?"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:42:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YSVF8.8295$tO3.246643041@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42992

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CE7AA2B.E3389E50@IEEE.org...
> From the latest issue of "America's 1st Freedom":
>
> "A Manitoba man who registered his Weller soldering gun as a firearm
> to protest restrictive Canadian gun laws could face a jail term. ...
> According to the "Ottawa Citizen", the Canadian Firearms Centre has
> turned the case over to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police."
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

So what's Dudley Do-Right gonna do? He otta arrest the public servant that allowed a soldering gun to be registered in the first place.

At Dayton I signed the petition for a Buckeye's right to carry a concealed handgun. Dropped a couple of bucks in their jar, too. It appears that Uncle Bob doesn't like it, but the senate already has enough override votes that Bob won't veto it.

3774. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 22:44:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <yVVF8.8297$VO3.246669358@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42993

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CE7F7BF.8BCED166@IEEE.org...
> Jim Weir wrote:
> > I still argue for, and will continue to argue for, amateur radio
licenses
> > patterned after the aviation certificates.
>
> Where's the life-and-death need for that in amateur radio? The
requirements
> for citizens to gain access to public property must be rational and
reasonable.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Is that why BLM is closing all of the access roads to public property? They want us to "save" the arctic wildlife refuge - the one that we'll never see, but their tax-dollar based grants make it their own private playground.

3775. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 23:27:47 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <TxWF8.31714$Vm2.1508709@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 42994

>> K7JEB:
>> You guys just don't get it. *Every* licensing
>> requirement must be related to a clearly
>> enunciated regulatory purpose.

> K0HB:
> Are you saying that someone who is deficient
> in mathematics due to a learning disorder,
> poor study habits, or ADD, ought to get a
> free pass on the technical qualifications
> for an Amateur Radio license?

I'm asking: What regulatory purposes are served
by requiring mathematics proficiency (at a stated
level) to be demonstrated by amateur radio operator
license applicants?

There really are legitimate answers to that question.
I can think of several having to do with calculating
frequencies, bandwidths, power levels - all valid
concerns about operating within the Rules and
Regulations - and all areas in which problems
have occurred in the past.

The bottom line is that the government's only concern
in granting a license in the Amateur Radio Service
should be that the licensees follow the published
rules and regulations - including the technical ones.
How that is done is a mere implementation detail.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona
...-.-

3776. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-19 23:51:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FTWF8.8316$q54.247767269@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 42995

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020519182230.01889.00000851@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >It will help intelligent new amateurs put up
> >with the likes of you.
>
> That would be different, an intelligent new Ham.

Yes, its very much different from unintelligent old hams. Hint, hint.

3777. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 00:19:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CE840EA.6B33380D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 42996

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Weir wrote:
> > It just makes a hell of a lot of sense to insure that people are competent in a
> > field that has the potential for death (high voltage and such) and creating a
> > public nuisance with a mis-tuned kilowatt before turning them loose to wreak
> > their havoc.
> >
> > Or do you not believe in education?
>
> I do believe in education, particularly for people who use "insure" for "ensure".
> I reckon the Bible was right about moats and specks.

...or even motes (again). Maybe you guys can get a two-for-one rate if
you sign up for classes now.

Dave K8MN

3778. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 01:13:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwdpek0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 42997

On Sun, 19 May 2002 22:09:11 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than cement, it
>might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
>asphalt are not.

Aew tou saying that a (cubic) yard of asphalt has the same mass and
compression parameters as a yard of concrete?

Are you averring that the local building offical and the tower
manufacturer will agree to this substitution?

In what state are you a registered professional civil or structural
engineer?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane, PE

3779. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 02:45:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ac9o6eknm1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42998

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3CE58952.5BC3AD49@adelphia.net...
> That's kind of off the subject, but since you throw that in what do we
> do with people who have ADD? And if they have something like ADD *and*
> one of these other problems, should they be exempted from everything?

ADD does not require total exemptions. ADD does call for certain
accomodations to be made in testing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > Here's another one of those little problems: Do we have
> > medical waivers for people who have any number of possible
> > ailments or disabilities: One arm, arthritis, lost fingers,
> > paralized arm, hand, etc?
> >
> > Something to think about.
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> > -

3780. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 02:56:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ac9opv$9go$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 42999

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020518220722.23618.00000181@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <ac1vht$vk3$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Here's another one of those little problems: Do we have
> >medical waivers for people who have any number of possible
> >ailments or disabilities: One arm, arthritis, lost fingers,
> >paralized arm, hand, etc?
>
> Bill:
> Good question. Here's the short, simple answer: No. No medical
> waivers. There is no guarantee stamped on our heads at birth that we
> will be able to do anything and everything we want to do, and we're
> simply going to have to come to the realization that amateur radio
> is included among the list of things that aren't for everyone. If this
> is in any way incorrect, I want the federal government to fully
> compensate me for the career as a military and commercial airline
> pilot I never had as a result of my eyesight.

The point was in making a practical test a requirement (i.e. soldering
a connector). I see no reason to make that a general requirement
in the first place, but simply identified that IF it were a requirement
there are people that are excellent hams today who wouldn't be able
to pass that test. How does a blind person learn to solder anything,
much less a connector...yet there are many blind hams who are great
hams and a credit to the entire ham community.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3781. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 03:08:05 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <pMZF8.404$9E4.255@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43000

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message

>
> Everyone seemed to ask: So why aren't you at Dayton?
>

Christening of Grand-daughter.

73, Hans, K0HB

3782. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 03:08:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ac9ph4cub1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43101

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:AE412A7AA428C472.7055291F7168CFF0.60F1C14CA996D40F@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 16 May 2002 12:59:11 -0400, Rick Adams
> <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote:
>
> > Actually, it was based on a concept of contractual freedom.
> >Unlike laws and ordinances, CC&Rs are _voluntary_ limitations accepted
> >by the purchaser.
>
> "Voluntary" is hardly the word for it when they're mandatory on all
> the houses available within a two-hour drive of your workplace.
>
> >You _can't_ "pass" a CC&R that is binding on anyone
> >after they have made their purchase--it can only be introduced prior
> >to sale.
>
> True for CC&Rs, but not for HOAs' rules, which are also a serious
> problem.

For HOA rules to be implemented assumes there is an HOA
setup as part of the development (i.e. subdividion) and that it
is valid as part of the deeded proocess. A neighborhood could
jointly agree to create an HOA and setup rules, BUT that could
only be for those that agree to go along.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3783. Re: "The Smoking Gun?"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 03:19:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020519231915.15968.00000260@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 43102

In article <3CE7AA2B.E3389E50@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>From the latest issue of "America's 1st Freedom":
>
>"A Manitoba man who registered his Weller soldering gun as a firearm
>to protest restrictive Canadian gun laws could face a jail term. ...
>According to the "Ottawa Citizen", the Canadian Firearms Centre has
>turned the case over to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police."

Cecil:

Interesting. Obviously, Canadians have no right to Keep And Bear
Arms, and, consequently, also don't have any right to protest against
their government. Otherwise, whichever bureaucrat processed the
request to register the Weller as a firearm would simply have rejected
the application on the basis that it wasn't, in fact, a firearm. It would
be interesting to see how the RCMP handles the case.

Any government who would make trouble for a citizen over something
like this is only proving what a good idea our Second Amendment
really is.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Member, NRA

3784. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 03:19:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020519231916.15968.00000261@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 43103

In article <6lVF8.8260$wz3.245736815@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> If this
>> is in any way incorrect, I want the federal government to fully
>> compensate me for the career as a military and commercial airline
>> pilot I never had as a result of my eyesight.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>That's not why you weren't a pilot.

Brian:

If my 20/400 eyesight didn't disqualify me for a career as a military pilot, and a subsequent career as an airline pilot, could you please tell me why not -- and how not? Keep in mind, when I took my acceptance physical for the Air Force Academy, they rejected me for the entire program based on my eyesight, since they were seeking strictly pilot/navigator qualified personnel at the time! Four years later when trying to enlist, I was reject for a job as an SP or LE due to my eyesight. Went in under open Admin and finally took the Air Transportation career field. Sooo -- if my eyesight wasn't the reason for me not being a pilot, please, praytell what was?

Keep in mind, I know full well I could have become a private pilot at my own expense, and took flying lessons right up to soloing, but never had an instrument or commercial rating. I just couldn't afford to fly on my own resources as a hobby. So, again, tell me why I never had a career as a pilot.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3785. Cushcraft R7 / R7000 Antennas TECH Page w/downloads

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 03:20:32 UTC
From: Joe Martin <p166micron@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bea7f52253b8fbf5a57afdd338c30f9c.93981@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43104

Here is an extremely informative Cushcraft R7 / R7000 tech page I found with illustrations, tech tips, R7 trap drawings, R7 and R7000 instruction and assembly manuals too.

It is all free and also all downloadable. By far the best page of it's kind I have ever found...

http://www.ab7sl.com/index.html?row1col2=r7.html

Joe Martin - WA5LHV

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3786. Re: The Truth About Most Hams [from rec.radio.cb]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 03:29:19 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020519232919.27766.00000484@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 43105

>hfa9315@alaska.usa.com (HFA_9315) wrote in message
>news:<e97ee11a.0205060851.33048afa@posting.google.com>...
>> As a Ham operator of many years one thing still holds true. Most hams
>> are silly little snobs who use radio to build up their sense of self
>> worth. All of you "good hammie" types may reply with a flame if you
>> like, but the truth remains the truth.

Ham radio doesn't appeal to everyone. Ham radio is a cult. To be in this cult you have to follow Ham conventions and Ham traditions, otherwise you are not a true Ham.

You must use code words in your normal conversation so a non-Ham cannot figure out what you mean. Drop all those code words from Ham radio. Do you have to use all those code words to be a true Ham?

Hams and ham radio tend to be boring. There are Ham picnics, visits to radio museums. How about hiking, camping, Ham cruises? Ham radio cannot attract new members because it is not interesting to people. The non-Ham public associates Hams with strange, code word using, cult-like people. Then, when they attend Ham Radio meetings to learn about Ham radio, how is their opinion changed?

> Haming could be a wonderful hobby. Instead it is nothing more than a
> bunch of small minds with low self esteem hoping to invoke their
> warped
> thoughts on others.

Ham radio could be a fun hobby with activities such as radio direction finding, but most Hams are not interested in that. How about radar detection? Hams do not usually want to do group activities, or use radio skills. The people that do, keep it to themselves and do not involve others.

Some people want to do exciting things with radio that do not fit into the Ham radio aspects or Ham radio culture. I am a radio amateur but do not consider myself a "Ham". Clubs that are called Amateur Radio should not be called Amateur Radio clubs, they should be called HAM RADIO club. There should be other, non-Ham Amateur radio clubs.

A typical Ham wants to operate a radio, not experiment with the radio. Hams are not technical. Contesting is one example of this. The goal is to contact as many people you can in a certain time. Awards, such as "Worked All States" (for contacting people in every state) are given. Its all about the contacts. That’s what Ham radio is all about. That’s not necessarily bad, it just doesn't appeal to everyone. The award is for contacting at least one person in every US state. There are various awards for band activity and contesting (number of contacts in a given time). Logging in your contacts can get pretty tedious. Pretty boring when you think about it.

Ham radio does not require a lot of knowledge. Basically, anyone can buy a radio, set it up, and start communicating. There does not need to be a test for that. It only requires the ability to follow directions for the radio that you buy. I bought a wooden cabinet. It did not come pre-assembled. I put it together and now I use the cabinet. They do not make you get furniture certification for you to buy cabinets. Why should they make you get a license for putting together an antenna for a radio? These days, with commercial products, all you have to do is follow directions. The knowledge required is greatly exaggerated.

You do not need three license classes at all. Even the lowest class doesn't need all the knowledge that they test for. You can have no knowledge at all and pass the test after a one day cram session (where they give you the questions and the answers- a question pool). It is easy to pass the test since you know what the answers are.

Also, when a question pool is used for the testing, people see it as insincere. Now meaningless criteria are used for all sorts of justifications. If is this kind of flimsy associations that one would be outraged if a private corporation applied the same criteria. Here, its harmless, but it means that getting that license is meaningless and hardly a source of pride.

Hams do have low self esteem. They show excess pride in their Ham hobby. Many change their automobile license plate to their call sign as their license plate! They will take a day off from work to go to a ham fest (Ham flea market) on Friday, when the same ham fest is on Saturday. Ham radio is all these people have.

> Want to try some SSTV? Take a look around 27.775....or maybe packet?
> look around 27.900. Oh, the FM DX has been rolling in around
> 26.675.....see
> what I mean? These 11 mtr guys are the ones having the fun on the
> radio, and
> isn't fun what it's supposed to be about? (And don't spew that crap
> about "hams" and "public service"..... you are all useless as far as
> that goes and you and I both know it).

Yes, fun is what its all about. Something those contesting, codeword using Hams tend to forget.

Forget about public service. There are enough paid people in place to do those jobs. Public service is greatly exaggerated. Self justification is understandable, even admirable.

If Ham radio is to survive, Hams should advocate the freedoms that Ham radio allow. This can be a source of great pride which anyone can understand and relate to.

3787. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 03:33:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CE86ECD.8D395A08@adelphia.net>
Source record: 43106

Don't try this at home Kids!!!! Asphalt gets quite soft at warm temps,
and you wouldn't like what could happen.

- Mike -

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Sun, 19 May 2002 22:09:11 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than cement, it
> >might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
> >asphalt are not.
>
> Aew tou saying that a (cubic) yard of asphalt has the same mass and
> compression parameters as a yard of concrete?
>
> Are you averring that the local building offical and the tower
> manufacturer will agree to this substitution?
>
> In what state are you a registered professional civil or structural
> engineer?
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane, PE

3788. Re: "The Smoking Gun?"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 04:18:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE878FC.D5AF8E81@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43107

Brian P Burke wrote:
> At Dayton I signed the petition for a Buckeye's right to carry a concealed
> handgun.

Again from "America's 1st Freedom": "Freedom got a lift when a three-judge
panel from the 1st Ohio District Court of Appeals ruled unanimously that a
ban on concealed weapons violated the state constitution ..."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3789. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 04:26:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE87AF3.772F3709@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43108

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I do believe in education, particularly for people who use "insure" for "ensure".
> > I reckon the Bible was right about moats and specks.
>
> ...or even motes (again). Maybe you guys can get a two-for-one rate if
> you sign up for classes now.

Thanks Dave, I always wondered what specks in the eye had to do with moats.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3790. Re: "The Smoking Gun?"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 04:31:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE87C16.29A4DEEA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43109

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Interesting. Obviously, Canadians have no right to Keep And Bear
> Arms, and, consequently, also don't have any right to protest against
> their government. Otherwise, whichever bureaucrat processed the
> request to register the Weller as a firearm would simply have rejected
> the application on the basis that it wasn't, in fact, a firearm.

I didn't type the entire article. He had no idea it would be accepted.
"When he got a registration card back with the make of the gun listed as
a Black & Decker/Weller, he said he couldn't believe his eyes."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3791. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 06:17:46 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <ey0G8.25457$D41.850585@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43110

> Bill Sohl, K2UNK, wrote:
> .... How does a blind person learn to solder anything,
> much less a connector...yet there are many blind hams who are great
> hams and a credit to the entire ham community.

I'll tell you how they do it -- by cajoling sighted hams into
doing it for them! Those guys have some special "people"
skills that match anything any "practical" test could come
up with. (Typed as I am putting a completely overhauled D-104
microphone back together for one of our sightless brethern
-- and it was only supposed to be a simple matter of changing
the plug from Yaesu to Kenwood).

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3792. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 06:31:35 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acaohe0a83@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43114

```
>
> >I am still trying to assemble a group of hams together for
> >this purpose, but there is this lethargy recently, that needs to change.
In
> >other words, with a lot of these people, you couldn't light a fire under
> >their ass with a 1000 gallons of gasoline.
>
> Sure.
>
> You have to remember that many hams are already overcommitted to work,
> family, school, church, etc.

No.... missing the point, even at the meetings when you ask for volunteers,
or opinions or just general reaction from some of these people and it is
like a blank stare similar to a deer caught in the headlights. Maybe Dow
chemical has something to do with it since they are in our town......

>
> >There is a little over 500
> >schools in the tri-county area in which I am in, and I have this lofty
goal,
> >that we could encourage at least ONE new ham from each of these schools.
> >Now that may be much to expect one student out of 300-500 students to get
> >licensed per year, but I believe it is a beneficial goal. That would
make
> >500 (or more) new hams within the Mid-Michigan area alone per year.
Kinda a
> >crazy thought eh?
>
> Not crazy at all.
>
> >I just need a little help in the equipment category for
> >the presentations.... I am very comfortable in the public speaking side
of
> >the presentation, and in fact, I am doing a presentation to about 300 or
so
> >law enforcement/ems/fire personell in June with the hopes of getting some
of
> >these people, albeit not necessarily of the youth set, but definitely of
the
> >mentality and training that would make them a positive asset to our
hobby.
> >(They are accustomed to recieving training and of course following
rules.)
>
```

> I think the most basic question is, "why aren't these folks hams already?"
> If the reason is simply that they don't know ham radio exists, then
> pubicity is the answer. But there may be other reasons that are
> harder to address.

I have found that the biggest problem is awareness at all, most people that I have tried to "sell" or promote the hobby to weren't even aware of the capabilities of ham radio. Then there are a few that think it is CB, and some that think we are the next cast members of the next Revenge of the Nerds movie. (pocket protectors and all) This is pretty much the ordering of awareness as I have encountered it recently. I definitely will keep on trying to change the perceptions to positive ones though.

> >> >It has been stated many times, but we definitely need to promote amateur
> >> >radio to people in the 30 'n" under categories....
> >>
> >> I agree 100%. That's what the ARRL "Big Project" is about. Another
> >> reason I'm a member. But that project is only one step.
>
> >> >You are the one that seems to post the information about license numbers.
> >>
> >> That's me.
> >>
> >> >I wonder if age could some how be factored into those calculations.
> >>
> >> I would do so if there were a reliable source of that info. The FCC has
> >done
> >> the on-again off-again thing with DOB information, so there is no complete
> >> database of how old US hams are. Surveys and reports are often very
> >> inaccurate because they do not take representative samples. For example,
> >> although I'm a fairly active ham, I haven't been to a hamfest in several
> >years,
> >> nor to a local club meeting in a year or so. It's not because I don't want
> >to
> >> go,
> >> but because family and work obligations prevent it.
> >
> >Understood, but it would be neat to see, and would back up some peoples
> >statements that are merely a guess or an averaging at this point.
>
> To really be meaningful, the info would have to be indexed against the
> population's
> ages. On average, Americans today are living longer and having fewer children.
> That has definite effects on lots of things.

> >
> >> >I can honestly guess that the
> >> >overwhelming majority of hams are in the 50-70 year old age bracket,
and
> >> >over the next 20 years or so, we will lose alot of those hams to
natural
> >> >(and unnatural also) causes of death.
> >>
> >> I'm 48, and been a ham 35 years in October.
> >
> >Well... a "teenager" in the hobby eh? :)

Was referring to the relative age in the hobby, where 60 seems to be the
equivalent of 30 some years old. :)

Ryan

3793. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 06:33:45 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acaohf1a83@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43118

As it is so easy to lump everyone into categories Larry? What about the ones who just became aware of it recently, prior to their licensing. Did they wait for a lesser testing scheme on purpose if they were never aware of the hobby in the first place?

Ryan KC8PMX

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20020518231131.23618.00000189@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <1utF8.7492$Mv3.220179759@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Well there you have it. You know Larry, you've come on here with that same
> >size 22 YL attitude concerning no-code Technicians. Luckily, you're not
> >able to monopolize the group as she did, as we each get to have our say.
> >
> >If you had to do the 1995 ARRL Maryland State Convention ARRL Forum again,
> >how would you have handled it differently?
>
> Brian:
>
> I don't know that I *would* have handled it differently. However, I would
> hope that should Craigie and Turnbull also be there, that *they* would
> handle the situation much differently, indeed!
>
> BTW -- my "attitude" toward No-Code Technicians is based entirely on
> THEIR attitude and behavior. They want an easy way into the ARS,
> with full privileges granted for drastically reduced effort made in the
> licensing
> process, and a demand that they be accepted as full-fledged hams in
> spite of having significantly less technical knowledge and operational
> skill in all areas of the hobby. Their demands are based on liberal,
> New Age concepts of "inclusiveness" and "acceptance," while they
> sternly reject anything that resembles the conventional wisdom regarding
> the need to learn and gain privileges through progressive skill development
> and testing.
>
> Make something of that, PUNK.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

3794. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 06:37:31 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acaohg2a83@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43116

Okay... ya got me there, that is one emotion or inflection that can be clearly and quickly stated in word form. But there is other emotions that cannot easily be demonstrated in a text (or code) that can only be detected by listening to a voice. Now when I am referring to the voice comms, I am not referring to extreme emotions, just the day to day communications and what we percieve by what we hear.

Ryan KC8PMX

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CE7A7EF.34D3201C@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > What about even to detect whether a person is saying something with a
"smile
> > in their voice" ...
>
> ....
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> ------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3795. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 06:44:39 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acaohh3a83@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43119

Just another one of the 100+ weekend classes or training sessions that we as firefighters have available to us to improve our skills that are available through the year. Am already full-time employed.

Too bad that there is not something similar in Amateur radio. There could be various elements in the different facets of the hobby that we could take as a class that would help us to improve our skills. I mean going further in depth into the various subjects such as antennas, or radio circuitry or message handling or ????

I personally have some great strengths in certain subjects as they relate to amateur radio, and definitely some weaknesses I would like to improve upon. They say we must be a self-policing body, but what about a self-educating body? Talk about getting clubs more activity and participation.....

Just a thought,

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

>
> Finish school and life will get better.
>
>

3796. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 06:48:20 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acaohi4a83@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43115

Almost forgot this too.... Recently had some incredible bills and that has left the checking account at the lowest it has been at in almost 5 years. Unexpected repair on my truck and some other unplanned, and unexpected expenses kinda removed the amount in my checking account that I refer to as my "goof off" money. The money that is mine after the bills are all paid, and still have a little buffer before touching the goof off money. Guess that is why it is good to save for the proverbial rainy day.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> Finish school and life will get better.
>
>

3797. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 06:50:46 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acaohj5a83@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43120

Joe... PRB-1 has nothing for renters or leasee's. It assumes that hams are only residential home owners and that is about it.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> >Only if it harms the property. I see nothing wrong with the ability to set
> >up a portable antenna that does not create any damage to the property. In
> >my own specific case, I cannot even have one of those "dish network" mini
> >satellite dishes as an option to cable tv.
>
> Better recheck that one; that's exactly what the existing exemptions
> are for.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

3798. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 06:58:15 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acaohj6a83@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43117

True.... because the current names of the license levels means absolutely nothing. It shows no direction or ranking. Extra what anyways? The words Novice License seems pretty clear, Technician is misleading, General could go a couple of ways. Advanced makes sense if the General class was the starting point but I still think that some form of ranking in the licensure as far as the names of the different licenses go would be better. And of course, to help them further with the "big head complex" the Extra class would be referred to the most optimum that someone could achieve. I.E. 1st Class

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

>
> What does it matter what the names are? It could be:
>
> top dog = extra
> 2nd banana = general
> 3rd banana = tech
> etc.
>

3799. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 11:11:42 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <OR4G8.32564$Vm2.1571183@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43111

Brian P Burke wrote:

> ... Anyway, there you have it. Fair Larry has spoken.
> Others think the internet might have had something
> to do with most hams vacating the repeaters......

My own take is that it is more a result of the build-out of the cellular telephone networks. That took a lot of the autopatch and "honey do" traffic away from the VHF/UHF repeaters, and with it the impetus to fix up the XYL and harmonics with Technician ham tickets. Then along came GMRS and FRS that directly competed with the ARS for the short-range, simplex, "caravan" traffic and the advantages of a licensed service for personal communications faded further. It has been argued that the ARS is not a personal communications service, but even the most casual monitoring of the ham bands shows this to be a significant component of the content of ARS communications, and not just on VHF/UHF either.

So, "there you have it".

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona
...-.-

3800. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 12:06:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520080641.05958.00000055@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 43112

In article <boVF8.8261$Vy3.245696807@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020518220708.13422.00000105@mb-mb.aol.com...
>
>> Here in PA, I had to specifically ask to see the deed restrictions before
>> making an offer. My RE attorney had to dig them up from the files at the
>> county seat. Even though this house is more than 50 years old, it has a
>> page and a half of fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing against antennas,
>> though, but a tower might be difficult, as it may be considered a
>> "structure" due to its permanent nature. In fact, I do not know of any
>> amateur radio towers in Radnor Township. Kinda odd, considering that
>> Radnor was the home of Charlie Stewart.
>
>If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than cement, it
>might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
>asphalt are not.

HAW!!! Oh that's a GOOD one!! Almost up to the level of ol' Masa's promise of April 2, 1998.

A freestanding tower set in a cubic yard of asphalt won't be permanent, that's for sure. Not after the first warm day.

Of course it would probably never actually be erected in the first place. Township would never grant the building permit, for one thing. Asphalt truck wouldn't pour the stuff in the hole, either because they fear liability or because they were laughing too hard.

btw, one sets tower bases in concrete, not cement.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3801. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 12:06:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520080641.05958.00000054@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 43113

In article <527563DA45A58713.BA7FE6F755ADBE93.C3CD7C82B5DFB700@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>On 18 May 2002 00:06:39 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>There is also the business of finding out what the restrictions are in the
>>first place. Of course everyone should find them BEFORE signing anything,
>>but in some areas it's mighty difficult to get to the actual CC&Rs.
>
>IMO, this is something that needs to be addressed by the individual
>states; require the seller to provide a copy of *all* restrictions
>before the sale is completed. Void them if it isn't done.

Better yet, have the restrcitions as part of the initial offering information,
like the price and number of bathrooms. Anybody who has an issue with
restrictions is going to want to know up-front that they exist, and what
they cover. However, the real estate folks sure won't like it. When folks
are confronted with a couple of pages of what they can't do, they may
see lots of walk-aways.

>>>Tech study guide: $10
>>>Tech exam: $10
>>>Coming to the realization that licenses (by definition, even) permit
>>>you to do things that unlicensed people can't: Priceless
>>
>>HAW! I love that one! Can I use it?
>
>Of course.

TNX
>
>>But most important of all, any ham could become interested in emergency
>>comms in the future - maybe even as a result of having a decent antenna.
>
>I hear a few people from time to time mention that they don't check
>into the Late Net regularly because they can't have a good antenna at
>home. Considering that:
>a) it's 2m
>b) I can usually hit that repeater on vacation from 90mi out with a
> J-pole up at 15ft
>c) at least one of our once-or-twice-a-week crowd has a good signal
> from 45mi out with a mobile halfwave
>they aren't needing a 27-element yagi on a 190ft tower, they just need
>a way to get their HOA to let them put a groundplane on the roof.
>

Exactly. This is one point that is often missed. Most hams are not looking to put up huge towers, they just want a wire or two and maybe a vertical or small VHF yagi.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3802. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 14:50:26 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE90D32.229956B@psu.edu>
Source record: 43121

You have hit on a big part of *why* the conduct is so gentlemanly while using CW. It is by nature terse, and all inference must be made from the text. (with that *HI* exception) It is how I can tell a friend in person that they are full if crap, and they will take it as a good mannered jest, and if I typed or tapped it out, they would not be pleased at all.

- Mkie KB3EIA -

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> Okay... ya got me there, that is one emotion or inflection that can be
> clearly and quickly stated in word form. But there is other emotions that
> cannot easily be demonstrated in a text (or code) that can only be detected
> by listening to a voice. Now when I am referring to the voice comms, I am
> not referring to extreme emotions, just the day to day communications and
> what we percieve by what we hear.
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CE7A7EF.34D3201C@IEEE.org...
> > KC8PMX wrote:
> > > What about even to detect whether a person is saying something with a
> "smile
> > > in their voice" ...
> >
> > ....
> > --

3803. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 14:59:19 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CE90F47.67F35EE7@psu.edu>
Source record: 43122

Changing the topic slightly, is there a rule of thumb for the amount of concrete in which to set the tower? Something like equal or greater mass compared to the tower?

- Mike KB3EIA -

N2EY wrote:
>
> HAW!!! Oh that's a GOOD one!! Almost up to the level of ol' Masa's
> promise of April 2, 1998.
>
> A freestanding tower set in a cubic yard of asphalt won't be permanent,
> that's for sure. Not after the first warm day.
>
> Of course it would probably never actually be erected in the first place.
> Township would never grant the building permit, for one thing. Asphalt
> truck wouldn't pour the stuff in the hole, either because they fear
> liability or because they were laughing too hard.
>
> btw, one sets tower bases in concrete, not cement.

3804. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 16:00:36 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <E49G8.672$t23.327@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43123

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Changing the topic slightly, is there a rule of thumb for the amount of
> concrete in which to set the tower?

No "rule of thumb" that I know. Depends on your soil (sandy, clay, rock), height of tower, free-standing vs. guyed or house-bracketed, prevailing wind conditions, subject to radial ice or not, etc, etc, etc.

In "normal" soil (at least 4000#/sf vertical and 400#/sf horizontal bearing capacity), you should be able to keep a 45' tower erect with 2 yards of good (5-bag strength) concrete. Serious towers (higher than 45 feet self supported) really ought to have an engineering consultation.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Walk softly and carry a big fish.

3805. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 17:59:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520135955.03751.00000106@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43124

In article <eu4G8.4051$Fe7.205029403@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Are you averring that the local building offical and the tower
>> manufacturer will agree to this substitution?
>>
>> In what state are you a registered professional civil or structural
>> engineer?
>>
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane, PE
>
>Phil, you guys are always out to screw someone, aren't you?

Aside from Phil forgetting to take his HUMOR pills this week, you have to remember that attorneys are always for "no-ass-fault" law. :-)

[maybe he just got his legal briefs in a knot...]

3806. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 17:59:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520135956.03751.00000107@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43125

In article <acaohj6a83@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>True.... because the current names of the license levels means absolutely
>nothing. It shows no direction or ranking. Extra what anyways? The words
>Novice License seems pretty clear, Technician is misleading, General could
>go a couple of ways. Advanced makes sense if the General class was the
>starting point but I still think that some form of ranking in the licensure
>as far as the names of the different licenses go would be better. And of
>course, to help them further with the "big head complex" the Extra class
>would be referred to the most optimum that someone could achieve. I.E. 1st
>Class

Ryan, all of the TITLES grew, became a part of the nomenclature over
the last half century. Many of the title-holders attach great personal
importance to those titles, rather well above the actual accomplishment.
That and TENURE (maintaining a license through regular renewals) are
substitutes for "professional equity" standing in the hobby. That is very
important emotional baggage for all those concerned and cannot be
mislaid without raising a Hue and Cry for the heads of the dastards
who dare defile those TITLES.

TITLES and STATUS (through tenure) are very important to some and
must be kept alive.

Never mind that most get totally lost when behind the front panel of
their radios...the titles and status proclaim them to be "extra special"
and thus able to look down on lowlier titles and claim superiority.

In one way such attitudes are serving their purpose. They reject
enough newcomers to keep their status intact by preserving their
hobby environment. Since they have a federal merit badge of a
license they can wave that around like a flag to prove their
alleged superiority over "lesser" licensees and be triumphant in
"accomplishments" over all who do not have such a license.

ONE license, no distinctive "classes" would be more attractive
to the hobby in general...but that is such a no-no that uttering
such heresy shows a "lack of proper spirit" (toward those with
title and status). :-)

What these supermen of ham radio need is MORE license
classes, MANY more or all gradations so as to preserve their
self-importance...of course, grandfathering their present title and
status to the top-most class of such a multiple-tiered class
structure. They "deserve it." :-)

3807. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 17:59:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520135957.03751.00000108@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43126

In article <Lr4G8.4050$vf7.205062245@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Larry, there are lots of reasons that people don't make it in to the Air
>Force Academy, a flying slot in the Air Force, or commercial airlines.
>Hell, even active duty rated pilots have to be careful they don't lose it.
>
>They just happened upon a convenient excuse to eliminate you. If you had
>Superman vision I wouldn't fly with you.

Larry isn't superman...but he DOES need supervision. :-)

3808. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 19:00:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwf0t30.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43127

On Mon, 20 May 2002 02:50:46 -0400, KC8PMX wrote:

>Joe... PRB-1 has nothing for renters or leasee's. It assumes that hams are
>only residential home owners and that is about it.

PRB-1 assumes nothing of the sort. It deals with restrictions posed by
ordinances, statutes, procedures or rules rnacted by local or state
government entities, regardless of property ownership.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

3809. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 19:00:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwf1dz1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43128

On Mon, 20 May 2002 10:46:34 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>> In what state are you a registered professional civil or structural
>> engineer?
>>
>> ---
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane, PE
>
>Phil, you guys are always out to screw someone, aren't you?

The first question that I always ask an opposition witness is
swaigned to elicit his/her expertise or standing in the matter.
Then we know up front whether or not the individual is (forgive
the technical lawyer jargon) talking through a paper a**hole.

The two things that are guaranteed to light my rocket are
non-lawyers playing lawyer and non-engineers playing engineer....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3810. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 19:00:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwf1s92.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43129

On Mon, 20 May 2002 10:59:19 -0400, mike coslo wrote:

> Changing the topic slightly, is there a rule of thumb for the amount of
>concrete in which to set the tower? Something like equal or greater mass
>compared to the tower?

My tower structural engineering consultant (and all of the textbooks
on the subject) tells me that it should be enough to keep both the center
of gravity and the center of rotation well below the ground
level. At least that's what I learned in my engineering school
tower design course in the stone age.....

He also tells me that the "rule of thumb" is to double the tower
manufacturer;s recommended dimensions "just to be on the safe side".

For mounting a tower in a yard of chocolate pudding, the above
advice is worth what one pays for it..... <ggg>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3811. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 19:14:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE94B0E.F733D767@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43130

mike coslo wrote:
> Changing the topic slightly, is there a rule of thumb for the amount of
> concrete in which to set the tower? Something like equal or greater mass
> compared to the tower?

Rohn specifies such. For instance, for a self-supporting 25G tower
the "concrete required - 2.4 cu.yds."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3812. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 19:22:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <P1cG8.935$t23.290@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43131

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

>
> Rohn specifies such. For instance, for a self-supporting 25G tower
> the "concrete required - 2.4 cu.yds."
>

25G how tall?

3813. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 21:22:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CE9691B.904CB4A2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43132

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > Rohn specifies such. For instance, for a self-supporting 25G tower
> > the "concrete required - 2.4 cu.yds."
>
> 25G how tall?

Thirty feet or less.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3814. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:04:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dqeG8.132$Ku7.7716180@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43133

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:OR4G8.32564$Vm2.1571183@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > ... Anyway, there you have it. Fair Larry has spoken.
> > Others think the internet might have had something
> > to do with most hams vacating the repeaters......
>
> My own take is that it is more a result of the build-out
> of the cellular telephone networks. That took a lot of
> the autopatch and "honey do" traffic away from the VHF/UHF
> repeaters, and with it the impetus to fix up the XYL and
> harmonics with Technician ham tickets. Then along came
> GMRS and FRS that directly competed with the ARS for the
> short-range, simplex, "caravan" traffic and the advantages
> of a licensed service for personal communications faded
> further. It has been argued that the ARS is not a personal
> communications service, but even the most casual monitoring
> of the ham bands shows this to be a significant component
> of the content of ARS communications, and not just on
> VHF/UHF either.
>
> So, "there you have it".
>
>
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona
> ...-.-

Jim, good point. Even my wife and fambly are using FRS for caravanning and other outings. After exposure to some silly ham stuff in Illinois, she no longer wanted to get a license. Even though it was CW/Morse that intrigued her.

3815. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:06:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <oreG8.133$iw7.7815413@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43134

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020520135957.03751.00000108@mb-cm.aol.com...
> In article <Lr4G8.4050$vf7.205062245@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > >Larry, there are lots of reasons that people don't make it in to the Air
> > >Force Academy, a flying slot in the Air Force, or commercial airlines.
> > >Hell, even active duty rated pilots have to be careful they don't lose
> it.
> > >
> > >They just happened upon a convenient excuse to eliminate you. If you had
> > >Superman vision I wouldn't fly with you.
> >
> >
> > Larry isn't superman...but he DOES need supervision. :-)

Len, where you been? I've been out here fending off the wolves with sticks.

3816. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:10:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7veG8.135$Pu7.7721081@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43135

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwf1dz1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 20 May 2002 10:46:34 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >> In what state are you a registered professional civil or structural
> >> engineer?
> >>
> >> ---
> >> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane, PE
> >
> >Phil, you guys are always out to screw someone, aren't you?
>
> The first question that I always ask an opposition witness is
> swaigned to elicit his/her expertise or standing in the matter.
> Then we know up front whether or not the individual is (forgive
> the technical lawyer jargon) talking through a paper a**hole.

Huh? What does that mean?

> The two things that are guaranteed to light my rocket are
> non-lawyers playing lawyer and non-engineers playing engineer....

Lots of guys just bury their tower base in the soil. I've never heard you
comment on that.

3817. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:14:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <UyeG8.136$Zy7.7981157@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43136

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020520080641.05958.00000055@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <boVF8.8261$Vy3.245696807@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020518220708.13422.00000105@mb-mb.aol.com...
> >
> >> Here in PA, I had to specifically ask to see the deed restrictions
before
> >> making an offer. My RE attorney had to dig them up from the files at
the
> >> county seat. Even though this house is more than 50 years old, it has a
> >> page and a half of fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing against
antennas,
> >> though, but a tower might be difficult, as it may be considered a
> >> "structure" due to its permanent nature. In fact, I do not know of any
> >> amateur radio towers in Radnor Township. Kinda odd, considering that
> >> Radnor was the home of Charlie Stewart.
> >
> >If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than cement,
it
> >might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
> >asphalt are not.
>
> HAW!!! Oh that's a GOOD one!! Almost up to the level of ol' Masa's
> promise of April 2, 1998.
>
> A freestanding tower set in a cubic yard of asphalt won't be permanent,
> that's for sure. Not after the first warm day.

What's your problem? Even on a warm day, my 12'x30'x3" driveway is stable
enough to park heavy equipment on without denting it.

> Of course it would probably never actually be erected in the first place.
> Township would never grant the building permit, for one thing. Asphalt
> truck wouldn't pour the stuff in the hole, either because they fear
> liability or because they were laughing too hard.
>
> btw, one sets tower bases in concrete, not cement.

40lb bags, right?

3818. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:16:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_AeG8.138$0A7.8048992@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43137

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwf1s92.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 20 May 2002 10:59:19 -0400, mike coslo wrote:
>
> > Changing the topic slightly, is there a rule of thumb for the amount of
> >concrete in which to set the tower? Something like equal or greater mass
> >compared to the tower?
>
> My tower structural engineering consultant (and all of the textbooks
> on the subject) tells me that it should be enough to keep both the
center
> of gravity and the center of rotation well below the ground
> level. At least that's what I learned in my engineering school
> tower design course in the stone age.....
>
> He also tells me that the "rule of thumb" is to double the tower
> manufacturer;s recommended dimensions "just to be on the safe side".
>
> For mounting a tower in a yard of chocolate pudding, the above
> advice is worth what one pays for it..... <ggg>
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil, are you saying that you have to use a winch to unstick your vehicle
from your chocolate pudding driveway in August?

3819. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:19:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <rDeG8.139$Ay7.7955755@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43138

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CE90D32.229956B@psu.edu...
> You have hit on a big part of *why* the conduct is so gentlemanly while
> using CW. It is by nature terse, and all inference must be made from the
> text. (with that *HI* exception) It is how I can tell a friend in person
> that they are full if crap, and they will take it as a good mannered
> jest, and if I typed or tapped it out, they would not be pleased at all.
>
> - Mkie KB3EIA -

So whan Larry's "friend" taps out "QFU" and doesn't append a "hi," is Larry
actually serious.

3820. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:31:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520183131.27747.00000651@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 43139

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>No.... missing the point, even at the meetings when you ask for volunteers,
>or opinions or just general reaction from some of these people and it is
>like a blank stare similar to a deer caught in the headlights.

That happens just as frequently at non-ham meetings I attend, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3821. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:32:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520183253.27747.00000653@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 43140

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>Too bad that there is not something similar in Amateur radio. There could
>be various elements in the different facets of the hobby that we could take
>as a class that would help us to improve our skills. I mean going further
>in depth into the various subjects such as antennas, or radio circuitry or
>message handling or ????

For info on doing this on-line, see:

http://www.arrl.org/cce/

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3822. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:34:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520183437.27747.00000654@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 43141

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than cement, it
>>might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
>>asphalt are not.

>Of course it would probably never actually be erected in the first place.
>Township would never grant the building permit, for one thing.

My township would want the same permit for a concrete driveway as an asphalt
one.

I think he made it all up. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3823. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:36:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520183654.27747.00000658@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 43142

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Phil, are you saying that you have to use a winch to unstick your vehicle
>from your chocolate pudding driveway in August?

If my potholes get any deeper in my asphalt driveway, I may need a winch to get my car out of them.

Anyone who installs a tower in an asphalt base would be eligible for the Darwin award, IMHO.

73, Ed

3824. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:38:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520183820.27747.00000660@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 43143

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> >>Prove you said above 500 mhz.

>> All Amateur Radio communication takes place on frequencies above 500 mHz.

>milli-hertz?

That's how I read the original post.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3825. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:41:35 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zYeG8.152$FI7.8583422@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43144

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:acaohh3a83@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Just another one of the 100+ weekend classes or training sessions that we
as
> firefighters have available to us to improve our skills that are available
> through the year. Am already full-time employed.
>
> Too bad that there is not something similar in Amateur radio. There could
> be various elements in the different facets of the hobby that we could
take
> as a class that would help us to improve our skills. I mean going further
> in depth into the various subjects such as antennas, or radio circuitry or
> message handling or ????

I think its called an engineering degree.

> I personally have some great strengths in certain subjects as they relate
to
> amateur radio, and definitely some weaknesses I would like to improve
upon.
> They say we must be a self-policing body, but what about a self-educating
> body? Talk about getting clubs more activity and participation.....
>
> Just a thought,

Ryan, to their credit, the ARRL is offering web based classes in emergency comms, and antenna modelling (for $). More to follow. Meanwhile, FEMA offers a half dozen web or book based emergency response courses, all free of charge. Around Columbus OH I've heard a group on 147.45 simplex doing some building and emergency training. Find people like that and take it as far as it will go.

73, Brian

3826. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 22:46:39 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <6A718AA58B6661AE.4B2E26EA8C0F8AAF.0002D25EE46D25EC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43145

On 19 May 2002 18:06:34 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <AD890075E57D49D5.470937689F512C2E.F52C60806346ADF5@lp.airnews.net>,
>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:
>
>>On Sun, 19 May 2002 01:07:32 -0400, "KC8PMX"
>><kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:
>>
>>>Only if it harms the property. I see nothing wrong with the ability to set
>>>up a portable antenna that does not create any damage to the property. In
>>>my own specific case, I cannot even have one of those "dish network" mini
>>>satellite dishes as an option to cable tv.
>>
>>Better recheck that one; that's exactly what the existing exemptions
>>are for.
>
>Nope. The existing exemptions apply to homeowners, not renters.

Note that 47CFR 1.4000(a)(1) now includes the phrase "ownership or
leasehold interest," and "lease provision." It was amended to include
that in late '99, IIRC. Of course, that's still only for broadcast
receive antennas, but we can target that one for our next campaign :)

(a)(1) Any restriction, including but not limited to any state or
local law or regulation, including zoning, land-use, or building
regulations, or any private covenant, contract provision, lease
provision, homeowners' association rule or similar restriction, on
property within the exclusive use or control of the antenna user where

the user has a direct or indirect ownership or leasehold interest in
the property that impairs the installation, maintenance, or use of:
(i) An antenna that is:
(A) Used to receive direct broadcast satellite service, including
direct-to-home satellite service, or to receive or transmit fixed
wireless signals via satellite, and
(B) One meter or less in diameter or is located in Alaska;
(ii) An antenna that is:
(A) Used to receive video programming services via multipoint
distribution services, including multichannel multipoint distribution
services, instructional television fixed services, and local
multipoint distribution services, or to receive or transmit fixed
wireless signals other than via satellite, and
(B) That is one meter or less in diameter or diagonal measurement;
(iii) An antenna that is used to receive television broadcast
signals; or

(iv) A mast supporting an antenna described in paragraphs (a)(1)(i), (a)(1)(ii), or (a)(1)(iii) of this section; is prohibited to the extent it so impairs, subject to paragraph (b) of this section.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3827. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 23:01:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwfe9o4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43146

On Mon, 20 May 2002 22:10:11 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>> >Phil, you guys are always out to screw someone, aren't you?
>>
>> The first question that I always ask an opposition witness is
>> swaigned to elicit his/her expertise or standing in the matter.
>> Then we know up front whether or not the individual is (forgive
>> the technical lawyer jargon) talking through a paper a**hole.
>
>Huh? What does that mean?

The defense rests......
>
>> The two things that are guaranteed to light my rocket are
>> non-lawyers playing lawyer and non-engineers playing engineer....
>
>Lots of guys just bury their tower base in the soil. I've never heard you
>comment on that.

What keeps it there when the wind starts blowing and the rain starts
falling?

It's their house that it's going to fall on, not mine....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3828. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 23:16:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwfekm5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43148

On Mon, 20 May 2002 22:14:12 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>> btw, one sets tower bases in concrete, not cement.
>
>40lb bags, right?

Nah - the quantity of concrete dictates a pour from a
Transit-Mix truck with the Schwing concrete pump.

Takes LOTS of concrete to equal the holding power of chocolate
pudding.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3829. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 23:16:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwfeq76.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43147

On Mon, 20 May 2002 22:16:26 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>Phil, are you saying that you have to use a winch to unstick your vehicle
>from your chocolate pudding driveway in August?

When I lived in the desert one did not use asphlat on a
driveway for that very reason.

OTOH San Francisco in the summertime has an average mid-day
temperature of 65 degrees. Different story.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3830. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 23:26:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <GCfG8.211$j8.133@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43149

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote

> Still, 160 is only a secondary allocation
> and used only by a select few hams who
> happen to live on large acreages
> and farms.

I have 114 DXCC entities confirmed on 160, and my station is on a city lot,
far less than even one acre, let along "large acreage" or a farm.

So much for that rant.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3831. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 23:52:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <s%fG8.172$a6.9861372@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43150

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwfe9o4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 20 May 2002 22:10:11 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >> >Phil, you guys are always out to screw someone, aren't you?
> >>
> >> The first question that I always ask an opposition witness is
> >> swaigned to elicit his/her expertise or standing in the matter.
> >> Then we know up front whether or not the individual is (forgive
> >> the technical lawyer jargon) talking through a paper a**hole.
> >
> >Huh? What does that mean?
>
> The defense rests......
> >
> >> The two things that are guaranteed to light my rocket are
> >> non-lawyers playing lawyer and non-engineers playing engineer....
> >
> >Lots of guys just bury their tower base in the soil. I've never heard
you
> >comment on that.
>
> What keeps it there when the wind starts blowing and the rain starts
> falling?
>
> It's their house that it's going to fall on, not mine....
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Is N2EY going to install his tower at your house as well? Otherwise, how's
it going to fall on your house?

3832. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 23:54:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <41gG8.174$z9.10073332@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43151

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020520183654.27747.00000658@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Phil, are you saying that you have to use a winch to unstick your vehicle
> >from your chocolate pudding driveway in August?
>
> If my potholes get any deeper in my asphalt driveway, I may need a winch
to get
> my car out of them.
>
> Anyone who installs a tower in an asphalt base would be eligible for the
Darwin
> award, IMHO.

What about the 20wpm Extra that used to live down the street from me. His tower was just buried in the dirt. Rohn 25g at 30ft with a tribander on top.

3833. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-20 23:56:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_2gG8.176$f8.9987425@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43152

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwfeq76.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 20 May 2002 22:16:26 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >Phil, are you saying that you have to use a winch to unstick your vehicle
> >from your chocolate pudding driveway in August?
>
> When I lived in the desert one did not use asphlat on a
> driveway for that very reason.
>
> OTOH San Francisco in the summertime has an average mid-day
> temperature of 65 degrees. Different story.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

So a lump of asphalt below the frost line is a soupy mess?

3834. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 00:00:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <f6gG8.177$Ta.10148137@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43153

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020520183820.27747.00000660@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> >>Prove you said above 500 mhz.
>
> >> All Amateur Radio communication takes place on frequencies above 500
mHz.
>
> >milli-hertz?
>
> That's how I read the original post.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

So Larry wants to get rid of all our authorizations?

3835. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 00:23:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <acc47djik1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43154

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwf0t30.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 20 May 2002 02:50:46 -0400, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >Joe... PRB-1 has nothing for renters or leasee's. It assumes that hams
are
> >only residential home owners and that is about it.
>
> PRB-1 assumes nothing of the sort. It deals with restrictions posed by
> ordinances, statutes, procedures or rules rnacted by local or state
> government entities, regardless of property ownership.

True, but I think the point being made by was that if, as a renterm
the landlord prohibits antennas, then there is nothing in PRB-1
that is of any help to the renter.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3836. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 00:27:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <acc4g0$nk2$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43155

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwfe9o4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 20 May 2002 22:10:11 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >> The two things that are guaranteed to light my rocket are
> >> non-lawyers playing lawyer and non-engineers playing engineer....
> > >
> > >Lots of guys just bury their tower base in the soil. I've never heard
you
> > >comment on that.
>
> What keeps it there when the wind starts blowing and the rain starts
> falling?

What keeps the trees from falling over. Bury it deep enough at the base
and it can support a considerable amount of height.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3837. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 00:37:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520203719.10400.00000157@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 43156

In article <_IYE8.11499$3U6.9843150@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> writes:

>Just my .02. I can see both sides of the argument--especially if one
>happens not to be a ham--but I tend to be extremely independent when
>it comes to *any* outside entity telling me what I can do with my own
> property.

I understand the feeling, Jerry.

However, one's neighbors DO have a valid interest in how you use your property. And you have a valid interest in how they use theirs. That's the reason for building codes like the NEC (National Electrical Code) and zoning.

>Once I've paid for it, the idea of some blue-haired, busybody old lady
>telling me what I can erect, own, or keep in my driveway for as long
>as I shall live there just don't "git" it.

I call this the "Gladys Kravitz" problem.

>So strongly do I feel about it that, in order for someone to be able to do
>that, they must be able to get around on the backside of my 12 ga. shotgun
>before I can get off a round. Hehe!

The question is where Gladys' rights stop and yours begin.

> Now, having vented my spleen about CC&R contracts, the way
>I handled it was to buy an older home. In so doing, I got, not only the
>ability to put up all the antennas I want, but also a much better
>built house in a very low crime, older neighborhood. I got real plaster
>walls instead of drywall. I got 2 X 12 floor and joist construction, same
> in the ceiling. I got a floored attic, a full basement, 2 fireplaces, a
>garage-workshop, and, again, nobody can tell me that I cannot have a
>100' tower (as long as I follow reasonable and prudent safety rules
>and city ordinances).

Yup. But you were lucky - such a house and neighbor hood existed where you wanted to live, AND such a house was for sale when you wanted to buy, AND you could afford it. Many people aren't so lucky. For example, consider the family that gets transferred to another city. They have to find a neighborhood and a house within a short period of time, and often there are multiple important criteria to be met (distance to 2 or more jobs, schools, stores, transportation, etc.).

>At this point, there are no rules against antennas and towers in my
>town.

And that could change at any time. At the very least, if you want that 100 foot tower, you'll need a permit.

>I LOVE my real, red oak floors, knotty pine kitchen--and, of course,
>my radio shack down in the basement--cool in summer and cozy in
>winter with the wood stove a-simmerin'.

I know what ya mean - I've had three houses of my own, all with nice cozy basements, hardwood floors and lotsa real wood. But the newest house I've owned is this one, built in 1950.

Most of all, I was lucky to grow up in a place without such restrictions. Many if not most of today's kids aren't. How many parents do you think would pack up and move so their 13 year old son could have a wire out the attic window to the crabapple tree?

Ham radio needs this bill, and more, to insure that we have reasonable use of our homes. The bill isn't a final answer by any means, but it is a step in the right direction. Every amateur needs to write his/her congressperson to get behind this bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3838. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 03:03:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520230353.20178.00000114@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 43157

In article <oreG8.133$iw7.7815413@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >They just happened upon a convenient excuse to eliminate you. If you had
>> >Superman vision I wouldn't fly with you.
>>
>>
>> Larry isn't superman...but he DOES need supervision. :-)
>
>Len, where you been? I've been out here fending off the wolves with sticks.

I've been elsewhere (no, not Dayton). You are being tested to co-exist in wolfpacks...you passed! :-)

Now...watch ol' Richard Chamberpot jump in here with another putz-gram, followed shortly by Sig Heil and his "you'll be nothing, nothing but a beginner if you get a license now" and other assorted Heilianisms of a derogatory nature. They are obsessed with "getting back" at those who will not worship and adore them. :-)

3839. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 03:03:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020520230354.20178.00000115@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 43158

In article <rDeG8.139$Ay7.7955755@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3CE90D32.229956B@psu.edu...
>> You have hit on a big part of *why* the conduct is so gentlemanly while
>> using CW. It is by nature terse, and all inference must be made from the
>> text. (with that *HI* exception) It is how I can tell a friend in person
>> that they are full if crap, and they will take it as a good mannered
>> jest, and if I typed or tapped it out, they would not be pleased at all.
>>
>> - Mkie KB3EIA -
>
>So whan Larry's "friend" taps out "QFU" and doesn't append a "hi," is Larry
>actually serious.

Absolutely! Gods of radio (as in Larry's case) never ever jest about
radio...they just float Ten-Tecs to desert islands and suchlike...

3840. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 04:01:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521000105.06702.00001235@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 43159

>Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/20/02 13:59 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020520135956.03751.00000107@mb-cm.aol.com>

> Many of the title-holders attach great personal
>importance to those titles, rather well above the actual accomplishment.

I'd suggest one review my comments to the FCC in response to the proposed restructing NPRM.

As a matter of fact, almost everyone here, including most of the Extra's, suggested some re-naming of the licenses to "lettered" groups instead of names.

>That is very
>important emotional baggage for all those concerned and cannot be
>mislaid without raising a Hue and Cry for the heads of the dastards
>who dare defile those TITLES.

As I said...Go back and read the various comments to the FCC...

>TITLES and STATUS (through tenure) are very important to some and
>must be kept alive.

Just as a good lie and rant are to those WITHOUT one...Such as yourself, for example.

>What these supermen of ham radio need is MORE license
>classes, MANY more or all gradations so as to preserve their
>self-importance...of course, grandfathering their present title and
>status to the top-most class of such a multiple-tiered class
>structure. They "deserve it."

Actually, the only one from this forum that I recall suggesting MORE license classes was Bob Wexlebaum, W2ILP. I personally suggested four classes, "lettered" from D to A, and a reduction of the highest code test from 20wpm to 12.

As for the titles, those were carried forward by the FCC, not us...put "blame" where blame is due, Your Putziness.

Steve

3841. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 04:03:18 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acdpbh1v5d@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43173

Oh... then it *may* protect or assist me as a either a renter or a leasee?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site
please)
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwf0t30.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 20 May 2002 02:50:46 -0400, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >Joe... PRB-1 has nothing for renters or leasee's. It assumes that hams
are
> >only residential home owners and that is about it.
>
> PRB-1 assumes nothing of the sort. It deals with restrictions posed by
> ordinances, statutes, procedures or rules rnacted by local or state
> government entities, regardless of property ownership.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> ARRL Volunteer Counsel
>
>

3842. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 05:10:32 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <C56433BDDF19DE89.0D3760DD11EFC04A.372DC9E9CCC5F87A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43160

On Mon, 20 May 2002 02:50:46 -0400, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:

>Joe... PRB-1 has nothing for renters or leasee's. It assumes that hams are
>only residential home owners and that is about it.

I was referring to your comment that your landlord wouldn't let you
have a DSS dish. The applicable bit of regulation for that is 47CFR
Section 1.4000, which I posted a little earlier.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3843. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 06:41:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CE9BAC1.32462C81@att.net>
Source record: 43161

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CE579B2.B86E7A76@IEEE.org...
>
> > Good luck on convincing people that a sentence with "don't" in it is
> > really a positive response. It's not like you to try to defend an
> > indefensible position.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Cronyism allows it.

You'd know if anyone ever did.

3844. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 06:41:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CE9C4FE.388FF918@att.net>
Source record: 43162

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Don't try this at home Kids!!!! Asphalt gets quite soft at warm temps,
> and you wouldn't like what could happen.
>

Oh, I dunno... a few years ago I watched a major highway being built where they laid layer after layer of asphalt over a crushed limstone base, to a thickness of around 14 to 16 inches (eyeball guesstimate). I'm still waiting for the ruts I was sure all those 80K lb eighteen wheelers would cause on hot summer days...

3845. Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 08:00:55 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <X8nG8.10$eZ3.6685839@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43163

Can anyone think of a way to legally or politically find out the actual location of a repeater if there is suspected legal issues on part of the operator? I know that the exact location is not regulated by the FCC, but there should be some oversight? In this case, one operator would be guilty of using two or three repeaters in an illegal fashion, but the repeater trustee would be a different individual and unaware of the violations and infractions.

LARS121

3846. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 10:51:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521065157.21055.00000007@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43164

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Lots of guys just bury their tower base in the soil. I've never heard you
>comment on that.

I will gladly offer a comment on that: Doing that would be even more stupid
than using asphalt. Towers should be installed to good engineering practice,
not to rec.radio.policy lore about what "lots of guys" do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3847. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 10:54:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521065421.21055.00000008@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43165

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> It's their house that it's going to fall on, not mine....

>Is N2EY going to install his tower at your house as well? Otherwise, how's
>it going to fall on your house?

Uh, read Phil's post again, more slowly this time...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3848. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 10:55:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521065542.21055.00000009@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43166

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>What keeps the trees from falling over.

An extensive root system plays a pretty strong part in keeping trees upright.
So does the fact that they sway in the wind.

3849. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 10:58:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521065807.21055.00000011@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43167

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>So Larry wants to get rid of all our authorizations?

If he said that he wants to give up all ham frequencies above 500 mhz, that is exactly what I would read.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3850. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 12:02:34 UTC
From: Carl <n7kuw@dropthisnospam.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <uHqG8.70391$UV4.103426@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 43168

There are repeater coordination groups in every part of the country.
Determine who the local coordination group is and contact them. They will
know the exact location if the repeater is coordinated. If it is not
coordinated, they are probably well aware of it and will also know the
location.

Carl.

Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:X8nG8.10$eZ3.6685839@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com...
> Can anyone think of a way to legally or politically find out the actual
location of a
> repeater if there is suspected legal issues on part of the operator? I
know that the exact
> location is not regulated by the FCC, but there should be some oversight?
In this case,
> one operator would be guilty of using two or three repeaters in an illegal
fashion, but
> the repeater trustee would be a different individual and unaware of the
violations and
> infractions.
>
> LARS121
>
>

3851. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 13:21:24 UTC
From: cj697@bfn.org
Message-ID: <GwGqFo.Kwq@freenet.buffalo.edu>
Source record: 43169

> In article [5]<3B3E14B7BDB7D250.A050924D41C01AA6.D182CA432E4AFA5C@lp.airnews.ne
> t>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >On Thu, 16 May 2002 10:12:29 -0400, Bill Hanrahan <hanrahan@kua.net>
> >wrote:
> >
> >>Hans, I've only recently been reading rrap, so I'm not familiar with
> >>the opposition to CC&R relief that you're referring to. I'm at a loss
> >>as to what their reasoning in opposing CC&R relief could have been.
> >
> > Actually, it was based on a concept of contractual freedom.
> >Unlike laws and ordinances, CC&Rs are _voluntary_ limitations accepted
> >by the purchaser. You _can't_ "pass" a CC&R that is binding on anyone
> >after they have made their purchase--it can only be introduced prior
> >to sale. To many people, the concept of the government invalidating
> >those agreements is a clear threat to their right to enter into a
> >binding contract and is an infringement of the private sector.
> >
> > While many have argued that in many areas it is impossible to
> >purchase a desirable home where no CC&Rs are in effect, the fact
> >remains that it IS possible to do so and even if it weren't that
> >wouldn't justify government intrusion.
>
> I disagree.
>
> The widespread use of boilerplate deed restrictions creates an effective
> monopoly. The amount of available housing without such restrictions dwindles
> because the restrictions are permanent. In many areas it is effectively
> impossible to find properties for sale that are not restricted.
>
> >If, for example, no one chose
> >to open a fast serve restaurant in your community, it would certainly
> >not justify a government agency requiring full service restaurants to
> >open drive-thru windows and sell low cost food.
>
> Not a valid analogy. Is there a community in America with no drive-thrus?
> I think not.
>
> Here's a valid analogy:
>
> Suppose that 30 years ago a community decided to ban drive-thrus so
> that the owners of local restaurants would not have to deal with the
> competition. And suppose the ban was effected by means of deed

> restrictions, which are singularly difficult to change. End result
> would be no available real estate for drive-thrus.
>
> >While a home purchase
> >is far more important than the purchase of a Big Mac, the principle IS
> >the same.
>
> No, it isn't. Real estate is unique and non-portable.
> In many areas there is no "new" real estate available - it's all been
> "developed". Around here it is common for "old" houses to be bought
> for the land and torn down so that "new" houses can be built - complete
> with deed restrictions.
>
> >Why should the government have the right to limit the
> >restrictions YOU as seller place on a piece of property?
>
> Because you are SELLING it. That means YOU won't own it any more.
> Why should the seller's rights exceed the buyer's? Note that most
> deed restrictions never expire and are nigh-impossible to change.
>
> Would you support the right to deed restrictions that banned people
> of certain races, religions, atheists/agnostics, gays, or the disabled?
> I wouldn't.
>
> >If the buyer
> >isn't satisfied with them, he or she has every right to buy from
> >someone whose agreements are more compatible with their needs instead.
>
> If ands only if such a seller exists. They become rarer and rarer.
>
> But the larger principle is this: Why should the seller of a property be able
> to
> impose arbitrary restrictions on an item being sold? Particularly when the
> seller will have no interest in or responsibility to the buyer after the sale?
>
> > One argument never voiced here, btw, concerns non-hams. If a
> >person who is not a ham takes an interest in CB radio, for example, or
> >in shortwave radio, police scanners, or a similar area, he or she
> >would remain restrict by CC&R antenna limitations. To see his or her
> >neighbor granted an exception (by law) to those restrictions simply
> >because his/her interests are in ham radio instead of SWL is bound to
> >be angering to such an individual--and with good cause.
>
> Why? Those groups are perfectly capable of getting their own bills. The
> satellite TV folks' exception only covers TV reception antennas - it doesn't
> even extend to FM broadcast radio. Do you see lots of anger about that?
>
> It is important to be clear about what the bill would do if passed. It would
> NOT give hams blanket permission to violate deed restrictions or put up
> any antenna they desire.

>
> In most cases, what we're really talking about is being allowed to put up
> a simple wire antenna or maybe a vertical. Or two. Yet in many areas
> the rule is "no antennas" of any kind. That's simply unreasonable.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Much of this is kind of academic, as nobody really 'owns' their property. Oh, sure, you get a nice piece of paper that says you own it, all registered at the local government clerks office, but in reality you are leasing it from the government. You have an indefinite term lease that the government can break under certain conditions. Those conditions are certainly better than you would get from ANY other landlord, but it is a lease nonetheless. This can be shown by the fact that you can be removed from "your" property for not paying your rent to the local government in the form of property taxes. You can also be removed under certain other admittedly rare conditions, but in most of them you have to be compensated by the government.

As far as CC+R's are concerned, IMHO if they are not revealed to the buyer before the close then they should be considered invalid. The reasoning being that you might not have purchased (leased from the government?) the property had you known about the restrictions. An ideal situation might be something like truth-in-lending and truth-in-advertising laws. Require full disclosure.

Four years ago my XYL and I purchased a house built to our specifications. We specifically chose to NOT buy a house in a development because of CC&Rs (well, I was the driving force behind THAT decision). I knew I would want to put up an antenna or two, and I didn't want to have any problems. So I have my G5RV up in the backyard, and I am going to mount a j-pole and either a horizontal turnstile or a halo for 2 meters in a month or so. And I don't have to worry about some wannabe petty dictator(s) telling me I can't.

73 de Bill N2KMF

--

Real men use flintlocks... In the rain.

3852. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 13:38:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205210538.79bd0d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43170

"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<GCfG8.211$j8.133@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote
>
> > Still, 160 is only a secondary allocation
> > and used only by a select few hams who
> > happen to live on large acreages
> > and farms.
>
> I have 114 DXCC entities confirmed on 160, and my station is on a city lot,
> far less than even one acre, let along "large acreage" or a farm.
>
> So much for that rant.
>
Yea verily. We have guys here who are creeping up on the 250-300
confirmed level, mostly with just just inverted vees hung from 50
towers and such. Ya gotta have ears and know how to use 'em. The FCC
has hugely expanded our privs on 160 over the years, the band ain't
going nowhere, thankew GPS.
>
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
w3rv

3853. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 13:46:06 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <ycsG8.27280$D41.1018081@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43171

Steve Robeson, K4YZ, wrote:

> Actually, the only one from this forum that I
> recall suggesting MORE license classes was Bob
> Wexlebaum, W2ILP. I personally suggested four
> classes, "lettered" from D to A, and a reduction
> of the highest code test from 20wpm to 12.

I think we ought to have degrees, not classes,
ranging from 1st degree all the way up to 33rd
degree.

And have funny little hats with arcane ham
radio symbols on them to wear at hamfests.

Oh, wait, we have those already.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3854. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 15:28:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <5ItG8.717$9R3.225@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43172

Dave Larson of Encino, California wrote

> Can anyone think of a way to legally or politically find out the actual location of a
> repeater if there is suspected legal issues on part of the operator?

Dave,

Please take your "K6BWA is using ham radio to send telemetry into my body" agenda somewhere else.

Thank you,

de Hans, K0HB

3855. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 17:15:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205210915.4172e25e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43174

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020521065542.21055.00000009@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >What keeps the trees from falling over.
>
> An extensive root system plays a pretty strong part in keeping trees upright.
> So does the fact that they sway in the wind.

All true.

Trees are the result of billions of years of evolution, in part to derive a structure that will not fall over. Their root structure is often a very large percentage of the total tree mass. Yet many of them do fall over or break in the wind.

No structure is exempt from Fudd's First Law of Opposition.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3856. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 17:18:06 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ijvG8.34465$Vm2.1744471@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43175

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0205210915.4172e25e@posting.google.com...
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020521065542.21055.00000009@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> > From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >
> > >What keeps the trees from falling over.
> >
> > An extensive root system plays a pretty strong part in keeping trees
upright.
> > So does the fact that they sway in the wind.
>
> All true.
>
> Trees are the result of billions of years of evolution, in part to
derive
> a structure that will not fall over. Their root structure is often a
very
> large percentage of the total tree mass. Yet many of them do fall over
or
> break in the wind.
>
> No structure is exempt from Fudd's First Law of Opposition.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Or Grandpa Stonebender's Law of Evolution: If you want to invent a better
sheep, first invent a better coyote.

3857. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 17:52:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521135235.10913.00000084@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 43176

In article <20020521000105.06702.00001235@mb-mr.aol.com>, somebody writes:

>> Many of the title-holders attach great personal
>>importance to those titles, rather well above the actual accomplishment.
>
> I'd suggest one review my comments to the FCC in response to the
>proposed restructing NPRM.

I would suggest that a God of Ham Radio should publicize such
comments in here for all to admire and revere, to worship as gifts
from the all-seeing and all-knowing to lowly mortals.

At least one other God of Radio submits those on a semi-regular
basis. :-)

> As a matter of fact, almost everyone here, including most of the Extra's,
>suggested some re-naming of the licenses to "lettered" groups instead of
>names.

Noooooo they did NOT. Some, not even close to "everyone here."

One memorable post of about four years ago had well over 30
different classes/grades/varieties of rank-status-title-privileges
to those who "deserved it."

>>That is very
>>important emotional baggage for all those concerned and cannot be
>>mislaid without raising a Hue and Cry for the heads of the dastards
>>who dare defile those TITLES.
>
> As I said...Go back and read the various comments to the FCC...

Go back and read the comments and LAW from the FCC.

>>TITLES and STATUS (through tenure) are very important to some and
>>must be kept alive.
>
> Just as a good lie and rant are to those WITHOUT one...Such as yourself,
>for example.

Now, now, getting testy are you? :-)

Does Sig have the curse now and you filling in for him?

Can't understand your own "CV" comments in here and the
applicability to titles and status?!? Tsk, tsk.

>>What these supermen of ham radio need is MORE license
>>classes, MANY more or all gradations so as to preserve their
>>self-importance...of course, grandfathering their present title and
>>status to the top-most class of such a multiple-tiered class
>>structure. They "deserve it."
>
> Actually, the only one from this forum that I recall suggesting MORE
>license classes was Bob Wexlebaum, W2ILP. I personally suggested four
>classes, "lettered" from D to A, and a reduction of the highest code test from
>20wpm to 12.

Does anyone really care what you've written in here once in a while
in between all those personal insults directed at those who do not
agree with you?

> As for the titles, those were carried forward by the FCC, not us...put
>"blame" where blame is due, Your Putziness.

See, another "putz-gram" sent off. Prediction of behavior is no
problem at all. :-)

The FCC originally had three lettered license grades/distinctions.

The ARRL lobbied for, and got all those fancy TITLES. That was back
in the days when Big Brother did all the talking "for amateur radio."

ONE license is all that is needed for regulatory purposes.

Anything more is nothing but government welfare support for
sanctified self-importance of the already-licensed.

Wow, multiple classes. A real crowd-pleaser for "incentive" to join
amateur radio and "promoting interest" in a hobby. Cat-fighting by
radio..."my license is bigger-better than yours"...
:-)

3858. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 17:52:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521135236.10913.00000085@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 43177

In article <5ItG8.717$9R3.225@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Dave Larson of Encino, California wrote
>
>> Can anyone think of a way to legally or politically find out the actual
>location of a
>> repeater if there is suspected legal issues on part of the operator?
>
>Dave,
>
>Please take your "K6BWA is using ham radio to send telemetry into my body"
>agenda somewhere else.
>
>Thank you,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Oh, my, a Radio KOP warning!

Get up on the wrong side of the badge this morning? :-)

Despite the traditional Armenian protest chant, that seemed an
honest, straightforward QUESTION. Did it need to pass some
Minnesotan "newsgroup review" before posting? I don't think so.

3859. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 18:20:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwgt3s8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43178

On Mon, 20 May 2002 20:23:13 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> >Joe... PRB-1 has nothing for renters or leasee's. It assumes that hams
>are
>> >only residential home owners and that is about it.
>>
>> PRB-1 assumes nothing of the sort. It deals with restrictions posed by
>> ordinances, statutes, procedures or rules rnacted by local or state
>> government entities, regardless of property ownership.
>
>True, but I think the point being made by was that if, as a renterm
>the landlord prohibits antennas, then there is nothing in PRB-1
>that is of any help to the renter.

Granted - that's why we're going around on this Merry-Go-Round with
The Congress.

My reaction was to the statement "It assumes that hams are only
residential home owners and that is about it".

PRB-1 doesn't assume anything of the sort - it just plays "chicken" by
refusing to deal with private restrictions (per the famous footnote).

Then again PRB-1 was written in the mid-80s when the Commish' was well
afflicted with the "chicken" syndrome.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3860. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 18:20:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwgthta.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43179

On Mon, 20 May 2002 23:52:56 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>> It's their house that it's going to fall on, not mine....
>>
>Is N2EY going to install his tower at your house as well? Otherwise, how's
>it going to fall on your house?

If he installs it at my house it's no longer his, it's mine under
the "property found on post" rule.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3861. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 18:20:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwgtxkb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43181

On Tue, 21 May 2002 00:03:18 -0400, KC8PMX wrote:

>Oh... then it *may* protect or assist me as a either a renter or a leasee?

Yes. it will "protect" you against tailure to make reasonable
accomodations by actions of a governmenmtal agency even if you are a
tenant.

No, it will not "guarantee" you the "right" to put up any antenna of
your choice wherever you want, even if you are the owner of the
property.. There is no "right" to "guasrantee".

See the holding of the U S Court of Appeals for the 9th Cir. in
Howard v City of Burlingame.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3862. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 18:20:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwguslc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43180

On Mon, 20 May 2002 20:27:48 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> What keeps it there when the wind starts blowing and the rain starts
>> falling?
>
>What keeps the trees from falling over. Bury it deep enough at the base
>and it can support a considerable amount of height.

IIRC utility poles require a minimum of 20% of their length buried
in most soils. It just depends on keeping the center of rotation
below ground level.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3863. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 19:44:33 UTC
From: szekeres@pitt.edu
Message-ID: <ace80d$42k$1@usenet01.srv.cis.pitt.edu>
Source record: 43182

In article <ycsG8.27280$D41.1018081@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB"
<k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote:
>Steve Robeson, K4YZ, wrote:
>
>> Actually, the only one from this forum that I
>> recall suggesting MORE license classes was Bob
>> Wexlebaum, W2ILP. I personally suggested four
>> classes, "lettered" from D to A, and a reduction
>> of the highest code test from 20wpm to 12.
>
>I think we ought to have degrees, not classes,
>ranging from 1st degree all the way up to 33rd
>degree.
>
>And have funny little hats with arcane ham
>radio symbols on them to wear at hamfests.
>
>Oh, wait, we have those already.

I would have gone for higher classes if they had'm. Can't figure why anybody
would want to make the uppers easier, they are supposed to get harder.
Maybe 30WPM, with extended questions, and of course, years required.
Maybe also take a voltage torture test.

Oh my, this made me remember how long I've been a ham. About 40 years!

gregS
N6GS

3864. fr&#65533;quences

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 19:46:52 UTC
From: Max <j.dafonseca@wanadoo.fr>
Message-ID: <ace86kach1@wanadoo.fr>
Source record: 43183

Salut je cherche des fr&#65533;quences pour l'&#65533;coute des pompiers, militaires, ambulances, polices , douanes, crs,etc etc Region du Var (83) sur un scanner de fr&#65533;quence histoire de passer le temps . Merci A+

3865. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 19:49:12 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205211948450.11359-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43184

On Tue, 21 May 2002, Lars121 wrote:
>Can anyone think of a way to legally or politically find out the actual location of a
>repeater if there is suspected legal issues on part of the operator? I know that the exact
>location is not regulated by the FCC, but there should be some oversight? In this case,
>one operator would be guilty of using two or three repeaters in an illegal fashion, but
>the repeater trustee would be a different individual and unaware of the violations and
>infractions.

Is there a reason why you can't simply tell the trustee about the user's
improper operation?

3866. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 20:54:07 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <PtyG8.1232$_L.778@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43185

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> All Amateur Radio communication takes place on frequencies above 500 mHz.
>

Ed,

Do you really think Larry meant milliHertz, or are you simply searching for
fly shit out of the pepper pot?

Bet you a lobster dinner that Larry meant above 500 Megahertz.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3867. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 21:20:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <acedn2$ma3$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43186

How about a little radio DFing? Pretty simple with a fixed site actually.

Dan/W4NTI

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:X8nG8.10$eZ3.6685839@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com...
> Can anyone think of a way to legally or politically find out the actual
location of a
> repeater if there is suspected legal issues on part of the operator? I
know that the exact
> location is not regulated by the FCC, but there should be some oversight?
In this case,
> one operator would be guilty of using two or three repeaters in an illegal
fashion, but
> the repeater trustee would be a different individual and unaware of the
violations and
> infractions.
>
> LARS121
>
>

3868. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 21:22:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CEABAB1.99D01223@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43187

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
>
> Ryan, all of the TITLES grew, became a part of the nomenclature over
> the last half century. Many of the title-holders attach great personal
> importance to those titles, rather well above the actual accomplishment.
> That and TENURE (maintaining a license through regular renewals) are
> substitutes for "professional equity" standing in the hobby. That is very
> important emotional baggage for all those concerned and cannot be
> mislaid without raising a Hue and Cry for the heads of the dastards
> who dare defile those TITLES.
>
> TITLES and STATUS (through tenure) are very important to some and
> must be kept alive.
>

Having an "extra" license is just a line item on my resume. Below the
13 utility patents issued and another pending, and the BSEE from
Syracuse. Now that I'm done bragging :-), the "extra" license is roughly
equal to say a 6 credit college course. Yes, it's an achievement, but
not the ultimate achievement.

BTW, if you ever apply for a patent, be sure to ask for a "utility patent",
NOT a "design patent". A design patent is little more than a document
describing the styling of a radio cabinet, for example. The patent for
say the light bulb or the transistor is a utility patent, and actually means
something in the industry.

3869. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 21:30:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <acee8vasf1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43188

I agree...when I first got on the air in 1961 the 160m band was nearly useless with all the LORAN trash and the FCC mandated power restrictions of 25 and 50 watts.

Now it is basically wide open and full of amateur stations running decent equipment and having good signals.

Heck the Amateur gear of the day didn't even bother with putting 160 on it. Remember the Heathkit SB series?

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message news:d22b54c3.0205210538.79bd0d2@posting.google.com...
> "K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message news:<GCfG8.211$j8.133@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote
> >
> > > Still, 160 is only a secondary allocation
> > > and used only by a select few hams who
> > > happen to live on large acreages
> > > and farms.
> >
> > I have 114 DXCC entities confirmed on 160, and my station is on a city lot,
> > far less than even one acre, let along "large acreage" or a farm.
> >
> > So much for that rant.
> >
> Yea verily. We have guys here who are creeping up on the 250-300
> confirmed level, mostly with just just inverted vees hung from 50
> towers and such. Ya gotta have ears and know how to use 'em. The FCC
> has hugely expanded our privs on 160 over the years, the band ain't
> going nowhere, thankew GPS.
> >
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> w3rv

3870. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 21:34:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CEABD49.6D4540E2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43189

The FCC relies on asking the trustee if any questions they have come up.
Besides, are you sure that there are violations? Ask privately the
coordination committee that serves your area if there are any
violations or poor practices being done. Maybe someone at the
ARRL might know the general principals and express a casual
opinion. Do your research before going public, so you won't look
the fool if the situation is in fact legal and proper. If you think
after research that there still is a problem, contact the trustee
privately and tell him that "I think there may be a rules violation
with your repeater".

But if it's just a minor infraction that is not causing any real
harm, don't worry about it.

What you really don't want to do is announce it in the
middle of a ham club meeting or similar public forum.

Lars121 wrote:

> Can anyone think of a way to legally or politically find out the actual location of a
> repeater if there is suspected legal issues on part of the operator? I know that the
exact
> location is not regulated by the FCC, but there should be some oversight? In this case,
> one operator would be guilty of using two or three repeaters in an illegal fashion, but
> the repeater trustee would be a different individual and unaware of the violations and
> infractions.
>
> LARS121

3871. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 21:51:00 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <8jzG8.1321$_L.1230@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43190

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> The FCC relies on asking the trustee if any questions they have come up.
> Besides, are you sure that there are violations?

Bob,

This guy is a fruitcake (perhaps a dangerous fruitcake) who believes that someone has implanted a neural monitoring device into his body and is carrying out communications with that device over K6BWA repeaters.

Do a google-search on "LARS121" and you will find all sorts of whacko gems, like the one below from ALT.MINDCONTROL!

73, de Hans, K0HB

lars121 said:

> Forget that museum relic garbage from the '70's! Sharpen your pencils dumb-dumbs, because
> you obviously have some learning to do. It is now 2002 and it is not a secret how remote
> monitoring and stimulation using RF telemetry can be obtained. It's public knowledge. Go
> to http://www.uspto.gov/patft/index.html
>
> Look up these patents
>
> United States Patent 5,571,148
> Implantable multichannel stimulator
>
> 5,551,016 Monitoring system and interface apparatus therefor
>
> 6,315,721 System of implantable devices for tormenting you
>
> 6,208,894 System of implantable devices for spying on you
> 6,164,284 System of implantable devices for laughing at you
> 6,067,474 Minitaure injectable microstimulators (in this one, everytime you read
> "battery", think "tantalum capacitor".
> 6,035,237 Makes the devices so small, MRI can't detect them unless ultra high-field 3.0T
> or above
> 5,999,848 Shows how to make one integrated circuit play hide n seek by dividing it 4 ways
> 5,791,344 Patient monitoring software

> 6,195,585 How they hear you when your all alone.....
> 5,569,307 How they make sure nobody else hears them but you!
> 5,198,807 How many frequencies do they use
> 6,205,361 These electrodes plump when ya cook 'em
>

3872. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:01:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ktzG8.796$ab6.32974096@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43191

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020520230353.20178.00000114@mb-mt.aol.com...
> In article <oreG8.133$iw7.7815413@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >They just happened upon a convenient excuse to eliminate you. If you
had
> >> >Superman vision I wouldn't fly with you.
> >>
> >>
> >> Larry isn't superman...but he DOES need supervision. :-)
> >
> >Len, where you been? I've been out here fending off the wolves with
sticks.
>
> I've been elsewhere (no, not Dayton). You are being tested to
> co-exist in wolfpacks...you passed! :-)

Lived to talk about it, anyway.

> Now...watch ol' Richard Chamberpot jump in here with another
> putz-gram, followed shortly by Sig Heil and his "you'll be nothing,
> nothing but a beginner if you get a license now" and other
> assorted Heilianisms of a derogatory nature. They are obsessed
> with "getting back" at those who will not worship and adore them.
> :-)

I've noticed. So how did the exam go? BTW, I didn't see Dave nor Marti at
the Hamvention.

3873. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:03:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tuzG8.800$v76.32751913@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43192

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020521000105.06702.00001235@mb-mr.aol.com...
> As a matter of fact, almost everyone here, including most of the
Extra's,
> suggested some re-naming of the licenses to "lettered" groups instead of
names.

How about random groups of 5?

3874. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:05:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mwzG8.801$0d6.33071277@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43193

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:ycsG8.27280$D41.1018081@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Steve Robeson, K4YZ, wrote:
>
> > Actually, the only one from this forum that I
> > recall suggesting MORE license classes was Bob
> > Wexlebaum, W2ILP. I personally suggested four
> > classes, "lettered" from D to A, and a reduction
> > of the highest code test from 20wpm to 12.
>
> I think we ought to have degrees, not classes,
> ranging from 1st degree all the way up to 33rd
> degree.
>
> And have funny little hats with arcane ham
> radio symbols on them to wear at hamfests.
>
> Oh, wait, we have those already.

Those hats that double as spittoons? Forget it. I want colored belts, and
my handle can be "Grasshopper."

3875. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:07:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hyzG8.802$bf6.33210701@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43194

"GregS" <szekeres@pitt.edu> wrote in message
news:ace80d$42k$1@usenet01.srv.cis.pitt.edu...
> In article <ycsG8.27280$D41.1018081@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote:
> >Steve Robeson, K4YZ, wrote:
> >
> >> Actually, the only one from this forum that I
> >> recall suggesting MORE license classes was Bob
> >> Wexlebaum, W2ILP. I personally suggested four
> >> classes, "lettered" from D to A, and a reduction
> >> of the highest code test from 20wpm to 12.
> >
> >I think we ought to have degrees, not classes,
> >ranging from 1st degree all the way up to 33rd
> >degree.
> >
> >And have funny little hats with arcane ham
> >radio symbols on them to wear at hamfests.
> >
> >Oh, wait, we have those already.
>
> I would have gone for higher classes if they had'm. Can't figure why
anybody
> would want to make the uppers easier, they are supposed to get harder.
> Maybe 30WPM, with extended questions, and of course, years required.
> Maybe also take a voltage torture test.
>
> Oh my, this made me remember how long I've been a ham. About 40 years!
>
> gregS
> N6GS

Greg, thanks for the funny. I think the voltage torture test should be
combined with the 30wpm exam. A real live telegraph key could be the on-off
switch. Now where to hook up the aligator clips?

3876. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:08:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <jzzG8.1341$_L.152@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43195

Bob,

Below is another whacko gem from this guy.....

Now, would you want him snuffing around trying to find *your* repeater?

73, de Hans, K0HB

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:<kmqv8.1675$lv1.794043611@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> Because call signs K6BWA / KA6UFC's (go to www.qrz.com for call sign
> definition)entire career revolves around implantable biomedical devices
for
> wireless electrical stimulation of the human nervous system, and:
>
> 1. several devices have been recovered from infected sites on scalp and
> limbs,
> 2. and that they precisely match his US Patent Office filings and
drawings,
> 3. and because he has 224.840MHz repeaters to the N, S, E and S-E of my
> residence, all within a 19 mile radius,
> 4. and (!) because it is documented that due to tissue impedance and
> bandwidth issues, the 200MHz spectrum is preferred for this application
> which involves stimulation and recording of human biological signals.....
>
> Allow me to pose this question:
>
> What are the chances that K6BWA is NOT in violation of the law as well as
> FCC regulations??
>
>
> Additionally, what are the chances that these signal transmissions as
> described below, could appear to the FCC as legitimate encoding or appear
> similar to repeater configuration commands??
>
> Text from research reports sent to the NIH from K6BWA, "JS":
> "We have started construction of a implantable device controller that can
> store arbitrarily long or complex sequences of carrier modulation from a
PC
> and transmit those sequences while maintaining synchronization with the RF
> oscillator in the coil-driver sub-system (implant circuit)....
> "Personal-Trainer&#65533;&#65533;T" Motorola 68HC11 microcontroller... uses a shift
> register to count RF carrier cycles and generate requests for bytes
> representing the desired serial carrier states. This strategy greatly
> simplifies the firmware for the "Personal-TrainerT", but requires PC based

> software to implement the encoding of the medical device parameters into
> serial carrier modulations. The necessary software is an addition to our
> ClinFit software package..."
> "Suspended Carrier" allows the use of same coil for both incoming and
> outbound telemetry at the same frequency... by picking up the residual
> resonance as clock-timing parameters,..
> "No it's not aliens,... it's a HAM!"
>
>
> Are you a victim of mind controlling implants? Learn who can do what in a
> neighborhood near you at the most informative implant web site on the
> planet.... our government's own "Neural Prosthesis Program" at
> http://npp.ninds.nih.gov/ProgressReports/ or, for further information,
email
> it's program director at WH7Q@NIH.GOV This is the real deal people.Use
this
> information wisely.

3877. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:09:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5AzG8.803$Qa6.32959613@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43196

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020521135235.10913.00000084@mb-mm.aol.com...
> In article <20020521000105.06702.00001235@mb-mr.aol.com>, somebody writes:

> One memorable post of about four years ago had well over 30
> different classes/grades/varieties of rank-status-title-privileges
> to those who "deserved it."

And worked "very hard" for it.

Like the dunce at work that says, "I work harder than everyone else and get
less accomplished."

3878. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:12:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aDzG8.805$9c6.33038570@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43197

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CEABAB1.99D01223@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Ryan, all of the TITLES grew, became a part of the nomenclature over
> > the last half century. Many of the title-holders attach great personal
> > importance to those titles, rather well above the actual accomplishment.
> > That and TENURE (maintaining a license through regular renewals) are
> > substitutes for "professional equity" standing in the hobby. That is
very
> > important emotional baggage for all those concerned and cannot be
> > mislaid without raising a Hue and Cry for the heads of the dastards
> > who dare defile those TITLES.
> >
> > TITLES and STATUS (through tenure) are very important to some and
> > must be kept alive.
> >
>
> Having an "extra" license is just a line item on my resume. Below the
> 13 utility patents issued and another pending, and the BSEE from
> Syracuse. Now that I'm done bragging :-), the "extra" license is roughly
> equal to say a 6 credit college course. Yes, it's an achievement, but
> not the ultimate achievement.
>
> BTW, if you ever apply for a patent, be sure to ask for a "utility
patent",
> NOT a "design patent". A design patent is little more than a document
> describing the styling of a radio cabinet, for example. The patent for
> say the light bulb or the transistor is a utility patent, and actually
means
> something in the industry.

Robert, from a search of the USPO, how can I determine if a patent has
expired? How can I determine if someone has "added" to a patent?

Private e-mail is good.

Brian

3879. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:13:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hEzG8.806$Uh6.33377389@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43198

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CE9C4FE.388FF918@att.net...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > Don't try this at home Kids!!!! Asphalt gets quite soft at warm
temps,
> > and you wouldn't like what could happen.
> >
>
>
>
> Oh, I dunno... a few years ago I watched a major highway being built
where they
> laid layer after layer of asphalt over a crushed limstone base, to a
thickness of
> around 14 to 16 inches (eyeball guesstimate). I'm still waiting for the
ruts I was
> sure all those 80K lb eighteen wheelers would cause on hot summer days...

Thanks Dick, you just pulled one straw off the Camels back.

Brian

3880. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:16:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <LGzG8.807$mf6.33221747@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43199

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020521065421.21055.00000008@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> It's their house that it's going to fall on, not mine....
>
> >Is N2EY going to install his tower at your house as well? Otherwise,
how's
> >it going to fall on your house?
>
> Uh, read Phil's post again, more slowly this time...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Evelyn Wood wouldn't be very happy with that suggestion. How 'bout if I
just copy code more slowly?

Anyway, is Phil is concerned about someone elses house? Why? Good nose for
litigation or what?

3881. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:18:30 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <WIzG8.808$bj6.33462371@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43200

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0205210915.4172e25e@posting.google.com...
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020521065542.21055.00000009@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> > From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >
> > >What keeps the trees from falling over.
> >
> > An extensive root system plays a pretty strong part in keeping trees
upright.
> > So does the fact that they sway in the wind.
>
> All true.
>
> Trees are the result of billions of years of evolution, in part to derive
> a structure that will not fall over. Their root structure is often a very
> large percentage of the total tree mass. Yet many of them do fall over or
> break in the wind.
>
> No structure is exempt from Fudd's First Law of Opposition.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

So a tree is merely a lever to lift a little subsoil to the surface?

Put the same taproot in a bed of asphalt and let me know what happens.

3882. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:20:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <wKzG8.809$xW5.31950045@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43201

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020521065157.21055.00000007@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Lots of guys just bury their tower base in the soil. I've never heard
you
> >comment on that.
>
> I will gladly offer a comment on that: Doing that would be even more
stupid
> than using asphalt. Towers should be installed to good engineering
practice,
> not to rec.radio.policy lore about what "lots of guys" do.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Lots of guys send code so atrociously that a digital computer cannot copy
it. Please comment.

3883. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:22:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hMzG8.811$yk6.33541312@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43202

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwguslc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>
> On Mon, 20 May 2002 20:27:48 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >> What keeps it there when the wind starts blowing and the rain starts
> >> falling?
> >
> >What keeps the trees from falling over. Bury it deep enough at the base
> >and it can support a considerable amount of height.
>
> IIRC utility poles require a minimum of 20% of their length buried
> in most soils. It just depends on keeping the center of rotation
> below ground level.

So Union Electric buries "masts" in soil and its good engineering practice,
but WD4XXX buries his tower base in soil and he's an idiot?

3884. Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:26:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3QzG8.812$XZ5.32153708@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43203

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CE9BAC1.32462C81@att.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CE579B2.B86E7A76@IEEE.org...
> >
> > > Good luck on convincing people that a sentence with "don't" in it is
> > > really a positive response. It's not like you to try to defend an
> > > indefensible position.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > Cronyism allows it.
>
> You'd know if anyone ever did.

Dick, don't push your luck. You just got finished removing one straw from
the camel's back. Don't add another one to the load.

3885. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:26:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4QzG8.813$XZ5.32153708@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43204

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:PtyG8.1232$_L.778@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > All Amateur Radio communication takes place on frequencies above 500
mHz.
> >
>
> Ed,
>
> Do you really think Larry meant milliHertz, or are you simply searching
for
> fly shit out of the pepper pot?
>
> Bet you a lobster dinner that Larry meant above 500 Megahertz.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans, take a deep breath. Relax. OK.

Ed has just pulled a Cecil.

3886. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 22:29:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <SSzG8.815$Xj6.33502490@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43205

"Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:X8nG8.10$eZ3.6685839@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com...
> Can anyone think of a way to legally or politically find out the actual
location of a
> repeater if there is suspected legal issues on part of the operator?

Lars, I refer you to the ARRL handbook chapter with the Chinese girl on the front page. In China they do a lot of DFing to put contraban transmitters out of business.

I know that the exact
> location is not regulated by the FCC, but there should be some oversight?
In this case,
> one operator would be guilty of using two or three repeaters in an illegal
fashion, but
> the repeater trustee would be a different individual and unaware of the
violations and
> infractions.

Best of luck.

3887. "Greenstamps" to Cuba?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 23:06:36 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEAD2FC.7020604@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43206

While talking to some of the "CO's" in Cuba (40m CW) on Sunday morning, I noticed that some of them wanted US hams to QSL them directly instead of via their local clubs. They also clearly were asking fir greenstamps, i.e. dollars so that they could pay for the Cuban postage to send us their QSL cards. I wouldn't send them one 'red' cent, but:

1. Would this be in violation of the Trading with the Enemy Act (Trade Embargo)?

2. Does the FCC Part 97 permit ongoing CW communications between US stations and Cuba?

Some of these QSO's have been very interesting, especially when the commie 'radio club operators' come in and try to stop them from asking for money sent directly to them (in Spanish, of course). As an advanced class operator, I do not remember any test question that dealt directly with this question. Advice would be appreciated.

73 de KR4AJ

3888. Re: "Greenstamps" to Cuba?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 23:28:04 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8KAG8.35090$Vm2.1779239@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43207

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEAD2FC.7020604@bellsouth.net...
> While talking to some of the "CO's" in Cuba (40m CW) on Sunday morning,
> I noticed that some of them wanted US hams to QSL them directly instead
> of via their local clubs. They also clearly were asking fir greenstamps,
> i.e. dollars so that they could pay for the Cuban postage to send us
> their QSL cards. I wouldn't send them one 'red' cent, but:
>
> 1. Would this be in violation of the Trading with the Enemy Act (Trade
> Embargo)?
>
> 2. Does the FCC Part 97 permit ongoing CW communications between US
> stations and Cuba?
>
> Some of these QSO's have been very interesting, especially when the
> commie 'radio club operators' come in and try to stop them from asking
> for money sent directly to them (in Spanish, of course). As an advanced
> class operator, I do not remember any test question that dealt directly
> with this question. Advice would be appreciated.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ
>
>

The Geneva Treaties allow a country to object to communication with its amateurs and that becomes binding on the radio authorities in all member nations. When I got into the hobby back when dinosaurs roamed there were some, Laos, Cambodia, perhaps North Korea who did object. I do not recall any bilateral freezes. So far as I know, communication with Cuba is perfectly legal and always has been.

What our current viewpoint on this sort of activity is these days I know not and care less. I strongly doubt it consitutes trading with the enemy, enema maybe but not enemy.

You are witnessing a pretty standard deal in any number of authoritarian countries over the years, fighting over who gets to strip the mail of bills and IRCs. Anyone remember the infamous PO Box 88 Moscow?? Some clubs got their addresses into the International CallBook so they could get in on the loot. The IRCs required would have shipped the office safe let alone a QSL so the Post Office got in on the looting as well.

Watching our idiot Pres take up where the senile Jesse Helms left off for purely partisan gain is simply gut-rumbling. There is a time to take a stand for de minimus and that was 20 years ago. We are imitating the

Fastest Gun in the West -- No Toes Ike.

Dick N&#65533;BK

3889. Re: "Greenstamps" to Cuba?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-21 23:30:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <eMAG8.1483$_L.115@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43208

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote

>
> 2. Does the FCC Part 97 permit ongoing CW communications between US
> stations and Cuba?
>

Thankfully the "forbidden countries" list of the 50's-60's cold war era is
discontinued. In any case, I don't think Cuba was ever on that list.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3890. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 00:06:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521200641.10400.00000192@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 43209

In article <GwGqFo.Kwq@freenet.buffalo.edu>, cj697@bfn.org (Bill Twist) writes:

(lots of old stuff removed to save space)

>Much of this is kind of academic, as nobody really 'owns' their property.
>Oh, sure, you get a nice piece of paper that says you own it, all
>registered at the local government clerks office, but in reality you are
>leasing it from the government. You have an indefinite term lease that
>the government can break under certain conditions. Those conditions are
>certainly better than you would get from ANY other landlord, but it is a
>lease nonetheless. This can be shown by the fact that you can be removed
>from "your" property for not paying your rent to the local government in
>the form of property taxes.

Hello Bill,

When I first read this, I was inclined to say you had it all wrong. But after some thought, I realize that you have really summed up the situation very accurately, not just for real estate but for all property. If a person doesn't pay their taxes, their property can be seized by the govt., plain and simple.

>You can also be removed under certain other
>admittedly rare conditions, but in most of them you have to be compensated
>by the government.

Eminent domain. And you cannot say that you'd rather have the land than the money.

There are also easement requirements, like the utilities having their pole line on "your" property without paying you any rent - even if you are not hooked up to those utilities.
>
>As far as CC+R's are concerned, IMHO if they are not revealed to the buyer
>before the close then they should be considered invalid. The reasoning
>being that you might not have purchased (leased from the government?) the
>property had you known about the restrictions. An ideal situation
>might be something like truth-in-lending and truth-in-advertising laws.
>Require full disclosure.

I am 100% for that!

The trick with such nullification laws is that they would put the govt. in the position of widespread nullification of private contracts.

The rules would also need some specifics as to when the restrictions are made known to the buyer. Handing a buyer four pages of fine print restrictions at the closing is not adequate.

>
>Four years ago my XYL and I purchased a house built to our specifications.
>We specifically chose to NOT buy a house in a development because of
>CC&Rs (well, I was the driving force behind THAT decision). I knew I
>would want to put up an antenna or two, and I didn't want to have any
>problems. So I have my G5RV up in the backyard, and I am going to mount a
>j-pole and either a horizontal turnstile or a halo for 2 meters in a month
>or so. And I don't have to worry about some wannabe petty dictator(s)
>telling me I can't.
>
Good for you! But not everyone has that option. In many areas there is simply
no
undeveloped/unrestricted land available. Many people simply cannot afford the
time and money to have a place built from scratch. And most people aren't
going
to up and move because a family member develops an interest in ham radio.

It is also interesting to note that in order to have a simple wire antenna and
a
VHF vertical, you had to have a house built. that alone says something about
the
need for this bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>73 de Bill N2KMF
>

3891. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 00:19:24 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <dc788a1b600267752190fdcbc870490e.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43210

Ed, here is your chance. Rather than the antenna you are going to put
together in a couple of weeks here in Rochester, NY, you could
demonstrate how to make a quarter wave whip for 500 mhz. Maybe it
be a half-wave. How do you anchor it to the moon?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA - looking forward to the hamfest!

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020520062935.27670.00000576@mb-mk.aol.com

> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >>Prove you said above 500 mhz.
>
> >Prove I didn't. (Hi, Cecil!)
>
> All Amateur Radio communication takes place on frequencies above 500 mHz.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3892. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 00:25:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <XzBG8.35175$Vm2.1784611@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43211

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020521200641.10400.00000192@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <GwGqFo.Kwq@freenet.buffalo.edu>, cj697@bfn.org (Bill Twist)
writes:
>
> (lots of old stuff removed to save space)
>
> >Much of this is kind of academic, as nobody really 'owns' their
property.
> >Oh, sure, you get a nice piece of paper that says you own it, all
> >registered at the local government clerks office, but in reality you
are
> >leasing it from the government. You have an indefinite term lease that
> >the government can break under certain conditions. Those conditions
are
> >certainly better than you would get from ANY other landlord, but it is
a
> >lease nonetheless. This can be shown by the fact that you can be
removed
> >from "your" property for not paying your rent to the local government
in
> >the form of property taxes.
>
> Hello Bill,
>
> When I first read this, I was inclined to say you had it all wrong. But
after
> some thought, I realize that you have really summed up the situation
very
> accurately, not just for real estate but for all property. If a person
doesn't
> pay their taxes, their property can be seized by the govt., plain and
simple.

It's taught as the 'bundle of sticks' theory. You have a lot of them, you
do not have all of them.
Covenants are simply a few more sticks you don't get.

>
> >You can also be removed under certain other
> >admittedly rare conditions, but in most of them you have to be
compensated
> >by the government.
>
> Eminent domain. And you cannot say that you'd rather have the land than

the
> money.
>
> There are also easement requirements, like the utilities having their
pole line
> on "your" property without paying you any rent - even if you are not
hooked
> up to those utilities.
> >
> >As far as CC+R's are concerned, IMHO if they are not revealed to the
buyer
> >before the close then they should be considered invalid. The reasoning
> >being that you might not have purchased (leased from the government?)
the
> >property had you known about the restrictions. An ideal situation
> >might be something like truth-in-lending and truth-in-advertising laws.
> >Require full disclosure.
>
> I am 100% for that!
>
> The trick with such nullification laws is that they would put the govt.
in the
> position of widespread nullification of private contracts.

Actually not all that uncommon a situation. The biggies on this that I recall are the Gold Clauses in bonds that were fought over when the US went off gold in 1934 and the voiding of racial covenants. Nullifying private contracts does not seem to cause a bankruptcy judge the loss of a lot of sleep.

>
> The rules would also need some specifics as to when the restrictions are
> made known to the buyer. Handing a buyer four pages of fine print
> restrictions at the closing is not adequate.
> >
> >Four years ago my XYL and I purchased a house built to our
specifications.
> >We specifically chose to NOT buy a house in a development because of
> >CC&Rs (well, I was the driving force behind THAT decision). I knew I
> >would want to put up an antenna or two, and I didn't want to have any
> >problems. So I have my G5RV up in the backyard, and I am going to
mount a
> >j-pole and either a horizontal turnstile or a halo for 2 meters in a
month
> >or so. And I don't have to worry about some wannabe petty dictator(s)
> >telling me I can't.
> >
> Good for you! But not everyone has that option. In many areas there is
simply
> no
> undeveloped/unrestricted land available. Many people simply cannot

afford the
> time and money to have a place built from scratch. And most people
aren't
> going
> to up and move because a family member develops an interest in ham
radio.
>
> It is also interesting to note that in order to have a simple wire
antenna and
> a
> VHF vertical, you had to have a house built. that alone says something
about
> the
> need for this bill.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >73 de Bill N2KMF
> >

Dick N�BK

3893. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 00:36:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pKBG8.877$Ta7.36902180@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43212

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:XzBG8.35175$Vm2.1784611@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020521200641.10400.00000192@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > In article <GwGqFo.Kwq@freenet.buffalo.edu>, cj697@bfn.org (Bill Twist)
> writes:
> >
> > (lots of old stuff removed to save space)
> >
> > >Much of this is kind of academic, as nobody really 'owns' their
> property.
> > >Oh, sure, you get a nice piece of paper that says you own it, all
> > >registered at the local government clerks office, but in reality you
> are
> > >leasing it from the government. You have an indefinite term lease that
> > >the government can break under certain conditions. Those conditions
> are
> > >certainly better than you would get from ANY other landlord, but it is
> a
> > >lease nonetheless. This can be shown by the fact that you can be
> removed
> > >from "your" property for not paying your rent to the local government
> in
> > >the form of property taxes.
> >
> > Hello Bill,
> >
> > When I first read this, I was inclined to say you had it all wrong. But
> after
> > some thought, I realize that you have really summed up the situation
> very
> > accurately, not just for real estate but for all property. If a person
> doesn't
> > pay their taxes, their property can be seized by the govt., plain and
> simple.
>
> It's taught as the 'bundle of sticks' theory. You have a lot of them, you
> do not have all of them.
> Covenants are simply a few more sticks you don't get.

That would make sense if you sold the rights to put up antennas, not park a
boat in your driveway, etc. Then someone else own those rights. They could
park their boat in your driveway. But in this case, you don't get any

money, and the property rights are lost forever.

Lose, lose situation.

3894. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 00:44:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aceql7lme1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43213

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020521000105.06702.00001235@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 05/20/02 13:59 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020520135956.03751.00000107@mb-cm.aol.com>
>
> > Many of the title-holders attach great personal
> >importance to those titles, rather well above the actual accomplishment.
>
> I'd suggest one review my comments to the FCC in response to the
proposed
> restructing NPRM.
>
> As a matter of fact, almost everyone here, including most of the
Extra's,
> suggested some re-naming of the licenses to "lettered" groups instead of
names.

IMHO, to the uninitiated, I'd suggest
that upon hearing the names of the licenses, the
typical non-ham would probably think the
Advanced was higher than Extra.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3895. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:14:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <acerit$e3k$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43218

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:hMzG8.811$yk6.33541312@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwguslc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> >
> > On Mon, 20 May 2002 20:27:48 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > >> What keeps it there when the wind starts blowing and the rain
starts
> > >> falling?
> > >
> > >What keeps the trees from falling over. Bury it deep enough at the
base
> > >and it can support a considerable amount of height.
> >
> > IIRC utility poles require a minimum of 20% of their length buried
> > in most soils. It just depends on keeping the center of rotation
> > below ground level.
>
> So Union Electric buries "masts" in soil and its good engineering
practice,
> but WD4XXX buries his tower base in soil and he's an idiot?

Seems logical too that if I have a 50 foot tower and apply the 20%
minimum, I could bury the first 10 feet and still have a 40' mast.
Given the open framework of typical masts, the wind load
of the mast and antenna is probably less than the typical utility
pole.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3896. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:16:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020521211649.23618.00000429@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43216

In article <acaohf1a83@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

As it is so easy to lump everyone into categories Larry? What about the
>ones who just became aware of it recently, prior to their licensing. Did
>they wait for a lesser testing scheme on purpose if they were never aware of
>the hobby in the first place?
>
>Ryan KC8PMX

Ryan:

That's the problem when standards are lowered. Those who came
in after the fact can never attain the status and prestige of those who
met more comprehensive and challenging license testing requirements.
They can insist until the end that they are equal to the Pre-Restructuring
hams, but it will never be the case, and they will always occupy a low
place on the pecking order among their superiors. Sad, but true.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3897. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:16:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020521211650.23618.00000431@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43214

In article <Lr4G8.4050$vf7.205062245@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>They just happened upon a convenient excuse to eliminate you. If you had
>Superman vision I wouldn't fly with you.

Brian:

That's allright. These days, I wouldn't fly with me, either.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3898. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:16:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020521211650.23618.00000430@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43217

In article <dqeG8.132$Ku7.7716180@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Jim, good point. Even my wife and fambly are using FRS for caravanning and
>other outings. After exposure to some silly ham stuff in Illinois, she no
>longer wanted to get a license. Even though it was CW/Morse that intrigued
>her.

Brian:

If it was CW/Morse that intrigued your XYL, why didn't she simply ignore the "silly stuff" on phone and pursue ham radio on her own terms? Do others have as much total, overruling control over her life as they seem to over yours? Or, is she, like yourself, an obsequious minion who allows the actions of others to deflect her from the path she would prefer to take? Or did you discourage her from learning the Morse code and becoming a ham, because she would then go on to be an active CW user, and thus be a better ham than yourself?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3899. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:16:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020521211651.23618.00000432@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43215

In article <20020520135957.03751.00000108@mb-cm.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>Larry, there are lots of reasons that people don't make it in to the Air
>>Force Academy, a flying slot in the Air Force, or commercial airlines.
>>Hell, even active duty rated pilots have to be careful they don't lose it.
>>
>>They just happened upon a convenient excuse to eliminate you. If you had
>>Superman vision I wouldn't fly with you.
>
>
>Larry isn't superman...but he DOES need supervision. :-)

Reminds me of a birthday present I got from my shift workers during my first tour in Germany. I was the Swing Shift Supervisor of Passenger Service at Rhein-Main Air Base. They gave me a baseball hat with an extra long visor, and the hat was embroidered: To SSgt. Roll, Our SUPER-visor! The visor was signed by everyone the shift. A very touching gift. If only I knew where they all are today...

73 de Larry, K3LT

3900. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:18:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwh90we.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43219

On Tue, 21 May 2002 22:22:05 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>> IIRC utility poles require a minimum of 20% of their length buried
>> in most soils. It just depends on keeping the center of rotation
>> below ground level.
>
>So Union Electric buries "masts" in soil and its good engineering practice,
>but WD4XXX buries his tower base in soil and he's an idiot?

Union Electric treats the pole with creosote to ward off bugs.
The equivalent for steel, galvanizing, wouldn't last very long
in dirt.. Anyone who would bury 20% of a steel tower is an idiot
when the cost of a properly designed and poured concrete base is
far less than the cost of a section of tower.

And what building official would issue a permit for a steel tower
buried in dirt? All the steel utility towers in the industry
that I have ever seen in several countries are on concrete footings
or pads for a reason.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3901. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:40:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020521214026.23618.00000441@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43220

In article <PtyG8.1232$_L.778@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>
>Ed,
>
>Do you really think Larry meant milliHertz, or are you simply searching for
>fly shit out of the pepper pot?
>
>Bet you a lobster dinner that Larry meant above 500 Megahertz.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

It wasn't even my quote, so don't sweat it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3902. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:40:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020521214026.23618.00000440@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43221

In article <20020521065807.21055.00000011@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>So Larry wants to get rid of all our authorizations?
>
>If he said that he wants to give up all ham frequencies above 500 mhz, that
>is
>exactly what I would read.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

There's only one slight problem with your theory: I wasn't the one who made the quote including the inaccurate abbreviation "mHz." The person who did so knows who he is, and is just sitting back and letting me take the heat for it.

BTW: If I ever see the abbreviation "mHz," or "mhz," I usually assume that the writer means "MegaHertz," or one million CPS. The term "milli-Hertz" simply isn't used in the electronics field, at least not in my experience.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3903. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:40:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020521214027.23618.00000442@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43222

In article <20020520230353.20178.00000114@mb-mt.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>
>>> >They just happened upon a convenient excuse to eliminate you. If you had
>>> >Superman vision I wouldn't fly with you.
>>>
>>>
>>> Larry isn't superman...but he DOES need supervision. :-)
>>
>>Len, where you been? I've been out here fending off the wolves with sticks.
>
>I've been elsewhere (no, not Dayton). You are being tested to
>co-exist in wolfpacks...you passed! :-)

Brian/Len:

Dick and I had an argument about the two of you the other day.
Dick said you wern't fit to eat with pigs, and I said you were!
Which one of us was right?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3904. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:46:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521214607.26868.00000129@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 43225

In article <3CE9C4FE.388FF918@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Don't try this at home Kids!!!! Asphalt gets quite soft at warm
>temps,
>> and you wouldn't like what could happen.
>>
> Oh, I dunno... a few years ago I watched a major highway being built where
>they laid layer after layer of asphalt over a crushed limstone base, to a
>thickness of around 14 to 16 inches (eyeball guesstimate). I'm still waiting
for > >the ruts was sure all those 80K lb eighteen wheelers would cause on hot
summer >days...

Apples and oranges.

An 80,000 pound truck spreads that weight over 18 wheels, so each wheel only supports about 4500 pounds. Those 4500 pounds are spread out over the area where the tire contacts the road surface - maybe a square foot per tire. 4500 pounds on one square foot equals about 30 pounds per square inch. That's not a lot of pressure. Yet 18 wheelers do tear up the road. The road actually flexes very slightly under the passing wheels. And on a road surface, the forces
are almost all downward.

A foundation for a freestanding tower is a completely different animal.

Check out how traffic light and roadsign masts are installed. Those are the closest
thing to antenna towers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3905. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:46:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521214607.26868.00000130@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 43226

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gwguslc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On Mon, 20 May 2002 20:27:48 -0400, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>>> What keeps it there when the wind starts blowing and the rain starts
>>> falling?
>>
>>What keeps the trees from falling over.

Extensive root system. In some species there is almost as much below
ground as above. Yet trees fall over in the wind.

>> Bury it deep enough at the base
>>and it can support a considerable amount of height.

Only if a lot of conditions are met. You CAN have a tower foundation without
concrete, but it's usually not cost effective.
>
> IIRC utility poles require a minimum of 20% of their length buried
> in most soils.

I can speak to this, having installed them with and without power equipment.

20% is an absolute minimum. This means a pole 35 feet long has at least 7 feet
buried and 28 feet exposed. Taller poles and softer soils need additional depth
and guys. Any side loading must be compensated for by proper guying.

A wood pole offers a large solid surface when buried. A lattice tower does not.

Wood poles taper, and the thicker, heavier end is installed downward. End
result is that a wood pole, properly engineered and installed, will not fall
over in
most winds.

> It just depends on keeping the center of rotation
> below ground level.

Yup. Proper engineering, that's all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3906. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:46:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020521214608.26868.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 43224

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gwgthta.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On Mon, 20 May 2002 23:52:56 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>>> It's their house that it's going to fall on, not mine....
>>>
>>Is N2EY going to install his tower at your house as well? Otherwise, how's
>>it going to fall on your house?
>
> If he installs it at my house it's no longer his, it's mine under
> the "property found on post" rule.

I would be gald to help install a properly engineered tower at K2ASP's house,
if
it weren't such a long commute.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3907. Re: fréquences

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 01:46:26 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEAF872.100@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43223

Comont ale vous es sil vous plais Max. Pardom mi Francais es tres bien.
Salut de kr4aj

Max wrote:

> Salut je cherche des frï¿½quences pour l'ï¿½coute des pompiers, militaires,
> ambulances, polices , douanes, crs,etc etc Region du Var (83) sur un
> scanner de frï¿½quence histoire de passer le temps . Merci A+
>
>
>
>
>

3908. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 02:15:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CEAFF80.2554A42A@adelphia.net>
Source record: 43227

It's a matter of force and leverage. The truck has it's weight
distributed among all the tires. Each one applies only so much force.

The tower on the other hand, is applying all its force in one small
area, the area of the tower cross section, or near to it. It's the same
principle where a cat or small dog can hurt when it stands on you, even
tho' it only weighs ten pounds. All the weight is concentrated in one
place.

To make things worse, the tower also acts as a lever, with the pivot
point at almost the very end. So there is a startling amount of force
involved here.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > Don't try this at home Kids!!!! Asphalt gets quite soft at warm temps,
> > and you wouldn't like what could happen.
> >
>
> Oh, I dunno... a few years ago I watched a major highway being built where they
> laid layer after layer of asphalt over a crushed limstone base, to a thickness of
> around 14 to 16 inches (eyeball guesstimate). I'm still waiting for the ruts I was
> sure all those 80K lb eighteen wheelers would cause on hot summer days...

3909. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 02:45:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2DDG8.953$EZ7.40044907@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43228

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020521211650.23618.00000430@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <dqeG8.132$Ku7.7716180@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Jim, good point. Even my wife and fambly are using FRS for caravanning
and
> >other outings. After exposure to some silly ham stuff in Illinois, she
no
> >longer wanted to get a license. Even though it was CW/Morse that
intrigued
> >her.
>
> Brian:
>
> If it was CW/Morse that intrigued your XYL, why didn't she simply
> ignore the "silly stuff" on phone and pursue ham radio on her own
> terms?

People like you scare her.

> Do others have as much total, overruling control over her
> life as they seem to over yours?

People like you scare her.

> Or, is she, like yourself, an
> obsequious minion who allows the actions of others to deflect her
> from the path she would prefer to take?

People like you scare her.

> Or did you discourage
> her from learning the Morse code and becoming a ham, because
> she would then go on to be an active CW user, and thus be a better
> ham than yourself?

I don't scare her.

> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Oh yes, sebenty tree.

Brian

3910. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 02:46:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3EDG8.954$oZ7.40028329@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43229

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020521214027.23618.00000442@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <20020520230353.20178.00000114@mb-mt.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >
> >>> >They just happened upon a convenient excuse to eliminate you. If you
had
> >>> >Superman vision I wouldn't fly with you.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> Larry isn't superman...but he DOES need supervision. :-)
> >>
> >>Len, where you been? I've been out here fending off the wolves with
sticks.
> >
> >I've been elsewhere (no, not Dayton). You are being tested to
> >co-exist in wolfpacks...you passed! :-)
>
> Brian/Len:
>
> Dick and I had an argument about the two of you the other day.
> Dick said you wern't fit to eat with pigs, and I said you were!
> Which one of us was right?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Please define "Fit."

3911. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 02:47:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4FDG8.956$lU7.39709977@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43230

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020521211650.23618.00000431@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <Lr4G8.4050$vf7.205062245@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >They just happened upon a convenient excuse to eliminate you. If you had
> >Superman vision I wouldn't fly with you.
>
> Brian:
>
> That's allright. These days, I wouldn't fly with me, either.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

No kidding.

3912. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 02:49:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dHDG8.958$N%7.40184953@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43231

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020521214607.26868.00000129@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3CE9C4FE.388FF918@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
writes:
>
> >Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >> Don't try this at home Kids!!!! Asphalt gets quite soft at warm
> >temps,
> >> and you wouldn't like what could happen.
> >>
> > Oh, I dunno... a few years ago I watched a major highway being built
where
> >they laid layer after layer of asphalt over a crushed limstone base, to a
> >thickness of around 14 to 16 inches (eyeball guesstimate). I'm still
waiting
> for > >the ruts was sure all those 80K lb eighteen wheelers would cause on
hot
> summer >days...
>
> Apples and oranges.
>
> An 80,000 pound truck spreads that weight over 18 wheels, so each wheel
only
> supports about 4500 pounds. Those 4500 pounds are spread out over the
> area where the tire contacts the road surface - maybe a square foot per
tire.
> 4500 pounds on one square foot equals about 30 pounds per square inch.
That's
> not a lot of pressure. Yet 18 wheelers do tear up the road. The road
actually
> flexes very slightly under the passing wheels. And on a road surface, the
> forces
> are almost all downward.
>
> A foundation for a freestanding tower is a completely different animal.
>
> Check out how traffic light and roadsign masts are installed. Those are
the
> closest
> thing to antenna towers.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

The power company augers out some earth and the crane tilts then drop a wooden pole in the hole.

3913. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 02:53:40 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CEB0834.966EE520@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43232

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> Yup. Proper engineering, that's all.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I haven't tried it (not looking to install a tower), but couldn't
you just download engineering drawings from tower venders?
It would be a generic design that would be good for all
kinds of soil, i.e., overdesigned. Then take it down to
the town hall and get the permits. Yes, inspections are
a pain in the ass, but if you did do it wrong, it could be
dangerous.

3914. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 02:53:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1LDG8.961$16.40277230@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43233

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwh90we.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Tue, 21 May 2002 22:22:05 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >> IIRC utility poles require a minimum of 20% of their length buried
> >> in most soils. It just depends on keeping the center of rotation
> >> below ground level.
> >
> >So Union Electric buries "masts" in soil and its good engineering
practice,
> >but WD4XXX buries his tower base in soil and he's an idiot?
>
> Union Electric treats the pole with creosote to ward off bugs.
> The equivalent for steel, galvanizing, wouldn't last very long
> in dirt.. Anyone who would bury 20% of a steel tower is an idiot
> when the cost of a properly designed and poured concrete base is
> far less than the cost of a section of tower.

Phil, just state that you couldn't possibly be wrong and we'll believe you.
No need to call your Extra brethren in radio an idiot.

> And what building official would issue a permit for a steel tower
> buried in dirt? All the steel utility towers in the industry
> that I have ever seen in several countries are on concrete footings
> or pads for a reason.

Yes, yes, yes. We all know concrete doesn't absorb water.

3915. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 02:55:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <EMDG8.964$vZ7.40035612@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43234

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message

> They can insist until the end that they are equal to the Pre-Restructuring
> hams, but it will never be the case, and they will always occupy a low
> place on the pecking order among their superiors. Sad, but true.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, do you axeually believe this crap?

3916. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 02:58:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5PDG8.966$l9.40486061@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43235

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020521214026.23618.00000440@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <20020521065807.21055.00000011@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >
> >>So Larry wants to get rid of all our authorizations?
> >
> >If he said that he wants to give up all ham frequencies above 500 mhz,
that
> >is
> >exactly what I would read.
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed:
>
> There's only one slight problem with your theory: I wasn't the one
> who made the quote including the inaccurate abbreviation "mHz."
> The person who did so knows who he is, and is just sitting back and
> letting me take the heat for it.

I used "mhz." What heat are you taking? You said you wanted to get rid of
VHF+ freqs, and if you get any heat for that its only because you should get
heat for it.

> BTW: If I ever see the abbreviation "mHz," or "mhz," I usually assume
> that the writer means "MegaHertz," or one million CPS. The term
> "milli-Hertz" simply isn't used in the electronics field, at least not in
> my experience.

What would you know of the electronics field? You're merely an amateur.

3917. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 03:21:00 UTC
From: Mark Wellsley <MW351@zelcomailreaders.org>
Message-ID: <acf2n2bmh0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 43236
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:3CE99FD7.3758F3F8@houston-hunks.com...
> SWL wrote:
> >
> > If you're talking about E. Hernandez the ham radio op, you better
> > check your info sources partner! You are very misinformed. Ed
> > is down in Dallas and runs a successful computer and data consulting
> > firm that has a big contract with the University of Texas. He also
> > guest lectures at UT and was recently recognized by the TexMex
> > community for outstanding contributions to the Hispanic community.
> > Also has received awards from the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.
> >
> > Lazaro "Tex" Garcia
>
> Yep, he's been a consultant for us too, and is quite an expert on
> pipelined, asynchronous, multiprocessing architecture. He's also quite
> popular with the ladies, contrary to the usual stereotype for a computer
> geek, and has been seen in the company of Texas' own Sandra Bullock in
> recent months.
>
> ------
> "I love Dr. Seuss, flamenco dancing and computers. I'm always on the
> internet." -- Sandra Bullock, People Magazine 07/31/95

Spoke with Eduardo Hernandez, Sr. this past weekend. He was quite surprised to learn he is the subject of a hate vendetta by a West Virginia ham operator. Eventually, we both realized it can't be him that the West Va. operator detests so much. It has to be Eduardo Hernandez the third, who lives in Michigan. Ed Hernandez III, no relation to Eduardo Hernandez, Sr., is a traveling minstrel who has been know to perform in West Virginia, and that apparently is the connection to the West Va. amateur who posts all the filthy obscene language in this news group. Ed Hernandez III also administers ham radio exams on an itinerant basis and has been known to do same in West Va. If that wasn't confusing enough, it was later learned that an Eduardo Hernandez, Jr. is computer consultant living in Florida and is in fact possibly related to Ed Hernandez, Sr. who lives in Texas. Both the Hernandez's are anxious to get this problem cleared up and to get the West Va. ham op to stop making up stories about the Hernandez's.

Mark W.

3918. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 03:55:12 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <AEEG8.906$VN4.32959844@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43237

Hans,

Perhaps you should save the juvenile name-calling for another group. I'm sure that you are an experienced ham, and I respect this, but your comments show that you can also be quite a childish snot. I can only hope you don't display such behavior in the presence of your wife and grandchildren. I am truly grateful for the information and insight that this group has shared with me because my knowledge of ham policy is still minimal. In contrast however, my knowledge of Biomedical Engineering and Physiology is considerable. If there is something that you don't understand regarding BME, I would be happy to provide you with the neccessary factual data or information. The whole point for a newsgroup is dispersal and sharing of views and information, so it seems ignorant to rant and accuse, escpecially when you know nothing of which you speak. If you want out of the dark, just ask.....

Lars

3919. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 04:19:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEB1C4A.85CDAF7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43238

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> That's the problem when standards are lowered. Those who came
> in after the fact can never attain the status and prestige of those who
> met more comprehensive and challenging license testing requirements.

Status and prestige are not objective characteristics of amateur radio
licenses. ARS licenses are only as good as the privileges granted.
Everything else is all in your mind.

> They can insist until the end that they are equal to the Pre-Restructuring
> hams, but it will never be the case, and they will always occupy a low
> place on the pecking order among their superiors. Sad, but true.

Only if they buy into your BS which most of them don't.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3920. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 05:49:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acgp8f1dit@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43304

I was referring to the local level, possibly having a regional arrangement within the states to do this. At least if we are talking about the ARRL, this is a way we can actually get some activity out of the section titleholders.

As far as online teaching, I am not sold of that method, other that utilizing it for taking tests online. Thought the idea might also be good in respect to hams actually seeing other hams face to face once in a great while.

I will be the first to admit that there is some great strengths and abilities I have within the hobby, and there are some weaknesses I would like to improve upon.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020520183253.27747.00000653@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >Too bad that there is not something similar in Amateur radio. There could
> >be various elements in the different facets of the hobby that we could take
> >as a class that would help us to improve our skills. I mean going further
> >in depth into the various subjects such as antennas, or radio circuitry or
> >message handling or ????
>
> For info on doing this on-line, see:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/cce/
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3921. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 05:55:18 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acgp8g2dit@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43307

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:zYeG8.152$FI7.8583422@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:acaohh3a83@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > Just another one of the 100+ weekend classes or training sessions that
we
> as
> > firefighters have available to us to improve our skills that are
available
> > through the year. Am already full-time employed.
> >
> > Too bad that there is not something similar in Amateur radio. There
could
> > be various elements in the different facets of the hobby that we could
> take
> > as a class that would help us to improve our skills. I mean going
further
> > in depth into the various subjects such as antennas, or radio circuitry
or
> > message handling or ????
>
> I think its called an engineering degree.

Don't believe that would be as necessary to improve the skills for the general and below classes. But some key elements of the different facets of ham radio would be good.

>
> > I personally have some great strengths in certain subjects as they
relate
> to
> > amateur radio, and definitely some weaknesses I would like to improve
> upon.
> > They say we must be a self-policing body, but what about a
self-educating
> > body? Talk about getting clubs more activity and participation.....
> >
> > Just a thought,
>

These are good, but I am looking for someone in regards to this to actually teach something like that. Self study courses may not always be a good solution, as you may not learn the material properly, but a qualified (having knowledge in the subject) person can identify gaps or errors in

knowledge in a class form. God forbid we actually see other hams face to face.

Ryan

> Ryan, to their credit, the ARRL is offering web based classes in emergency
> comms, and antenna modelling (for $). More to follow. Meanwhile, FEMA
> offers a half dozen web or book based emergency response courses, all free
> of charge. Around Columbus OH I've heard a group on 147.45 simplex doing
> some building and emergency training. Find people like that and take it as
> far as it will go.
>
> 73, Brian
>
>

3922. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 05:58:55 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acgp8h3dit@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43308

That is why PRB-1 is in the last of my concerns.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site
please)
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> > PRB-1 assumes nothing of the sort. It deals with restrictions posed by
> > ordinances, statutes, procedures or rules rnacted by local or state
> > government entities, regardless of property ownership.
>
> True, but I think the point being made by was that if, as a renterm
> the landlord prohibits antennas, then there is nothing in PRB-1
> that is of any help to the renter.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

3923. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 06:03:47 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acgp8j4dit@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43306

This guy still won't allow one of those even..... Don't think he will
believe it even if I showed him the law.

Guess the only solution is for me to move, but it is all I can afford at
this time until things get better financially. Playing catch up on student
loans and other debts takes a huge amount of my funds. Life's gonna suck
for the next 3 years or so, but after that it will get better.... I hope.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site
please)
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:C56433BDDF19DE89.0D3760DD11EFC04A.372DC9E9CCC5F87A@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 20 May 2002 02:50:46 -0400, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:
>
> >Joe... PRB-1 has nothing for renters or leasee's. It assumes that hams
are
> >only residential home owners and that is about it.
>
> I was referring to your comment that your landlord wouldn't let you
> have a DSS dish. The applicable bit of regulation for that is 47CFR
> Section 1.4000, which I posted a little earlier.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

3924. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 06:10:28 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acgp8k5dit@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43305

(opinion mode on)
I have seen some hams at hamfests with more crap on them, such as stupid tags and buttons etc. IMHO I think all that is necessary is a simple ID badge (clear laminate kind with alligator type clip) with pertinent information is more than adequate. Some of these people look like complete fools when they go out in public like that. Almost think I saw the same type of people at a Star Trek convention I had to work security for about 10 years ago. Talk about an image issue.

Never gonna see me at a ham radio related event with nothing but normal street clothes and a simple ID badge like described above or (if) one of the ARRL type of ID badges. Thats it.

(opinion mode off)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
www.qsl.net/w8kea (click on banner at bottom of screen to vote for the site please)
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> I think we ought to have degrees, not classes,
> ranging from 1st degree all the way up to 33rd
> degree.
>
> And have funny little hats with arcane ham
> radio symbols on them to wear at hamfests.
>
> Oh, wait, we have those already.
>
>
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona
>
>

3925. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 06:24:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522022457.24215.00000148@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 43239

>Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/21/02 13:52 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020521135235.10913.00000084@mb-mm.aol.com>

>> As a matter of fact, almost everyone here, including most of the
>Extra's,
>>suggested some re-naming of the licenses to "lettered" groups instead of
>>names.
>
>Noooooo they did NOT. Some, not even close to "everyone here."

Most of the Extra Class respondents from this forum DID suggest that very
change. Sorry.

>One memorable post of about four years ago had well over 30
>different classes/grades/varieties of rank-status-title-privileges
>to those who "deserved it."

I DID cite that one person made such a foolish suggestion, but I guess you
just glossed over that in your rush to once again assert your dwindiling
manhood.

It didn't work. The truth is still the truth.

>>Just as a good lie and rant are to those WITHOUT one...Such as
>yourself,
>>for example.
>
>Now, now, getting testy are you?

Nope. Just still can't help but wonder how decrepit and lonely you must
be to sit in front of your pooter for hours drafting such dribble that does
nbothing more than make a fool out of yourself.

>Does anyone really care what you've written in here once in a while
>in between all those personal insults directed at those who do not
>agree with you?

Matters not to me, Lennie. I am just having fun poking so many holes in
your lies and rants that the rest doesn't matter. All that night school down
the drain, eh Your Putziness?

The last thing that came out of this NG of any note was a letter that Hans
had printed in QST and an article that appeared in "Worldradio" with my byline.

And I limit that to "this NG". I wish in NO WAY to demean or detract from
the excellent efforts of several gentlemen (ie: W1RFI) who are published on a

regular basis.

>>As for the titles, those were carried forward by the FCC, not us...put
>>"blame" where blame is due, Your Putziness.
>
>See, another "putz-gram" sent off. Prediction of behavior is no
>problem at all.

Just as knowing that anything authored by "lenover21" will be a stinging slap at 675,000 LICENSED Amateur Radio operators, Lennie.

And besides, "licensed operator" is my "title", "Putz" is yours. The only thing you and I have in common is that we each earned our respective "titles".

Congratulations on yours, Putz.

>The ARRL lobbied for, and got all those fancy TITLES. That was back
>in the days when Big Brother did all the talking "for amateur radio."

And the FCC kept them this time despite several opportunitites and encouragement by scores of respondnents.

>ONE license is all that is needed for regulatory purposes.

"...in my opinion" should have been the rest of that sentence, Lennie.

>Anything more is nothing but government welfare support for
>sanctified self-importance of the already-licensed.

Again..."in (your) opinion."

>Cat-fighting by
>radio..."my license is bigger-better than yours".

And in YOUR case, Lennie....a NOVICE license is bigger than yours.

3926. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 09:55:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522055504.17553.00000160@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43240

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> and they will always occupy a low place on the pecking order among their
> superiors. Sad, but true.

Your prounoncement of same, irrespective of their actual accomplishments, is a way for you to feel superior in circumstances where you are not. I imagine that it comforts you to see life that way.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3927. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 09:55:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522055537.17553.00000161@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43241

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Larry, do you axeually believe this crap?

Be kind; it may be all he really has.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3928. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 09:57:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522055720.17553.00000162@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43242

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>So Union Electric buries "masts" in soil and its good engineering practice,
>but WD4XXX buries his tower base in soil and he's an idiot?

Has WD4XXX gone through the same engineering analysis as has the electric
utility company in burying their utility poles?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3929. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 10:07:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522060747.17553.00000163@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43243

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Lots of guys send code so atrociously that a digital computer cannot copy
>it. Please comment.

Perhaps the decoding software needs a bit of work.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3930. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 10:08:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522060845.17553.00000164@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43244

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>How 'bout if I just copy code more slowly?

If you wish.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3931. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 10:09:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522060938.17553.00000165@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43245

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Put the same taproot in a bed of asphalt and let me know what happens.

The tree dies.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3932. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 11:45:49 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acg2jp$b6q$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43052
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mark Wellsley" <MW351@zelcomailreaders.org> wrote in message
news:acf2n2bmh0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> Spoke with Eduardo Hernandez, Sr. this past weekend. He was quite
> surprised to learn he is the subject of a hate vendetta by a West Virginia
> ham operator. Eventually, we both realized it can't be him that
> the West Va. operator detests so much. It has to be Eduardo Hernandez
> the third, who lives in Michigan. Ed Hernandez III, no relation to
Eduardo
> Hernandez, Sr., is a traveling minstrel who has been know to perform in
> West Virginia, and that apparently is the connection to the West Va.
> amateur who posts all the filthy obscene language in this news group. Ed
> Hernandez III also administers ham radio exams on an itinerant basis and
> has been known to do same in West Va. If that wasn't confusing enough,
> it was later learned that an Eduardo Hernandez, Jr. is computer consultant
> living in Florida and is in fact possibly related to Ed Hernandez, Sr. who
> lives in Texas. Both the Hernandez's are anxious to get this problem
> cleared up and to get the West Va. ham op to stop making up stories
> about the Hernandez's.
>
> Mark W.

Try again, Ed-dildo.

3933. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 11:55:21 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <JGLG8.36053$Vm2.1847183@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43246

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522055504.17553.00000160@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> > and they will always occupy a low place on the pecking order among
their
> > superiors. Sad, but true.
>
> Your prounoncement of same, irrespective of their actual
accomplishments, is a
> way for you to feel superior in circumstances where you are not. I
imagine
> that it comforts you to see life that way.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ed, I agree with you totally and over the years have lived thru the break-up of the old sequential call-sign structure where we marched in lock-step into the sunset. It was an enema the hobby really needed.

Yet I still have the feeling the class system lives not so much among the uberfuerers as among the newbies. It is their really silly attacks on Larry that have fueled this sort of thing for years and handed him the keys to a career of endless amusement. There are few things as pathetic as an incompetant iconoclast.

I got to take the inevitable 'stately home tour' with a collection of British Baptists who are not all that high on the economic totem pole. The whole thing was a ritual: the owner-lady came down in the proper uniform, Papagallos and all, to pronounce on the unworthy bodies of the babushki who properly and eagerly served their part in the opera. Sometimes this code thing resembles an opera, of recent times complete with fat lady, where everyone has their parts memorized and sings them on cue.

It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you. Ever get the feeling it is more the flunkies playing the game than vice-versa??

Dick NBK

3934. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 12:00:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205220400.2d3949d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43247

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3CEB0834.966EE520@ix.netcom.com>...
> N2EY wrote:

> > Yup. Proper engineering, that's all.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> I haven't tried it (not looking to install a tower), but couldn't
> you just download engineering drawings from tower venders?

That's definitely a first step.

> It would be a generic design that would be good for all
> kinds of soil, i.e., overdesigned.

One can't assume that a particular design is suitable for all soils.
Part of the engineering process is determining if the suggested
manufacturer drawings can be used for a particular application.

> Then take it down to
> the town hall and get the permits.

Yup - with supporting documentation to show it does apply to the
proposed application. If every thing is in order, the cost of
having a licensed PE look it over and sign off on it is usually
nominal.

> Yes, inspections are
> a pain in the ass, but if you did do it wrong, it could be
> dangerous.

That's the main point. Building and safety codes are written in
blood, usually by people with more experience.

Also, it's often easier and cheaper to do it right the first time
rather than have to deal with problems later on.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3935. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 12:14:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEB8B8E.20DE4CE@att.net>
Source record: 43248

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Lots of guys send code so atrociously that a digital computer cannot copy
> >it. Please comment.
>
> Perhaps the decoding software needs a bit of work.

It's Gadfly's wetware that needs the work.

3936. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 12:25:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEB8DFC.70A1EDE8@att.net>
Source record: 43249

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020522055504.17553.00000160@mb-cv.aol.com...
> > From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >
> > > and they will always occupy a low place on the pecking order among
> their
> > > superiors. Sad, but true.
> >
> > Your prounoncement of same, irrespective of their actual
> accomplishments, is a
> > way for you to feel superior in circumstances where you are not. I
> imagine
> > that it comforts you to see life that way.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
>
> Ed, I agree with you totally and over the years have lived thru the
> break-up of the old sequential call-sign structure where we marched in
> lock-step into the sunset. It was an enema the hobby really needed.
>
> Yet I still have the feeling the class system lives not so much among the
> uberfuerers as among the newbies. It is their really silly attacks on
> Larry that have fueled this sort of thing for years and handed him the
> keys to a career of endless amusement. There are few things as pathetic
> as an incompetant iconoclast.
>
> I got to take the inevitable 'stately home tour' with a collection of
> British Baptists who are not all that high on the economic totem pole.
> The whole thing was a ritual: the owner-lady came down in the proper
> uniform, Papagallos and all, to pronounce on the unworthy bodies of the
> babushki who properly and eagerly served their part in the opera.
> Sometimes this code thing resembles an opera, of recent times complete
> with fat lady, where everyone has their parts memorized and sings them on
> cue.
>
> It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you.
> Ever get the feeling it is more the flunkies playing the game than
> vice-versa??

Then, when you analyze the background of said flunkies and draw conclusions
as to the origins of their behavior, the problem clarifies to a solution.

Their behavior is not of recent origin, in the case of the "old newbies", and the real new ones just follow their lead.

In the Brave New World where anything older than yesterday is 'legacy' and thus unworthy of anything but discard, yesterday's accomplishment, whatever it was or whatever it meant yesterday, is flushed with prejudice. The future will surely take care of itself.

3937. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 12:26:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522082615.17542.00000167@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43250

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> >Lots of guys send code so atrociously that a digital computer cannot copy
>> >it. Please comment.

>> Perhaps the decoding software needs a bit of work.

> It's Gadfly's wetware that needs the work.

Amateur Radio would benefit either way if he develops his personal skill to decode CW or if he were to develop a decoding algorithm that is more capable of adjusting to the variations from ideal that are characteristic of manually-sent Morse encoding.

The latter would actually have more potential value because it might have applicablity to software decoding of other digital modes subject to changes in propagation delay over ionospheric paths.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3938. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 12:27:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522082743.17542.00000168@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43051

From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net

>It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you.
>Ever get the feeling it is more the flunkies playing the game than
>vice-versa??

I think that there is plenty of baiting going on with both sides of the debate.
I do have to agree with Larry, though, that he is a master at it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3939. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 12:33:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEB9022.6B7C360D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43053

Richard McCollum wrote:
> It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you.

Could it be that the 'elite' part is just a wet dream? Respect cannot
be earned by simply passing a minimum requirements exam.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3940. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 12:39:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEB916B.5928A6B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43054

Dick Carroll wrote:
> In the Brave New World where anything older than yesterday is 'legacy' and
> thus unworthy of anything but discard, yesterday's accomplishment, whatever
> it was or whatever it meant yesterday, is flushed with prejudice.

Passing a minimum requirements exam and then resting on one's laurels
does not elicit respect, Dick. Yesterday's accomplishments are old news.
What have you done for the ARS lately?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3941. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 13:24:11 UTC
From: HoopyKloopie <postodplugs@aol.com>
Message-ID: <%ZMG8.573$4J1.417@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43055

Am I reading this thread right folks......

There's now actually a debate going on the
proper shorthand spelling of the
word "Megahertz"...???????

No wonder the net attendance
at the 2002 Dayton Hamvention
was into the tank.

Better face it folks - Wayne Green was
right a LONG time ago writing in his Editorials
in 73 Magazine - this hobby is not dying,
it's already DOA. sheesh.

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:5PDG8.966$l9.40486061@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020521214026.23618.00000440@mb-dh.aol.com...
> > In article <20020521065807.21055.00000011@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI)
> > writes:
> >
> > >
> > >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> > >
> > >>So Larry wants to get rid of all our authorizations?
> > >
> > >If he said that he wants to give up all ham frequencies above 500 mhz,
> that
> > >is
> > >exactly what I would read.
> > >
> > >73,
> > >Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > Ed:
> >
> > There's only one slight problem with your theory: I wasn't the one
> > who made the quote including the inaccurate abbreviation "mHz."
> > The person who did so knows who he is, and is just sitting back and
> > letting me take the heat for it.
>
> I used "mhz." What heat are you taking? You said you wanted to get rid

of
> VHF+ freqs, and if you get any heat for that its only because you should
get
> heat for it.
>
> > BTW: If I ever see the abbreviation "mHz," or "mhz," I usually assume
> > that the writer means "MegaHertz," or one million CPS. The term
> > "milli-Hertz" simply isn't used in the electronics field, at least not
in
> > my experience.
>
> What would you know of the electronics field? You're merely an amateur.
>
>
>

3942. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 14:18:55 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <7BA148F72A92E287.F021E61FB51EDFF6.21B6381B9BD60635@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43056

On Wed, 22 May 2002 03:55:12 GMT, "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net>
wrote:

>In contrast
>however, my knowledge of Biomedical Engineering and Physiology is considerable.

Well, then maybe you can work out a deal with someone who has a
considerable knowledge of psychiatry.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3943. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 14:23:22 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522102322.19958.00000001@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 43057

Lets see, For what I would cost to go to Dayton from Ca. for a weekend, I could go to Hawaii for a week.

3944. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 15:33:24 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8TOG8.29955$D41.1163401@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43058

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CEB9022.6B7C360D@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you.
>
> Could it be that the 'elite' part is just a wet dream? Respect cannot
> be earned by simply passing a minimum requirements exam.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

In a sane and rational universe you are correct. But this is the Amateur
Radio universe where people live. People in hobbies behave oddly.

3945. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 15:51:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522115154.03111.00000012@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 43059

>Subject: Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio
>From: "HoopyKloopie" postodplugs@aol.com
>Date: 05/22/02 09:24 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <%ZMG8.573$4J1.417@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>There's now actually a debate going on the
>proper shorthand spelling of the
>word "Megahertz".

Nothing new about that. it's been going on for decades.

>No wonder the net attendance
>at the 2002 Dayton Hamvention
>was into the tank.

The weather had more to do with that than anything.

>Better face it folks - Wayne Green was
>right a LONG time ago writing in his Editorials
>in 73 Magazine - this hobby is not dying,
>it's already DOA. sheesh.

Wayne Green is an idiot savant. Has his moments of brilliance, surrounded by tons of meaningless foolishness. He can't tell whose crap stinks because he has his head so far up his own butt. That's been going on for decades too.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3946. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 15:54:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522115403.03111.00000013@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 43060

>ubject: Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?
>From: kf6vyh@aol.com (Kf6vyh)
>Date: 05/22/02 10:23 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020522102322.19958.00000001@mb-mf.aol.com>
>
>Lets see, For what I would cost to go to Dayton from Ca. for a weekend, I
>could
>go to Hawaii for a week.

Your point?

They are both about the same distance depending where in CA you are.

All depends on whether you want beaches or Ham radio. You ahve to have
your priorities set, ya know!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3947. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 16:00:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522120025.13744.00000205@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 43061

In article <20020520062935.27670.00000576@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>>Prove you said above 500 mhz.
>
>>Prove I didn't. (Hi, Cecil!)
>
>All Amateur Radio communication takes place on frequencies above 500 mHz.

Not quite "all." QST comes out once a month. That is roughly
0.38 microHertz. :-)

3948. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 16:00:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522120025.13744.00000204@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 43063

In article <PtyG8.1232$_L.778@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Ed,
>
>Do you really think Larry meant milliHertz, or are you simply searching for
>fly shit out of the pepper pot?
>
>Bet you a lobster dinner that Larry meant above 500 Megahertz.
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hans the Psychic Telepath trolled again. :-)

3949. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 16:00:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522120026.13744.00000206@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 43065

In article <ace80d$42k$1@usenet01.srv.cis.pitt.edu>, szekeres@pitt.edu (GregS)
writes:

>>I think we ought to have degrees, not classes,
>>ranging from 1st degree all the way up to 33rd
>>degree.
>>
>>And have funny little hats with arcane ham
>>radio symbols on them to wear at hamfests.
>>
>>Oh, wait, we have those already.
>
>I would have gone for higher classes if they had'm. Can't figure why anybody
>would want to make the uppers easier, they are supposed to get harder.
>Maybe 30WPM, with extended questions, and of course, years required.
>Maybe also take a voltage torture test.
>
>Oh my, this made me remember how long I've been a ham. About 40 years!
>
>gregS
>N6GS

What has tenure-in-a-hobby got to do with it?

49 years ago in February I keyed on my first HF transmitter, quite
legally without any license whatsoever. So did N2JTV at roughly
the same time. We were both at the same station, but on
different shifts.

Ignoring the political boilerplate phrases, amateur radio is really
a HOBBY. It's been that way for over a half century.

Transmitting RF requires regulation. A "ticket" (license) is just a
regulatory tool of the government agency required to regulate
civil radio use. Approach it that way instead of the nostalgia gig
that old-timers get into and there can be some meaningful
discussion of "what should ham licenses test."

So far under this subject header, the "discussions" are based on
little but individuals trying to promote their own experiences as a
"basis" for continuing test regulations. That's just self-serving
nonsense insofar as the uncountable thousands who MIGHT be
interested in amateur radio and MIGHT be interested enough to
get a license.

3950. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 16:00:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522120027.13744.00000207@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 43064

In article <aDzG8.805$9c6.33038570@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> BTW, if you ever apply for a patent, be sure to ask for a "utility patent",
>> NOT a "design patent". A design patent is little more than a document
>> describing the styling of a radio cabinet, for example. The patent for
>> say the light bulb or the transistor is a utility patent, and actually means
>> something in the industry.
>
>Robert, from a search of the USPO, how can I determine if a patent has
>expired? How can I determine if someone has "added" to a patent?
>
>Private e-mail is good.

Try www.delphion.com (the old "IBM" patent site). You can't get the
whole patent there without money, but you can view some of the
history and search information.

For example, Brian Kelly and his co-inventor have three patent
numbers for the same thing but successive date patents are
"replacements" for previous ones. That means he and co-buddy
have only ONE patent. It's a "mechanical" thingy about
bearings. [watch him "argue" that one...:-)]

3951. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 16:00:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522120028.13744.00000208@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 43062

In article <ktzG8.796$ab6.32974096@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Now...watch ol' Richard Chamberpot jump in here with another
>> putz-gram, followed shortly by Sig Heil and his "you'll be nothing,
>> nothing but a beginner if you get a license now" and other
>> assorted Heilianisms of a derogatory nature. They are obsessed
>> with "getting back" at those who will not worship and adore them.
>> :-)
>
>I've noticed. So how did the exam go? BTW, I didn't see Dave nor Marti at
>the Hamvention.

What "exam?" I don't have to study for my blood test until
next month... :-)

3952. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 16:29:55 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <7IPG8.1071$Xx1.49967343@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43066

> Well, then maybe you can work out a deal with someone who has a
> considerable knowledge of psychiatry.

Actually I know a little Psych too..... so perhaps we can start by discussing when your ignorance first manifested into the mindless babble that you now bless us with? Oh, and by the way, I do take cash with proper I.D. ;o)

3953. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 17:08:40 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CEBD099.DD57BDD1@psu.edu>
Source record: 43067

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3CE90D32.229956B@psu.edu...
> > You have hit on a big part of *why* the conduct is so gentlemanly while
> > using CW. It is by nature terse, and all inference must be made from the
> > text. (with that *HI* exception) It is how I can tell a friend in person
> > that they are full if crap, and they will take it as a good mannered
> > jest, and if I typed or tapped it out, they would not be pleased at all.
> >
> > - Mkie KB3EIA -
>
> So whan Larry's "friend" taps out "QFU" and doesn't append a "hi," is Larry
> actually serious.

We'd have to get a baseline of when Larry is actually serious first!

I'd like to actually hear a couple hams fighting using morse. The
longer this subthread goes on, the funnnier it seems.

I think a straight key would be better than a paddle for swearing,
whatchya think?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3954. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 17:19:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522131914.26679.00000037@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 43068

>Lets see, For what I would cost to go to Dayton from Ca. for a weekend, I
>could
>go to Hawaii for a week.
>

Thats an easy one, Hawaii of course. Why would anyone want to waste there money
on a Stupid Hamfest?

3955. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 17:19:17 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CEBD316.91BBD062@psu.edu>
Source record: 43069

The reason that a partially buried tower would "work" is that it acts
like a lever as far as the forces it places on the ground. If the pivot
point (ground level) is at a point where the forces applied cannot move
the earth in which the thing is buried, the tower won't move.

Such a tower will become weak pretty quickly tho', as corrosion weakens
the metal to the point where the applied forces overcome the strength of
the metal. This causes the metal to break at some point, and it shortens
the lever, then the forces can eventually move the earthe in which it is planted.

- mike KB3EIA -
W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Lots of guys just bury their tower base in the soil. I've never heard you
> >comment on that.
>
> I will gladly offer a comment on that: Doing that would be even more stupid
> than using asphalt. Towers should be installed to good engineering practice,
> not to rec.radio.policy lore about what "lots of guys" do.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3956. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 17:20:50 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CEBD373.7C5D3886@psu.edu>
Source record: 43070

Thanks, Cecil!

- mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:

> Rohn specifies such. For instance, for a self-supporting 25G tower
> the "concrete required - 2.4 cu.yds."

3957. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 17:25:41 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CEBD495.A2CBE40C@psu.edu>
Source record: 43071

Now try sticking a hunk of pipe in it. Then move the pipe from side to
side. This is what will eventually happen to your antenna. Asphalt never
ever gets hard as concrete. It is a material of convenience which can
simply be heated and formed into a road while still warm and plastic.
But it's desirable quality for indicated uses is temperature dependent plasticity.

- mike KB3EIA -

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> What's your problem? Even on a warm day, my 12'x30'x3" driveway is stable
> enough to park heavy equipment on without denting it.

3958. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 18:45:31 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <fHRG8.36621$Vm2.1877891@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43072

Bill Sohl, k2UNK, wrote:

> IMHO, to the uninitiated, I'd suggest
> that upon hearing the names of the licenses, the
> typical non-ham would probably think the
> Advanced was higher than Extra.

Yeah, maybe they ought to pile up on each other like:

Technician
General Technician
Advanced General Technician
Extra Advanced General Technician

But then we'd all be Tech's, wouldn't we? And the
dogs of egalitarian socialism would have been loosed.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3959. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 18:45:31 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <fHRG8.36622$Vm2.1878798@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43073

Larry Roll, K3LT, wrote:

> BTW: If I ever see the abbreviation "mHz," or "mhz,"
> I usually assume that the writer means "MegaHertz," or
> one million CPS. The term "milli-Hertz" simply isn't
> used in the electronics field, at least not in
> my experience.

If you're doing an AC circuit analysis with the SPICE
program and tell it to do a frequency sweep from 1.0mhz
to 500mhz, you'll get an ultra-low-frequency razzberry
just like Brian did. Been there, done that, felt like
an idiot-savant. (But that's another thread off this one).

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3960. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 19:27:14 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <miSG8.30281$D41.1179868@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43074

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:fHRG8.36621$Vm2.1877891@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl, k2UNK, wrote:
>
> > IMHO, to the uninitiated, I'd suggest
> > that upon hearing the names of the licenses, the
> > typical non-ham would probably think the
> > Advanced was higher than Extra.
>
> Yeah, maybe they ought to pile up on each other like:
>
> Technician
> General Technician
> Advanced General Technician
> Extra Advanced General Technician
>
> But then we'd all be Tech's, wouldn't we? And the
> dogs of egalitarian socialism would have been loosed.
>
>
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona

The military beat us to it years ago. If Hans had stayed in he might make Senior Executive Master Chief someday or perhaps Master Executive Senior Chief. Can we imagine Senior Chief Executive Master Sergeant Roll?

3961. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 19:34:40 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwisvf5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43075

On Tue, 21 May 2002 22:53:40 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:

>> Yup. Proper engineering, that's all.

>I haven't tried it (not looking to install a tower), but couldn't
>you just download engineering drawings from tower venders?
>It would be a generic design that would be good for all
>kinds of soil, i.e., overdesigned. Then take it down to
>the town hall and get the permits.

One does not get a building permit as a matter of right, as one gets a dog license. Almost all building officials will not issue a permit on "generic" plans and specs. The applicant is lucky if the b/o will accept the manufacturer's calculations without certifcation by a professional engineer licensed in that state (so-called "wet stamp").

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3962. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 19:34:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwitqh7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43076

On 22 May 2002 17:19:14 GMT, WA8ULX wrote:

>>Lets see, For what I would cost to go to Dayton from Ca. for a weekend, I
>>could go to Hawaii for a week.

>Thats an easy one, Hawaii of course. Why would anyone want to waste there
>money on a Stupid Hamfest?

Why would I want to go to Hawaii? Been thrre, done that, didn't
enjoy it at all.

For what a trip to and stay at Dayton would cost, I could get a
high-end VHF/UHF mobile rig.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3963. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 19:34:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwit7g6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43077

On 22 May 2002 05:00:43 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>Also, it's often easier and cheaper to do it right the first time
>rather than have to deal with problems later on.

And it's often easier and cheaper to hire the proper contractor who
does the work right the first time and gets the required permits and
passes inspections on first try with no hassle.

I speak from experience (deck rebuilding).

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3964. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 20:09:24 UTC
From: Ed Dildo <mexico@mexicosenioritasnet.com>
Message-ID: <acgtpt$1ql$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 43078
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

When are you going to find a job Woger?

"AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:acg2jp$b6q$0@pita.alt.net...
> "Mark Wellsley" <MW351@zelcomailreaders.org> wrote in message
> news:acf2n2bmh0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > Spoke with Eduardo Hernandez, Sr. this past weekend. He was quite
> > surprised to learn he is the subject of a hate vendetta by a West
Virginia
> > ham operator. Eventually, we both realized it can't be him that
> > the West Va. operator detests so much. It has to be Eduardo Hernandez
> > the third, who lives in Michigan. Ed Hernandez III, no relation to
> Eduardo
> > Hernandez, Sr., is a traveling minstrel who has been know to perform in
> > West Virginia, and that apparently is the connection to the West Va.
> > amateur who posts all the filthy obscene language in this news group.
Ed
> > Hernandez III also administers ham radio exams on an itinerant basis and
> > has been known to do same in West Va. If that wasn't confusing enough,
> > it was later learned that an Eduardo Hernandez, Jr. is computer
consultant
> > living in Florida and is in fact possibly related to Ed Hernandez, Sr.
who
> > lives in Texas. Both the Hernandez's are anxious to get this problem
> > cleared up and to get the West Va. ham op to stop making up stories
> > about the Hernandez's.
> >
> > Mark W.
>
> Try again, Ed-dildo.
>
>
>

3965. Re: Dayton reports??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 20:32:00 UTC
From: Milt S <msamiesnen@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <4fTG8.1262$4J1.543@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43079
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"J. Duffy Beischel" <jduffy(nospam)@zoomtown.com>
wrote in message news:ueje6dedf5pgab@corp.supernews.com...

> I love Dayton, and living in Cincinnati makes it real easy. I was
> disappointed. One, I'm getting real tired of the rain and cold. Weather
> was better when they held it a few weeks earlier at the very end of April.

The moved it to May to try and avoid the "april chill" effect
but sometimes mother nature has a way of tossing a curve
ball into the jet stream :) That same weekend
there were record low temp's all across the Midwest
and Northeast. A fluke in the Wx that couldn't be
helped. (unless of course whomever else is reading
happens to be a "true believer" in the chem-trails
and weather modifications BullShip they promote
on reactionary shortwave radio, in that case I'll
leave the reasons up to their imaginations :) :) :)

> Ticket prices are too high. No program anymore
> and increase in parking. No wonder attendance was down.
> Why charge for the program when the ads they
> sell are paying for the darn thing to be printed? Next year I wonder what
> manufacturer is going to pay to run an ad that
> most people won't see because
> they are going to fork out money to buy it!

Agreed. One of the Cardinal Rules of marketing is
never to let your potential customers know that they
are paying you a percentage of the advertising
budget! This is a faster turn off than paying retail.
People "like to" or "need to" think that they are paying
ONLY for the product they want to purchase. This makes
them think their getting a bargain deal, except for
big ticket items like Cars and Homes where it's a given..

Unfortunatly The Hamvention people seem to have not
lost their appetite for profits at any expense and
knowing how traditionally cheap ham radio op's are
this is not a good publicity move. (the only exception
being the cost of soda/pretzels/burgers which can be
priced as expensive as those at the dog racing track
and they'll still buy the greasy/carbohydrate packed
stuff)

Look at similar examples like Radio Shack charging
for their formerly free catalog (unless you buy something)
and the numerous sites on the Internet that used to carry
live streaming audio feeds for free, which have now dissappeared
or you are charged a listeners fee for. Radio Shack has
since resigned to giving catalogues away for
free again, if you wait around till March, and dot.coms
who charge pay-per-view/pay-per-listen are just about
all gone to byte-heaven, except of course for the
porno and bizzare sex video on demand websites ;)
[and most of this "pay-per-view" stuff you can now download from
www.kazaa.com for free! Kazaa is the new Napster folks - check it out!)

The general public is tight enough when it comes
to trying to get a dollar out from their wallet
for some things, but just try the same with white male
middle-aged ham radio op's?! You'd have better luck
trying to wrench a canned-ham bone from the
jaws of a junkyard dog. :) :) :)

> I noticed that the Cincinnati Hamfest has reduced
> their ticket prices to get
> people to attend this coming year. They really screwed up moving it from
> its old location years ago. Used to be well attended.
> They kept moving it > around town so it lost its identity.
> Nothing like it used to be. I hope
> the Hamvention folks don't screw up what they built.

I've been to the old Cincy-hamfest of years past, darn shame as
it was almost as big as the original Gaithersburg Md hamfest.
Same thing happened to the hamfest up in Hamburg NY when it used
to be held at the County fairgrounds. They moved it, now it's a
mere shell of it's former self last I heard. Many more have just
dissappeared without a trace.

> Even with the bad weather, flea market prices are too high and the fools
> won't really negotiate down to reasonable prices for used gear. In some
> cases it's actually cheaper to buy new.

You can thank E-Bay for that JDB!
Without a doubt the world biggest
24-hour online sucker-hamfest.

Perhaps I'm wrong, but it seems to
me that more than a few of these "professional ham
equipment dealers" I see with E-Bay item sales
and feedback counts in the 100's - and a
few in the 1000's) seem to network
amongst themselves to drive up the base
auction prices on ham gear(??) A bit of
"shill-bidding" here and there...perhaps..??

> A lot of vendors that normally attend were
> missing or hiding real well. No Universal.
> No Jun's (Ham City) and a few others that
> usually attend were no where to be found.
>
> The VX7R's were in water. The mics were actually connected and went right
> into the water so you could use the handhelds if you wanted. Oh, and R&L
> was selling them for $339.

Cute gimick, but Motorola or Cobra has had a pair
of waterproof "sport" FRS radios out for close to
a Year now for $59.95 in a hanging blister-pack
at WalMart last I looked.

> One reason I think attendance is down is the lack of
> innovation in products.
> Much of the stuff is the same old thing with different packaging.
> I have to commend Yaesu for at least trying and every year
> they seem to have something
> new. Icom is talking about some new digital stuff, but I'm sure it is a
> ways off.
>
> The Ten Tec Orion is nice, but the price is out of sight. Their new long
> awaited QRP rig started at $595, then went to $695 and now they are taking
> orders for an August delivery at $795! Too much money, not enough rig.

I agree with you 100% on the re-packaging of gear.
I'm one to peek "under the hood" of new radio gear
myself. What's "behind" that graphics-filled LCD?

Yaesu does seem to be the leader in innovation and
I would put Alinco in as a close second. Kenwood and
Icom...?...booring! Just expensive bells and whistle
gadgets in cheap sheet steel boxes. Looking at the electronics
inside of your average Icom and kenwood reminds me of
the insides of a Korean VCR that you can get for $65.00
at Circuit City. (and they REALLY pay 2-3 grand for
some of this stuff...??!! rotflmao!)
Yaesu and Alinco are mostly newer design
SMT with clean layouts and by far a better
value - Alinco I feel has the best dollar per
radio value going.

Sad news on Ten-Tec. The Orion shoud be called the Onion.
Looks like it came off the prototype workbench in the
Engineering lab - with all the bugs still inside. (?)
Iam afraid Ten-Tec will be gone by this time next year.
They used to build great rigs in the late 70's and 80's.
Easy to work on with readily available replacement parts you
could get from Digi-key and Mouser electronics if
needs be. Now their overpricing themselves out of the
market. What Ten-Tec *needs* to do is return to their roots
and build rigs like the Triton and Omni-D series again.

Functional and utilitiarian radio gear that is easy
to operate, maintain, and has minimal gimicky bells
and whistles. Stop trying to mimic the Japs, dump all
this digital pushbutton crap, except for the freq
display, and put more single-function standard type
controls. The Omni-D (..of which I own 2 of) are a
great example. The Paragon was perhaps the best radio
to ever come out of Tenn.

> SGC used to have a good rig with the 2020, but I noticed they screwed that
> up and changed the fixed SO239 on the back of the rig to a pigtail.
> Another component to fail. Also they took away the power plug and now
have a
> pigtail for the power lead. Yikes, on an HF rig?

Agree again, not a good idea to put a mid-power level
RF connector or high current power receptacle on a
pigtail. Anchor female receptacles to the chassis
with bolts and do it the right way. (I hope they
never get the idea to put a spring-loaded cable
retractor/pull reel like what's the power cord of
the XLY's Electrolux vaccum cleaner...oy! I heard one
engineer from Cubic or Azden talking about that
for a DC cigarette adapter power cord many
years ago at Dayton and nearly got sick...)

> APRS is really growing in popularity and there was a really nice APRS
> exhibit. People think it is only for tracking but there are a number of
> capabilities that make it very useful, fun and interesting.

This and Satellites are the two pearls this hobby needs to cultivate.

> Special note to the vendors. Try to look excited about your products when
> folks stop by to check out your products. I have a fortune in Kantronics
> gear so I stopped bu to chat. Early on Friday so they could not have been
> that tired yet...well I asked about intelligent tracking (APRS) for the
> KPC3+. Got a ho-hum answer that they're not going to do anything.
>
> Hats off to the Yaesu gentleman (Japanese) that greated me when I went to
> get my free hat. I was carrying the FT-1500 box in my hand as I went
> through the line. He looked at the box and said "thank you very much"
> with a smile on his face. Now there is a man that made me feel good about
> buying his product.

Kudos! (and the FT-1500 is a very nice radio
built like the proverbial bricks--thouse - grin)

> One last gripe...get rid of the non-ham, non-computer
> vendors...are you guys
> that desperate for money? Just how many sunglass vendors do you need at a
> radio/electronics/computer show? And enough of the trinket vendors.
>

> I just wish the Dayton folks and the vendors will sit down and talk about
> improving this event before is declines to the point where they can't get
> their audience back.
>
> Of course many of the ills can be cured with more hams.

I could not agree with you more strongly on the "trinket vendors"!
If I am going to PAY an admission fee to a flea market (which is
what Hamvention really is folks!) then I had better see stuff for
sale that I DO NOT SEE at the local every-weekend flea market
just down the road, where the admission and parking is free!!

Case in point, for years this one guy would show
up at all the Eastern hamfests selling new cheap
import luggage and gym bags. No ham stuff period.
Next year he was joined with some other guy selling clothing
and other crap in another section of the flea market.
Again no ham related items whatsoever for sale between them.
I've never been back to the hamfests that let these
turkeys into their flea market and I never will.

I could not make Dayton, and I really hope that
it is not turning into another consumer
products junk market dumping ground! It's bad
enough with all the computer related crap.
All that needs to happen is for somebody in an
overloaded mini-van to show up and be allowed to
start selling cheap imported wristwatches
on rubber banded styrofoam display cases, and you can
then kiss the Hamvention goodbye. (please someone
tell me these wristwatch-dealers did not show up and
were allowed to set up and sell like they did
someplace in NC last year!)

3966. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 21:00:26 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <3BDAC4C236C81BA8.CA2846EA299FCDEF.4C39ED3B19548335@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43080

On Wed, 22 May 2002 16:29:55 GMT, "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net>
wrote:

>> Well, then maybe you can work out a deal with someone who has a
>> considerable knowledge of psychiatry.
>
>Actually I know a little Psych too..... so perhaps we can start by discussing when your
>ignorance first manifested into the mindless babble that you now bless us with?

You know, it's really amusing when any member of the tinfoil hat
brigade accuses anyone else of babbling.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

3967. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-22 23:10:41 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <ach8s9$s4g$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 43081
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.eduardo-hernandez

"Ed Dildo" <mexico@mexicosenioritasnet.com> wrote in message
news:acgtpt$1ql$0@dosa.alt.net...
> When are you going to find a job Woger?

A second job? I already have one, dumbass. Maybe you should get a second
one, that way, you can get a keybaord that has a comma key Or at least
English lessons, you Mexican refugee.

Eduardo J Hernandez
300 Victoria Dr
Houston, TX 77022
Phone: 713-691-7124

Poor Ed-dildo.....

3968. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 01:28:23 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <XAXG8.1202$rr5.64550064@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43082

Joe Bramblett babbles:
> You know, it's really amusing when any member of the tinfoil hat
> brigade accuses anyone else of babbling.

Honey.... does this cap and gown go with my tin foil? I don't want the other brigade members to laugh at me..... (besides, I prefer aluminum for my faraday cage thank you)

Oh yeah, hey Bramblett... I've been to White Settlement... I know what Texas is like. Do you know what your Sister says during sex?
A: "Get off me Pa!... yer smashin' my smokes!"

3969. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:08:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <IaYG8.1153$3P2.65951773@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43083

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522120028.13744.00000208@mb-ma.aol.com...
> In article <ktzG8.796$ab6.32974096@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Now...watch ol' Richard Chamberpot jump in here with another
> >> putz-gram, followed shortly by Sig Heil and his "you'll be nothing,
> >> nothing but a beginner if you get a license now" and other
> >> assorted Heilianisms of a derogatory nature. They are obsessed
> >> with "getting back" at those who will not worship and adore them.
> >> :-)
> >
> >I've noticed. So how did the exam go? BTW, I didn't see Dave nor Marti
at
> >the Hamvention.
>
> What "exam?" I don't have to study for my blood test until
> next month... :-)

I think one day you'll pop up on here with an Extra license.

3970. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:10:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bcYG8.1157$yU2.66266226@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43085

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:fHRG8.36621$Vm2.1877891@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl, k2UNK, wrote:
>
> > IMHO, to the uninitiated, I'd suggest
> > that upon hearing the names of the licenses, the
> > typical non-ham would probably think the
> > Advanced was higher than Extra.
>
> Yeah, maybe they ought to pile up on each other like:
>
> Technician
> General Technician
> Advanced General Technician
> Extra Advanced General Technician
>
> But then we'd all be Tech's, wouldn't we? And the
> dogs of egalitarian socialism would have been loosed.

I still prefer andom groups of five.

3971. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:10:28 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <121e5da4ff50926ed8bac697a25392eb.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43084

You oughta see what construction companies go through putting up street lighting or traffic signals - the state inspector is right there taking a sample of the concrete before it is even poured! Specs are there for every bolt and nut. Sure, we get wind, but get some ice on the signals and then get 73 mph winds (like we got earlier this year) and you begin to realize why this isn't a joking matter. Frankly, a small beam and a 35 foot tower might not be all that serious; putting up a BIG antenna or array on an 80 foot tower - I'd hire a commercial firm and expect to pay pretty big money - but I'd sleep well at night.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwh90we.pminews@netnews.attbi.com

> Union Electric treats the pole with creosote to ward off bugs.
> The equivalent for steel, galvanizing, wouldn't last very long
> in dirt.. Anyone who would bury 20% of a steel tower is an idiot
> when the cost of a properly designed and poured concrete base is
> far less than the cost of a section of tower.
>
> And what building official would issue a permit for a steel tower
> buried in dirt? All the steel utility towers in the industry
> that I have ever seen in several countries are on concrete footings
> or pads for a reason.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3972. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:11:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%cYG8.1159$XO2.65943733@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43086

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:miSG8.30281$D41.1179868@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
> news:fHRG8.36621$Vm2.1877891@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Bill Sohl, k2UNK, wrote:
> >
> > > IMHO, to the uninitiated, I'd suggest
> > > that upon hearing the names of the licenses, the
> > > typical non-ham would probably think the
> > > Advanced was higher than Extra.
> >
> > Yeah, maybe they ought to pile up on each other like:
> >
> > Technician
> > General Technician
> > Advanced General Technician
> > Extra Advanced General Technician
> >
> > But then we'd all be Tech's, wouldn't we? And the
> > dogs of egalitarian socialism would have been loosed.
> >
> >
> > Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> > Glendale, Arizona
>
> The military beat us to it years ago. If Hans had stayed in he might make
> Senior Executive Master Chief someday or perhaps Master Executive Senior
> Chief. Can we imagine Senior Chief Executive Master Sergeant Roll?

Not in my wildest dreams.

3973. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:12:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <XdYG8.1161$VV2.66332744@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43087

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522120027.13744.00000207@mb-ma.aol.com...
> In article <aDzG8.805$9c6.33038570@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> BTW, if you ever apply for a patent, be sure to ask for a "utility
patent",
> >> NOT a "design patent". A design patent is little more than a document
> >> describing the styling of a radio cabinet, for example. The patent for
> >> say the light bulb or the transistor is a utility patent, and actually
means
> >> something in the industry.
> >
> >Robert, from a search of the USPO, how can I determine if a patent has
> >expired? How can I determine if someone has "added" to a patent?
> >
> >Private e-mail is good.
>
> Try www.delphion.com (the old "IBM" patent site). You can't get the
> whole patent there without money, but you can view some of the
> history and search information.
>
> For example, Brian Kelly and his co-inventor have three patent
> numbers for the same thing but successive date patents are
> "replacements" for previous ones. That means he and co-buddy
> have only ONE patent. It's a "mechanical" thingy about
> bearings. [watch him "argue" that one...:-)]

Military bearings? Timken bearings?

3974. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:13:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%eYG8.1162$mV2.66318403@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43088

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522060845.17553.00000164@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >How 'bout if I just copy code more slowly?
>
> If you wish.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

If its OK to read more slowly...

3975. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:14:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NfYG8.1163$US2.66157704@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43089

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522060747.17553.00000163@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Lots of guys send code so atrociously that a digital computer cannot copy
> >it. Please comment.
>
> Perhaps the decoding software needs a bit of work.

I would say the front end need the work, not the back end.

3976. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:15:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_gYG8.1164$2U2.66233467@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43090

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522082615.17542.00000167@mb-cv.aol.com...
> >From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> >Lots of guys send code so atrociously that a digital computer cannot
copy
> >> >it. Please comment.
>
> >> Perhaps the decoding software needs a bit of work.
>
> > It's Gadfly's wetware that needs the work.
>
> Amateur Radio would benefit either way if he develops his personal skill
to
> decode CW or if he were to develop a decoding algorithm that is more
capable of
> adjusting to the variations from ideal that are characteristic of
manually-sent
> Morse encoding.
>
> The latter would actually have more potential value because it might have
> applicablity to software decoding of other digital modes subject to
changes in
> propagation delay over ionospheric paths.

The best solution is for some Extras to learn to send better.

3977. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:17:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <MiYG8.1166$OX2.66455622@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43091

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522055720.17553.00000162@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >So Union Electric buries "masts" in soil and its good engineering
practice,
> >but WD4XXX buries his tower base in soil and he's an idiot?
>
> Has WD4XXX gone through the same engineering analysis as has the electric
> utility company in burying their utility poles?

But Ed, he's an old, pre-restructuring Extra.

3978. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:19:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <GkYG8.1167$tW2.66368624@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43092

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CEBD099.DD57BDD1@psu.edu...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3CE90D32.229956B@psu.edu...
> > > You have hit on a big part of *why* the conduct is so gentlemanly
while
> > > using CW. It is by nature terse, and all inference must be made from
the
> > > text. (with that *HI* exception) It is how I can tell a friend in
person
> > > that they are full if crap, and they will take it as a good mannered
> > > jest, and if I typed or tapped it out, they would not be pleased at
all.
> > >
> > > - Mkie KB3EIA -
> >
> > So whan Larry's "friend" taps out "QFU" and doesn't append a "hi," is
Larry
> > actually serious.
>
>
> We'd have to get a baseline of when Larry is actually serious first!
>
>
> I'd like to actually hear a couple hams fighting using morse. The
> longer this subthread goes on, the funnnier it seems.
>
> I think a straight key would be better than a paddle for swearing,
> whatchya think?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Hans does pretty good at calling people "Dump Hucks" with a keyboard.

3979. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:23:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <roYG8.1169$sY2.66497683@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43093

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:JGLG8.36053$Vm2.1847183@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020522055504.17553.00000160@mb-cv.aol.com...
> > From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >
> > > and they will always occupy a low place on the pecking order among
> their
> > > superiors. Sad, but true.
> >
> > Your prounoncement of same, irrespective of their actual
> accomplishments, is a
> > way for you to feel superior in circumstances where you are not. I
> imagine
> > that it comforts you to see life that way.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
>
> Ed, I agree with you totally and over the years have lived thru the
> break-up of the old sequential call-sign structure where we marched in
> lock-step into the sunset. It was an enema the hobby really needed.
>
> Yet I still have the feeling the class system lives not so much among the
> uberfuerers as among the newbies. It is their really silly attacks on
> Larry that have fueled this sort of thing for years and handed him the
> keys to a career of endless amusement. There are few things as pathetic
> as an incompetant iconoclast.
>
> I got to take the inevitable 'stately home tour' with a collection of
> British Baptists who are not all that high on the economic totem pole.
> The whole thing was a ritual: the owner-lady came down in the proper
> uniform, Papagallos and all, to pronounce on the unworthy bodies of the
> babushki who properly and eagerly served their part in the opera.
> Sometimes this code thing resembles an opera, of recent times complete
> with fat lady, where everyone has their parts memorized and sings them on
> cue.
>
> It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you.
> Ever get the feeling it is more the flunkies playing the game than
> vice-versa??

>
> Dick N&#65533;BK

What would Ed McMahon say to all of this?

3980. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:24:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YpYG8.1170$uW2.66369723@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43094

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CEB8DFC.70A1EDE8@att.net...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you.
> > Ever get the feeling it is more the flunkies playing the game than
> > vice-versa??
>
> Then, when you analyze the background of said flunkies and draw
conclusions
> as to the origins of their behavior, the problem clarifies to a solution.
> Their behavior is not of recent origin, in the case of the "old newbies",
and
> the real new ones just follow their lead.
>
> In the Brave New World where anything older than yesterday is 'legacy'
and
> thus unworthy of anything but discard, yesterday's accomplishment,
whatever
> it was or whatever it meant yesterday, is flushed with prejudice. The
future
> will surely take care of itself.
>
Into the crappo filter you go.

3981. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:26:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <JrYG8.1171$bX2.66415989@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43095

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522115403.03111.00000013@mb-da.aol.com...
> >ubject: Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?
> >From: kf6vyh@aol.com (Kf6vyh)
> >Date: 05/22/02 10:23 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020522102322.19958.00000001@mb-mf.aol.com>
> >
> >Lets see, For what I would cost to go to Dayton from Ca. for a weekend, I
> >could
> >go to Hawaii for a week.
>
> Your point?
>
> They are both about the same distance depending where in CA you are.
>
> All depends on whether you want beaches or Ham radio. You ahve to
have
> your priorities set, ya know!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I dunno. I've had ham radio AND beaches in both Guam and Florida.

3982. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:27:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xsYG8.1174$bX2.66415989@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43096

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522131914.26679.00000037@mb-mv.aol.com...
> >Lets see, For what I would cost to go to Dayton from Ca. for a weekend, I
> >could
> >go to Hawaii for a week.
> >
>
> Thats an easy one, Hawaii of course. Why would anyone want to waste there
money
> on a Stupid Hamfest?

A hamfest in Hawaii?

And, Holy Guacamole! Bruce spelled Hawaii right.

3983. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:31:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <PvYG8.1175$I13.66772185@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43097

"HoopyKloopie" <postodplugs@aol.com> wrote in message
news:%ZMG8.573$4J1.417@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

> Better face it folks - Wayne Green was
> right a LONG time ago writing in his Editorials
> in 73 Magazine - this hobby is not dying,
> it's already DOA. sheesh.

Quoting Wayne Green? Yeh, let me hook up my perpetual motion machine to my
bio-electrifier and my time travel machine, and all that jazz.

3984. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:32:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ZwYG8.1176$V03.66765022@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43098

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:fHRG8.36622$Vm2.1878798@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Larry Roll, K3LT, wrote:
>
> > BTW: If I ever see the abbreviation "mHz," or "mhz,"
> > I usually assume that the writer means "MegaHertz," or
> > one million CPS. The term "milli-Hertz" simply isn't
> > used in the electronics field, at least not in
> > my experience.
>
> If you're doing an AC circuit analysis with the SPICE
> program and tell it to do a frequency sweep from 1.0mhz
> to 500mhz, you'll get an ultra-low-frequency razzberry
> just like Brian did. Been there, done that, felt like
> an idiot-savant. (But that's another thread off this one).

What did SPICE say about Larry wanting to get rid of VHF+ frequencies?

3985. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:43:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <achl5m$g5g$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43099

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwisvf5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Tue, 21 May 2002 22:53:40 -0400, Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >> Yup. Proper engineering, that's all.
>
> >I haven't tried it (not looking to install a tower), but couldn't
> >you just download engineering drawings from tower venders?
> >It would be a generic design that would be good for all
> >kinds of soil, i.e., overdesigned. Then take it down to
> >the town hall and get the permits.
>
> One does not get a building permit as a matter of right, as one gets
> a dog license. Almost all building officials will not issue a
> permit on "generic" plans and specs. The applicant is lucky if the
> b/o will accept the manufacturer's calculations without certifcation
> by a professional engineer licensed in that state (so-called "wet
> stamp").

Yep, that's the ole "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours"
The variation on how building depts deal with the public
is incredible.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3986. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:47:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522224732.08739.00000282@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 43100

>And, Holy Guacamole! Bruce spelled Hawaii right.

Bit me a$$ wipe

3987. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:52:08 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CEC3CDB.EEF43F4B@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43251
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

2test wogie banged on his keyboard and attempted to write:

> Maybe you should get a second one, that way, you can get a keybaord that has a comma key
Or at least English lessons, you Mexican refugee.
^^^^^^^
You as well, wogie, there should be a comma after the word "key"
and the word "or" should not be capitalized. You really should not
post when you are in your drunken stupor.

3988. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:55:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522225516.22632.00000170@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 43252

>Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/22/02 12:00 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020522120028.13744.00000208@mb-ma.aol.com>

>What "exam?" I don't have to study for my blood test until
>next month.

As if Lennie could PASS an exam......

3989. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 02:59:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522225955.22632.00000171@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 43253

>Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/22/02 12:00 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020522120026.13744.00000206@mb-ma.aol.com>

>49 years ago in February ....

Oh geeze......berates someone about "tenure" and then goes on to his CV
again....

>Transmitting RF requires regulation.

In the strctest sense, ONLY if you want a pure DC tone.

>So far under this subject header, the "discussions" are based on
>little but individuals trying to promote their own experiences as a
>"basis" for continuing test regulations.

And of course we have Lennie railing about why he shouldn't have to take
the same tests as the unwashed masses because of HIS experiences.

Absent from his experiences is a visit to a VE session as an examinee.

>That's just self-serving
>nonsense insofar as the uncountable thousands who MIGHT be
>interested in amateur radio and MIGHT be interested enough to
>get a license.

As opposed to those who just rant about those who DO have a license, Your
Putziness?

3990. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:01:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020522230105.19816.00000138@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 43258

In article <2DDG8.953$EZ7.40044907@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> If it was CW/Morse that intrigued your XYL, why didn't she simply
>> ignore the "silly stuff" on phone and pursue ham radio on her own
>> terms?
>
>People like you scare her.
>
>> Do others have as much total, overruling control over her
>> life as they seem to over yours?
>
>People like you scare her.
>
>> Or, is she, like yourself, an
>> obsequious minion who allows the actions of others to deflect her
>> from the path she would prefer to take?
>
>People like you scare her.

Brian:

Right. People like me. That is, people who say things with which
YOU disagree. Must give you some sick sense of power to have
such total mind control over your wife.

>> Or did you discourage
>> her from learning the Morse code and becoming a ham, because
>> she would then go on to be an active CW user, and thus be a better
>> ham than yourself?
>
>I don't scare her.

Right.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3991. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:01:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020522230106.19816.00000139@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 43254

In article <3CEB1C4A.85CDAF7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> They can insist until the end that they are equal to the Pre-Restructuring
>> hams, but it will never be the case, and they will always occupy a low
>> place on the pecking order among their superiors. Sad, but true.
>
>Only if they buy into your BS which most of them don't.

Cecil:

Axeually, this "pecking order" BS is the NCTA's construct, not
mine. Personally, the last thing I ever want to know about any given
ham is his/her license class. I'm more interested in his/her on-the-
air behavior, technical competence (at the "amateur" level), and
willingness to explore the world of ham radio beyond the local
repeaters and their PTT switch.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3992. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:01:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020522230106.19816.00000140@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 43255

In article <20020522055504.17553.00000160@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>> and they will always occupy a low place on the pecking order among their
>> superiors. Sad, but true.
>
>Your prounoncement of same, irrespective of their actual accomplishments, is
>a
>way for you to feel superior in circumstances where you are not. I imagine
>that it comforts you to see life that way.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Not nearly as much as your predictable reactions amuse me, Ed!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3993. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:01:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020522230107.19816.00000141@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 43256

In article <3CEBD099.DD57BDD1@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>
> I think a straight key would be better than a paddle for swearing,
>whatchya think?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

Neither, axeually. Every CW operator knows that to really throw out
a pile of crap on CW, you need a "bug" keyer!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3994. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:01:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020522230107.19816.00000142@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 43257

In article <5PDG8.966$l9.40486061@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>The term
>> "milli-Hertz" simply isn't used in the electronics field, at least not in
>> my experience.
>
>What would you know of the electronics field? You're merely an amateur.

Brian:

Eeeaayuup! That's what I said!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3995. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:01:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020522230141.17511.00000413@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43259

Robert Casey wote:

>Now that I'm done bragging :-), the "extra" license is roughly
>equal to say a 6 credit college course. Yes, it's an achievement, but
>not the ultimate achievement.

An extra licence worth 6 credits? I doubt it. In the context of your post, it seems humorous, which is fine. If you actually knew the material, it may be considered 2 (but probably 1, as a course suppliment) credits for all three licence classes. You should know better than that, with all your patents, what college course loads are.

Almost anyone could pass all 3 tests within 2 weeks. This is not worth 6 credits or even worth 1 credit. One or two days to memorize the questions and answers, then take the test, is all that is required.

3996. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:15:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <79ZG8.1194$hk3.67889508@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43260

Bruce doesn't know how to graciously accept a compliment.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522224732.08739.00000282@mb-mu.aol.com...
> >And, Holy Guacamole! Bruce spelled Hawaii right.
>
> Bit me a$$ wipe

3997. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:17:20 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4bZG8.1195$4l3.67941547@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43261

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020522230106.19816.00000139@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <3CEB1C4A.85CDAF7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >> They can insist until the end that they are equal to the
Pre-Restructuring
> >> hams, but it will never be the case, and they will always occupy a low
> >> place on the pecking order among their superiors. Sad, but true.
> >
> >Only if they buy into your BS which most of them don't.
>
> Cecil:
>
> Axeually, this "pecking order" BS is the NCTA's construct, not
> mine. Personally, the last thing I ever want to know about any given
> ham is his/her license class.

Really? But once you find out, the epithets start.

3998. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:19:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1dZG8.1198$ce3.67561616@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43262

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020522230107.19816.00000141@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <3CEBD099.DD57BDD1@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >
> > I think a straight key would be better than a paddle for swearing,
> >whatchya think?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Mike:
>
> Neither, axeually. Every CW operator knows that to really throw out
> a pile of crap on CW, you need a "bug" keyer!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

This is the part where Hans comes in and calls you a "Dump Huck" for not knowing that a bug requires no keyer. Then Ed tells you it's not a modem, either.

3999. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:20:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <peZG8.1199$rm3.68009216@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43263

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:achl5m$g5g$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...

> Yep, that's the ole "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours"
> The variation on how building depts deal with the public
> is incredible.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Kick backs are common in the "professions."

4000. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:24:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEC60F0.BDBF8925@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43265

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "HoopyKloopie" <postodplugs@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:%ZMG8.573$4J1.417@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> > Better face it folks - Wayne Green was
> > right a LONG time ago writing in his Editorials
> > in 73 Magazine - this hobby is not dying,
> > it's already DOA. sheesh.
>
> Quoting Wayne Green? Yeh, let me hook up my perpetual motion machine to my
> bio-electrifier and my time travel machine, and all that jazz.

Forget perpetual motion - cold fusion will do the job.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4001. No difference at Dayton!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:25:50 UTC
From: stevebg <sbgood@njnet.com>
Message-ID: <3CEC60F5.9E6950CF@njnet.com>
Source record: 43264

That's right! Whether at the Dayton CB fest or anywhere else,
NO CODE = NO HAM and KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
CW or CB. No other choice.

4002. The CBer IDENTIFICATION exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:27:39 UTC
From: stevebg <sbgood@njnet.com>
Message-ID: <3CEC6162.E299AD5D@njnet.com>
Source record: 43266

NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.

Did you moan or scoff? YOU'RE A CBer.

4003. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:27:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEC61B1.444E32FA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43268

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Personally, the last thing I ever want to know about any given
> ham is his/her license class. I'm more interested in his/her on-the-
> air behavior, technical competence (at the "amateur" level), and
> willingness to explore the world of ham radio beyond the local
> repeaters and their PTT switch.

So are you finally off your "St. Valentines Day Massacre" kick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4004. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:27:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2lZG8.1203$pn3.68072676@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43267

Well, my buddy KL0BM used to tell me, "Brian, life is like a $hit sammich, the more bread you got, the less $hit you have to eat." I guess if you've got the money for a big tower and an 80M beam, you've got the money to hire a contractor and to grease the building inspector's palm.

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:121e5da4ff50926ed8bac697a25392eb.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> You oughta see what construction companies go through putting up street
> lighting or traffic signals - the state inspector is right there taking
> a sample of the concrete before it is even poured! Specs are there for
> every bolt and nut. Sure, we get wind, but get some ice on the signals
> and then get 73 mph winds (like we got earlier this year) and you begin
> to realize why this isn't a joking matter. Frankly, a small beam and a
> 35 foot tower might not be all that serious; putting up a BIG antenna
> or array on an 80 foot tower - I'd hire a commercial firm and expect to
> pay pretty big money - but I'd sleep well at night.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwh90we.pminews@netnews.attbi.com
>
> > Union Electric treats the pole with creosote to ward off bugs.
> > The equivalent for steel, galvanizing, wouldn't last very long
> > in dirt.. Anyone who would bury 20% of a steel tower is an idiot
> > when the cost of a properly designed and poured concrete base is
> > far less than the cost of a section of tower.
> >
> > And what building official would issue a permit for a steel tower
> > buried in dirt? All the steel utility towers in the industry
> > that I have ever seen in several countries are on concrete footings
> > or pads for a reason.
> >
> > ---
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4005. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:30:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FnZG8.1205$Ap3.68213816@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43269

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020522225516.22632.00000170@mb-mw.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 05/22/02 12:00 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020522120028.13744.00000208@mb-ma.aol.com>
>
> >What "exam?" I don't have to study for my blood test until
> >next month.
>
> As if Lennie could PASS an exam......

He's probably passed gall stones as big as you. Come to think of it, he
called it "Steve" and handed out cigars.

4006. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:35:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dsZG8.1207$3t3.68420801@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43270

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020522230105.19816.00000138@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <2DDG8.953$EZ7.40044907@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> If it was CW/Morse that intrigued your XYL, why didn't she simply
> >> ignore the "silly stuff" on phone and pursue ham radio on her own
> >> terms?
> >
> >People like you scare her.
> >
> >> Do others have as much total, overruling control over her
> >> life as they seem to over yours?
> >
> >People like you scare her.
> >
> >> Or, is she, like yourself, an
> >> obsequious minion who allows the actions of others to deflect her
> >> from the path she would prefer to take?
> >
> >People like you scare her.
>
> Brian:
>
> Right. People like me. That is, people who say things with which
> YOU disagree. Must give you some sick sense of power to have
> such total mind control over your wife.

Larry, people say things all day long that I don't agree with. Hell, even
my wife says and DOES things that I don't agree with. Mind control? Damn,
I wish the neighbors dog would stop talking to me. Let me put on my
aluminum foil hat for a second so I can think clearly. OK, that's better.

So anyway, why do you always sound like a raving lunatic?

4007. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 03:54:59 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <oHZG8.31440$mG.13041609@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 43271

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gw8clrg.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Thu, 16 May 2002 21:17:52 -0400, Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> >Just my .02. I can see both sides of the argument--especially if one
> >happens not to be a ham--but I tend to be extremely independent when
> >it comes to *any* outside entity telling me what I can do with my own
> >property. Once I've paid for it, the idea of some blue-haired,
> >busybody old lady telling me what I can erect, own, or keep in my
> >driveway for as long as I shall live there just don't "git" it.
>
> C'mon, Jerry, there is a whole list of things that "others" tell you
> what to do concerning your use of "your" land. Where you can get water
> from and what quality it must be. Where and how you can dispose of
> your sewage. Where and under what conditions you can get electrical
> power, What businesses you can conduct on "your" land....and on and on.
>
> >So strongly do I feel about it that, in order for someone to be able
> >to do that, they must be able to get around on the backside of my 12
> >ga. shotgun before I can get off a round. Hehe!
>
> And I know a lot of LEOs and DAs who would just love to see you try
> that...it's called "unacceptable behavior" in "my ceowd" and we
> put people in uncomfortable places (with no ham radios) for that.
>
> >Now, having vented my spleen about CC&R contracts, the way I handled
> >it was to buy an older home.
>
> How old is "old" ?

1956
>
> >In so doing, I got, not only the ability to put up all the antennas I
> >want, but also a much better built house in a very low crime, older
> >neighborhood. I got real plaster walls instead of drywall.
>
> Is that 'sposed to be an "advantage"? Not to me...I've "done"
> drywall work in major modificatons/additions to homes that I've
> owned, and although I'm certainly not the craftsman in the field,
> it's much easier for me to work with than the lath and plaster walls
> that I grew up with and first learned to do electrical "old work" on

Yep, it is to me
>
> > again, nobody can tell me that I cannot have a 100' tower (as long

> >as I follow reasonable and prudent safety rules and city ordinances).
>
> And you would deny the same enjoyment to other hams who want to
> live in a good home of their own choosing. That's pretty selfish.

I merely pointed out that I CHOSE NOT to buy a home in a CC & R neighbor-
hood. I got a house that was MUCH better constructed than the flimsy houses
of today.
>
> >At this point, there are no rules against antennas and towers in my
> >town.
>
> They're coming.my man, they're coming. The cellphone tower folks
> have been fighting that battle for years. The average city
> planner does not know, nor care about, the difference if we are not
> vigilant. Step one is to take the power to restrict same out of
> their hands. We call it "exclusice preemption" and sadly, PRB-1
> doesn;t go that far. We have to bluff the local authorities and
> HOAs into thinking that it does. (That's MY soapbox.)
>
>
>
> To each hus own. I prefer the chrome-and-glass modern look with
> laminate floors . We use the two working (but unused) fireplaces
> to display my wife's sculpture and floral arrangements. No ashes to
> clean up, no wood smoke fumes to cause emphysema, and the power
> company did an energy balance and proved to us that it's a negative
> heating factor, i.e. we lose more heat in taking in cold outside air
> than burning the wood provides.

It's called a Craft Wood Insert. It is a STOVE, not an open fireplace.
Upstairs
uses an airtight screen glass front with a built-in blower. I can guarantee
you we lose
very little heat from the use of these fireplaces. If you run either of them
at full tilt (fan)
it will get too hot-even if the temp outside is 15 degrees. Yes, a naked
fireplace is
extremely inefficient, and takes out more heat than it produces. Mine are
set up to
MAKE heat, not take it away.

Jerry
K4KWH
>
> Yo each his own.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest

> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

4008. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 04:07:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523000743.21693.00000150@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43272

In article <20020520183437.27747.00000654@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than cement,
>it
>>>might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
>>>asphalt are not.
>
>>Of course it would probably never actually be erected in the first place.
>>Township would never grant the building permit, for one thing.
>
>My township would want the same permit for a concrete driveway as an asphalt
>one.

Same here.
>
>I think he made it all up. :-)

He's just trying to top Cecil in the number-of-posts game.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

4009. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 04:07:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523000744.21693.00000151@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43274

In article <UyeG8.136$Zy7.7981157@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020520080641.05958.00000055@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> In article <boVF8.8261$Vy3.245696807@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
>> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020518220708.13422.00000105@mb-mb.aol.com...
>> >
>> >> Here in PA, I had to specifically ask to see the deed restrictions
>before
>> >> making an offer. My RE attorney had to dig them up from the files at
>the
>> >> county seat. Even though this house is more than 50 years old, it has a
>> >> page and a half of fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing against
>antennas,
>> >> though, but a tower might be difficult, as it may be considered a
>> >> "structure" due to its permanent nature. In fact, I do not know of any
>> >> amateur radio towers in Radnor Township. Kinda odd, considering that
>> >> Radnor was the home of Charlie Stewart.
>> >
>> >If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than cement,
>it
>> >might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
>> >asphalt are not.
>>
>> HAW!!! Oh that's a GOOD one!! Almost up to the level of ol' Masa's
>> promise of April 2, 1998.
>>
>> A freestanding tower set in a cubic yard of asphalt won't be permanent,
>> that's for sure. Not after the first warm day.
>
>What's your problem?

I don't have a problem, Brian. I just know enough about the mechanics of
towers,
wood poles and foundations to know that asphalt is not a good material for
foundations. Ever see a house with a poured-asphalt foundation?

>Even on a warm day, my 12'x30'x3" driveway is stable
>enough to park heavy equipment on without denting it.

So? A driveway is not the same thing as a tower foundation. How "heavy" is that "heavy equipment"? Does it have rubber tires? How many pounds per square inch does it exert when sitting on the driveway?
>
>> Of course it would probably never actually be erected in the first place.
>> Township would never grant the building permit, for one thing. Asphalt
>> truck wouldn't pour the stuff in the hole, either because they fear
>> liability or because they were laughing too hard.
>>
>> btw, one sets tower bases in concrete, not cement.
>
>40lb bags, right?

Ready mix right off the truck.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4010. Re: An interesting thougt about Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 04:07:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523000746.21693.00000152@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43273

In article <acaohe0a83@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>> >I am still trying to assemble a group of hams together for
>> >this purpose, but there is this lethargy recently, that needs to change.
>> >In
>> >other words, with a lot of these people, you couldn't light a fire under
>> >their ass with a 1000 gallons of gasoline.
>>
(N2EY wrote):

>> Sure.
>> You have to remember that many hams are already overcommitted to work,
>> family, school, church, etc.

>No.... missing the point, even at the meetings when you ask for volunteers,
>or opinions or just general reaction from some of these people and it is
>like a blank stare similar to a deer caught in the headlights. Maybe Dow
>chemical has something to do with it since they are in our town......

Ahh - now I understand. All I can say is that different people have different
levels of involvement/commitment.

>> >There is a little over 500
>> >schools in the tri-county area in which I am in, and I have this lofty
>> >goal,
>> >that we could encourage at least ONE new ham from each of these schools.
>> >Now that may be much to expect one student out of 300-500 students to get
>> >licensed per year, but I believe it is a beneficial goal. That would
>make
>> >500 (or more) new hams within the Mid-Michigan area alone per year.
>Kinda a
>> >crazy thought eh?
>>
>> Not crazy at all.
>>
>> >I just need a little help in the equipment category for
>> >the presentations.... I am very comfortable in the public speaking side
>of
>> >the presentation, and in fact, I am doing a presentation to about 300 or
>so
>> >law enforcement/ems/fire personell in June with the hopes of getting some
>of
>> >these people, albeit not necessarily of the youth set, but definitely of
>the
>> >mentality and training that would make them a positive asset to our

>hobby.
>> >(They are accustomed to recieving training and of course following
>rules.)
>>
>> I think the most basic question is, "why aren't these folks hams already?"
>> If the reason is simply that they don't know ham radio exists, then
>> pubicity is the answer. But there may be other reasons that are
>> harder to address.

>I have found that the biggest problem is awareness at all, most people that
>I have tried to "sell" or promote the hobby to weren't even aware of the
>capabilities of ham radio.

Bingo. Then the cure is exactly what you describe - raise the awareness.

>Then there are a few that think it is CB, and
>some that think we are the next cast members of the next Revenge of the
>Nerds movie. (pocket protectors and all) This is pretty much the ordering
>of awareness as I have encountered it recently. I definitely will keep on
>trying to change the perceptions to positive ones though.

GREAT!

(speaking about age info):

>> To really be meaningful, the info would have to be indexed against the
>> population's
>> ages. On average, Americans today are living longer and having fewer
>children.
>> That has definite effects on lots of things.
>> >
>> >> >I can honestly guess that the
>> >> >overwhelming majority of hams are in the 50-70 year old age bracket,
>and
>> >> >over the next 20 years or so, we will lose alot of those hams to
>natural
>> >> >(and unnatural also) causes of death.
>> >>
>> >> I'm 48, and been a ham 35 years in October.
>> >
>> >Well... a "teenager" in the hobby eh? :)
>
>Was referring to the relative age in the hobby, where 60 seems to be the
>equivalent of 30 some years old. :)

HAW!

Actually, there are a bunch of demographic things going on. I know many hams
who fall into the following categories:

- Young people who are on the quiet side, who are active hams but "invisible"
at
club meetings, hamfests and other in-person settings.

- Senior citizens who are actually newbies. They took up ham radio as a retirement activity and are having a blast. The vanity call rules hide the fact that they are relatively new to ham radio.

- Hams in their 20s thu 50s who are busy with careers, families, etc. They simply
do not get blocks of predictable free time that permit them to do things like attend
club meetings, etc. Some of them are almost inactive, with little or no equipment.

End result is that there are lots of "hidden" hams out there. Who knows how many
of the 680,000 or so fit into those categories?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4011. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 04:12:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CEC6C2C.31222827@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43275

Vshah101 wrote:

>
> Almost anyone could pass all 3 tests within 2 weeks. This is not worth 6
> credits or even worth 1 credit. One or two days to memorize the questions and
> answers, then take the test, is all that is required.

Silly me. I was thinking of actually learning the material, not just memorizing question pools. :-)

4012. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 05:00:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523010059.06451.00000019@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43276

In article <8TOG8.29955$D41.1163401@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3CEB9022.6B7C360D@IEEE.org...
>> Richard McCollum wrote:
>> > It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you.
>>
>> Could it be that the 'elite' part is just a wet dream? Respect cannot
>> be earned by simply passing a minimum requirements exam.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>In a sane and rational universe you are correct. But this is the Amateur
>Radio universe where people live.

Correction: This is the Amateur Radio universe where CONCEPTS
and STATES of MIND live, interconnected with lore, mythology,
held together by the glue of delusion that they are really
Something above the ordinary.

>People in hobbies behave oddly.

Then you are no better a "representative" of US amateur radio
than K4YZ.

4013. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 05:01:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523010100.06451.00000020@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43277

In article <JGLG8.36053$Vm2.1847183@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020522055504.17553.00000160@mb-cv.aol.com...
>> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>>
>> > and they will always occupy a low place on the pecking order among
>their
>> > superiors. Sad, but true.
>>
>> Your prounoncement of same, irrespective of their actual
>accomplishments, is a
>> way for you to feel superior in circumstances where you are not. I
>imagine
>> that it comforts you to see life that way.
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>
>Ed, I agree with you totally and over the years have lived thru the
>break-up of the old sequential call-sign structure where we marched in
>lock-step into the sunset. It was an enema the hobby really needed.
>
>Yet I still have the feeling the class system lives not so much among the
>uberfuerers as among the newbies. It is their really silly attacks on
>Larry that have fueled this sort of thing for years and handed him the
>keys to a career of endless amusement. There are few things as pathetic
>as an incompetant iconoclast.

Among those few are the technical incompetents who delude
themselves into believing they are Gods of Radio. Roll is one
of those. Judging from the smug superiority sneering above,
McCollum is another.

>It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you.
>Ever get the feeling it is more the flunkies playing the game than
>vice-versa??

You seem to be a Legend in your own mind.

4014. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 05:01:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523010101.06451.00000021@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43278

In article <20020522082615.17542.00000167@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
>>> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>> >Lots of guys send code so atrociously that a digital computer cannot copy
>>> >it. Please comment.
>
>>> Perhaps the decoding software needs a bit of work.
>
>> It's Gadfly's wetware that needs the work.
>
>Amateur Radio would benefit either way if he develops his personal skill to
>decode CW or if he were to develop a decoding algorithm that is more capable
>of adjusting to the variations from ideal that are characteristic of
>manually-sent Morse encoding.
>
>The latter would actually have more potential value because it might have
>applicablity to software decoding of other digital modes subject to changes
>in propagation delay over ionospheric paths.

Unlikely considering such work was already begun in the rest of
the radio world over four decades ago.

Computer-decoding of variable-spacing morse codes, enough to
enable automatic speed adjustment over wide rate range has
already been done on various platforms. Such remains little more
than a toy diversion, a programming exercise, of no practical
value in the rest of the radio world.

In that four-decade period up to time-now, communications has
shifted AWAY from the radio frequencies which require ionospheric
"bounce" conditions.

The myth continues that ionospheric path changes cause phase
shifts which make phase-shift modulations poor. Present-day
phase-shift modulations are being done as they were over a decade
ago. Such have been extensively tested in digital HF broadcasting.
Quadrature amplitude-phase shift modulations are a part of the
ALE protocol on HF.

4015. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 05:01:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523010101.06451.00000022@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43279

In article <1LDG8.961$16.40277230@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >> IIRC utility poles require a minimum of 20% of their length buried
>> >> in most soils. It just depends on keeping the center of rotation
>> >> below ground level.
>> >
>> >So Union Electric buries "masts" in soil and its good engineering
>practice,
>> >but WD4XXX buries his tower base in soil and he's an idiot?
>>
>> Union Electric treats the pole with creosote to ward off bugs.
>> The equivalent for steel, galvanizing, wouldn't last very long
>> in dirt.. Anyone who would bury 20% of a steel tower is an idiot
>> when the cost of a properly designed and poured concrete base is
>> far less than the cost of a section of tower.
>
>Phil, just state that you couldn't possibly be wrong and we'll believe you.
>No need to call your Extra brethren in radio an idiot.

This is an endearing quality of the Amateur Extra Super Special
licensee wherein they assume their AMATEUR license is also
the right to insult, belittle, and generally act boorishly to all
"lesser" individuals.

See communications by well-known 1x2s in here...namely K3LT,
K4YZ, W0EX as the most prolific.

4016. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 05:01:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523010102.06451.00000023@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43281

In article <20020521214026.23618.00000440@mb-dh.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>There's only one slight problem with your theory: I wasn't the one
>who made the quote including the inaccurate abbreviation "mHz."
>The person who did so knows who he is, and is just sitting back and
>letting me take the heat for it.
>
>BTW: If I ever see the abbreviation "mHz," or "mhz," I usually assume
>that the writer means "MegaHertz," or one million CPS. The term
>"milli-Hertz" simply isn't used in the electronics field, at least not in
>my experience.

The less-than-unity Hertz frequencies ARE used in electronics,
namely in biosciences for sensing various body electrical signals,
and in geological-seismic sciences, atmospherics, some parts
of marine-acquatic sciences, mechanical stability structures in
architecture and mechanical engineering.

Electronics is a fairly exact part of physics with very little
assumption involved.

Your "experience" in electronics seems limited to that of
amateur radio at a rather primitive level.

4017. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 05:01:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523010103.06451.00000024@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43282

In article <20020522022457.24215.00000148@mb-fy.aol.com>, somebody writes:

> Most of the Extra Class respondents from this forum DID suggest that
>very change. Sorry.

Incorrect. Produce the posts to show your "correction."

>>One memorable post of about four years ago had well over 30
>>different classes/grades/varieties of rank-status-title-privileges
>>to those who "deserved it."
>
> I DID cite that one person made such a foolish suggestion, but I guess
you
>just glossed over that in your rush to once again assert your dwindiling
manhood.

You did NOT "cite that one person," only Bob Wex.

Produce your posts.

> It didn't work. The truth is still the truth.

It isn't out there. "X-Files" is cancelled.

> Nope. Just still can't help but wonder how decrepit and lonely you must
>be to sit in front of your pooter for hours drafting such dribble that does
>nbothing more than make a fool out of yourself.

:-)

> Matters not to me, Lennie. I am just having fun poking so many holes in
>your lies and rants that the rest doesn't matter. All that night school down
>the drain, eh Your Putziness?

Obsession with certain newsgroup communicators doesn't matter
to anyone but yourself.

NB: College-credit courses are still college credit regardless of
class hours.

There is still time to get some formal education and learn something
even if fortysomething in age. Or, one can wave their AMATEUR
license around like they are a superior being and pretend they know
"all about radio."

It is still possible for a non-MD "health professional" to become a
Medical Doctor before reaching 50. Difficult but not impossible.
That way a claim of "saving lives" could be true instead of taking
direction from others who are MDs.

Some required formal classroom schedules CAN be done at night.

> And I limit that to "this NG". I wish in NO WAY to demean or detract
from
>the excellent efforts of several gentlemen (ie: W1RFI) who are published on a
>regular basis.

:-) Only if it serves your purpose in achieving (what you think) are
message points in here.

"Published on a regular basis" isn't a "certificate" or "license" or
anything but being printed on real paper with real ink. Anyone
with a printing press and an initial purchase of lots of blank paper
can do that. The National Enquirer and Erich von Daniken come
to mind. :-)

>
>>>As for the titles, those were carried forward by the FCC, not us...put
>>>"blame" where blame is due, Your Putziness.
>>
>>See, another "putz-gram" sent off. Prediction of behavior is no
>>problem at all.
>
> Just as knowing that anything authored by "lenover21" will be a stinging
>slap at 675,000 LICENSED Amateur Radio operators, Lennie.

Incorrect. You are NOT "representative" of anyone but yourself.

Having an amateur radio license is NOT a "license" to insult
others or act in an uncivil manner...on the "air" or on a
newsgroup.

> And besides, "licensed operator" is my "title", "Putz" is yours. The
>only thing you and I have in common is that we each earned our respective
>"titles".
>
> Congratulations on yours, Putz.

The word "putz" is a Yiddish insult word. It is not "awarded" nor
is there any "license" involved in using such an insult word.

Using it does not make your point except to point out your
general nature.

It does give others an opinion of US amateur radio.

> And in YOUR case, Lennie....a NOVICE license is bigger than yours.

That is childish name-calling again. The size of a license does
not matter, only the allocated bands and modes and other
regulations pertaining to a particular class of AMATEUR license.

You are free to continue the delusion that you are "more expert"
in any type, kind, format, or activity of radio. That pleases you
along with the freedom to insult, belittle, and generally

pejorate anyone not holding your opinions...which you do repeatedly. That does not elevate you above others except in your imagination.

Remember that your actions reflect on US amateur radio as perceived by all who see, hear, and observe you.

You can address the subject...or continue insulting, belittling, and pejorating others off the subject as you have been doing.

Your choice. All have seen which choice you made in the past.

4018. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 05:01:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523010104.06451.00000025@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 43280

In article <20020521214027.23618.00000442@mb-dh.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Brian/Len:
>
>Dick and I had an argument about the two of you the other day.
>Dick said you wern't fit to eat with pigs, and I said you were!
>Which one of us was right?

It's not nice to use "K3LT" when you are really K4YZ.

4019. Ham and Lace.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 05:05:16 UTC
From: Lars121 <lars121@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <gM_G8.1307$hy7.72716520@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43283

alt.support.crossdressing
On Wed, 22 May 2002 16:35:55 GMT "JBramblia" wrote:

>
>Here is a site that makes panties for men. Interesting thing is that
>you can get stuff embroidered on them. I had "KD5NRH" embroidered
>on mine but then my Wife discovered them and threw them in the trash.
>Now she's made because I took hers!
>It is here: www.manties.net

>JBramblia
>kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

Those in glass houses..... you know.

4020. Re: Repeater Location

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 05:31:36 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <DC96765E74DE04C1.7678579DB519103D.E23F8FE816063CDE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43284

On Thu, 23 May 2002 01:28:23 GMT, "Lars121" <lars121@pacbell.net>
wrote:

>I've been to White Settlement... I know what Texas is like.

And I've been to SF, so I know what California is like.

> Do
>you know what your Sister says during sex?
>A: "Get off me Pa!... yer smashin' my smokes!"

At least we have real women.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4021. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 06:13:07 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <acioor22ti8@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 43299

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020521211649.23618.00000429@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <acaohf1a83@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> As it is so easy to lump everyone into categories Larry? What about the
> >ones who just became aware of it recently, prior to their licensing. Did
> >they wait for a lesser testing scheme on purpose if they were never aware
of
> >the hobby in the first place?
> >
> >Ryan KC8PMX
>
> Ryan:
>
> That's the problem when standards are lowered. Those who came
> in after the fact can never attain the status and prestige of those who
> met more comprehensive and challenging license testing requirements.
> They can insist until the end that they are equal to the Pre-Restructuring
> hams, but it will never be the case, and they will always occupy a low
> place on the pecking order among their superiors. Sad, but true.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I agree that those that did come in "under the bar" (such as myself
categorically speaking) should not be proclaiming all-inclusive knowledge
of everything in ham radio. I do not, nor will I ever claim that I know
everything about ham radio, even if I could go 30 years back and get an
extra ticket, I still won't. There is so much to learn that it would truly
take multiple lifetimes to learn everything. That is the shear beauty of
the hobby.

Now, I may have specific areas of knowledge of the hobby, but I will not
claim total knowledge. I am not the "typical technician" as you have
referred to here in the newsgroups, and I think that makes me a special
breed. Unfortunately there is not a ton like me, which would definitely
improve YOUR opinions about us techs.

The constant bickering within this hobby about who took what tests and when,
instead of working on constant positive change will be the final death of
the hobby, as opposed to dropping or adding of certain tests.

Ryan
KC8PMX

4022. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 11:01:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523070132.16030.00000139@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43285

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>So anyway, why do you always sound like a raving lunatic?

I don't know about "raving lunatic," but someone who thinks that two people disagreeing with each other is some sort of mind control has a pretty odd view of the world.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4023. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 11:02:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523070242.16030.00000141@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43286

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>But Ed, he's an old, pre-restructuring Extra.

I think that just about ended the usefulness of this discussion.

Do you see everything through the filter of amateur testing?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4024. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 11:05:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523070525.16030.00000145@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43287

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

> you've got the money to hire
>a contractor and to grease the building inspector's palm.

I have never had to grease a palm in any of my dealings with local governments.
Have you, or is this just speculation that it would be "common" that hams have
to offer bribes to buidling inspectors to be able to put up towers?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4025. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 11:09:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523070907.16030.00000148@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43288

From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam

> Why would I want to go to Hawaii? Been thrre, done that, didn't
> enjoy it at all.

I managed a KH6 trip and loved it! Of course, we were way off the beaten path, avoiding the main beaches like the plague. We stayed at a few of the B&Bs, one at a nut farm. We got to see the volcano, and did a bit of hiking. The really cool part was when we walked about 2 miles to a green-sand beach. For about a half hour, we were the only ones there!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4026. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 11:13:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523071301.16030.00000151@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43289

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>The best solution is for some Extras to learn to send better.

I never thought I would live to see the day when Brian proposed more code testing in Amateur Radio. Who woulda' thunk it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4027. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 11:15:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523071524.16030.00000152@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43290

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>If its OK to read more slowly...

Why would it not be okay for one to read at any speed one wants?

If you need my okay to read slowly, though, I guess I can tell you that it is alright.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4028. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 11:16:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523071614.15565.00000393@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 43291

>Subject: Re: Code Question
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/23/02 01:00 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020523010059.06451.00000019@mb-cm.aol.com>

>Then you are no better a "representative" of US amateur radio
>than K4YZ.

Or worse...we COULD be represented by a known pathological liar for whom no one can do right...like YOU, Sire Anderson.

How's the "Extra Lite Out Of the Box" coming? It's only been 2 years now.

And how about that "recreational use only" radio service? Still assert it exisits?

Of course we could wait for you to come up with some proof for any one of the dozens of assertions of wrongdoing or misconsuct of the ARRL or any other "representitive" of Amateur Radio you insist upon insulting.

And of course we could again ask you to demonstrate your mastery of current Armed Forces terminology and ask you about the various commander's in chief of the branches.

Or we could wait even longer for the booming Part 15 device signal you promise to put out from SoCal just to prove you can radiate RF on an Amateur Band without a license.

Want your nose rubbed in MORE of your own foolishness. Lennie...?!?!

4029. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 11:20:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523072022.16030.00000153@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43292

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Not nearly as much as your predictable reactions amuse me, Ed!

Yes, I am consistent, aren't I. It is my belief that the accomplishments of a ham after he or she passes their test are more important to ham radio than the test. It is your belief that the test gives status to the ham that is never overtaken by later accomplishments. This is America, and we are each entitled to our beliefs.

I am curious, though; if you know what the response will be, why would you elicit it? I have seen small children push the button to hear the bell repeatedly, but most people grow past that at a relatively young age.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4030. Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 11:21:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523072106.15565.00000395@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 43293

>Subject: Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/23/02 01:01 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020523010102.06451.00000023@mb-cm.aol.com>

>The less-than-unity Hertz frequencies ARE used in electronics,
>namely in biosciences for sensing various body electrical signals....(SNIP)

Oh?

Let's have a reference, Lennie. The SMALLEST reference to frequency I
find is the Hertz.

Some standard reference book would be fine.

I find milliamps and microamps for doing what you suggest, but not
"millihertz".

4031. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 12:07:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523080711.19574.00000187@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 43295

In article <miSG8.30281$D41.1179868@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
>news:fHRG8.36621$Vm2.1877891@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>> Bill Sohl, k2UNK, wrote:
>>
>> > IMHO, to the uninitiated, I'd suggest
>> > that upon hearing the names of the licenses, the
>> > typical non-ham would probably think the
>> > Advanced was higher than Extra.
>>
>> Yeah, maybe they ought to pile up on each other like:
>>
>> Technician
>> General Technician
>> Advanced General Technician
>> Extra Advanced General Technician
>>
>> But then we'd all be Tech's, wouldn't we? And the
>> dogs of egalitarian socialism would have been loosed.
>>
>>
>> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
>> Glendale, Arizona
>
>The military beat us to it years ago. If Hans had stayed in he might make
>Senior Executive Master Chief someday or perhaps Master Executive Senior
>Chief. Can we imagine Senior Chief Executive Master Sergeant Roll?
>
How about Major Major?

73 de Jim "Appleby has flies in his eyes", N2EY

4032. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 12:16:08 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CECDD87.9FD47046@psu.edu>
Source record: 43294

He's right, Steve. We don't use the term much in radio, but in biology, geology, and a few audio fields, the term millihertz is pretty common.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 05/23/02 01:01 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020523010102.06451.00000023@mb-cm.aol.com>
>
> >The less-than-unity Hertz frequencies ARE used in electronics,
> >namely in biosciences for sensing various body electrical signals....(SNIP)
>
> Oh?
>
> Let's have a reference, Lennie. The SMALLEST reference to frequency I
> find is the Hertz.
>
> Some standard reference book would be fine.
>
> I find milliamps and microamps for doing what you suggest, but not
> "millihertz".

4033. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 12:22:09 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acip45$ko0$1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43297
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.john-perry

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> whined in message
news:3CEC3CDB.EEF43F4B@mailcity.net...
>
>
> 2test

What's "2test" Jizzswallowing Jingles? Are you making up words as you go
along now?

AB8MQ wrote::
>
> > Maybe you should get a second one, that way, you can get a keybord that
has a comma key. Or at least English lessons, you Mexican refugee.
> ^^^^^^^
> You as well, wogie, there should be a comma after the word "key"

No, you illiterate fuck, there should be what you like to slurp from your
momma, the results of her PERIOD.

> and the word "or" should not be capitalized.

Beginnings of sentences are always capitalized...BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!

You really shouldn't post after drinking your daughters cum, JJ.

4034. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 12:33:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CECE174.A93D8B8C@att.net>
Source record: 43296

N2EY wrote:

> How about Major Major?

Don't laugh, I once knew a Major George R. Minor.

4035. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 13:00:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205230500.2f2dce9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43298

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<rDeG8.139$Ay7.7955755@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>...
> "mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3CE90D32.229956B@psu.edu...
> > You have hit on a big part of *why* the conduct is so gentlemanly while
> > using CW. It is by nature terse, and all inference must be made from the
> > text. (with that *HI* exception) It is how I can tell a friend in person
> > that they are full if crap, and they will take it as a good mannered
> > jest, and if I typed or tapped it out, they would not be pleased at all.
> >
> > - Mkie KB3EIA -

There's a lot more to it. The written or telegraphed word can be used to communicate all sorts of emotions and context - if it's done right. Writers have been doing it for generations. Shakespeare, Vonnegut, Keillor, and many others don't need emoticons.

Of course reading is a different skill than listening. Some people have trouble understanding the nuances of the written word - they haven't developed the skill. I know some people who have trouble using the telephone because they cannot see facial expressions, gestures, etc.

The behavior of some people on the internet disproves the idea that it is somehow difficult to cuss or be insulting using nonvoice modes. Just look at the posts of some rrappers.

The main reason hams are so well-behaved on CW is not primarily due to the mode itself. It has to do with the traditions and culture of the amateur CW operator - a tradition and culture that is worthy of preservation.

> So whan Larry's "friend" taps out "QFU" and doesn't append a "hi," is Larry
> actually serious.

QFU What is the magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used?

The magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used is...

I've never heard "QFU" on CW on the ham bands. Have you?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4036. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 14:47:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Vh7H8.330$cN4.7@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43300

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> The SMALLEST reference to frequency I find is the Hertz.

In this case Len is correct. Millihertz is a common scientific unit of measurement. As an example, the HAARP project in Alaska includes an induction magnetometer. A quote from their literature..... "The major signal categories detected by the induction magnetometer are short period magnetic pulsations such as Pc1, Pc2, Pc3, PiB, and PiC in a frequency range above a few tens of milliHertz. Among these, the induction magnetometer most efficiently detects Pc1 waves in the frequency range from 0.1 Hz to 3 Hz."

73, Hans, K0HB

4037. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 15:35:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CED0C33.184C516B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43301

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> > you've got the money to hire
> >a contractor and to grease the building inspector's palm.
>
> I have never had to grease a palm in any of my dealings with local governments.
> Have you, or is this just speculation that it would be "common" that hams have
> to offer bribes to buidling inspectors to be able to put up towers?

We're having a new kitchen done, and I did the wiring. The electrical
inspector said it was good except I missed the green pigtail ground wires
to tie the metal boxes to the safety ground on the outlets. Fail. So
I put in the pigtails. Later that day the inspector squeezes in another visit,
now I pass. No grease needed. Codes usually have good reasons behind
them, I imagine that it has been found that the mounting screws to hold
the outlets to the boxes are sometimes not adequate to pass 20 amps of
short circuit to ground if that ever happens. So the pigtails do it.
The cost of the pigtails was far lower than any bribe, and I wouldn't
insult the inspector attempting a bribe anyway. And then there would
be the jail aspect on top of that.

The FCC doesn't ask civil engineering questions on the ham tests, so
we should not expect to know enough to successfully install a safe
tower. If you want a tower, the permits and engineering costs are
a part of the price.

4038. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 15:38:40 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CED0D00.E4D0E26B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43302

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 22 May 2002 17:19:14 GMT, WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >>Lets see, For what I would cost to go to Dayton from Ca. for a weekend, I
> >>could go to Hawaii for a week.
>
> >Thats an easy one, Hawaii of course. Why would anyone want to waste there
> >money on a Stupid Hamfest?
>
> Why would I want to go to Hawaii? Been thrre, done that, didn't
> enjoy it at all.
>

I went to the bathroom in Hawaii once. The plane stopped for refueling
on the way to Australia (which is a nice place, they actually like Americans
down there). We deplaned to stretch our legs and to hit the can.....

4039. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 15:41:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CED0DB9.99CB9DBF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43303

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >But Ed, he's an old, pre-restructuring Extra.
>
> I think that just about ended the usefulness of this discussion.
>
> Do you see everything through the filter of amateur testing?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Think Brian forgot the ":-)"

4040. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 16:42:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523124252.26816.00000147@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43309

In article <XdYG8.1161$VV2.66332744@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> For example, Brian Kelly and his co-inventor have three patent
>> numbers for the same thing but successive date patents are
>> "replacements" for previous ones. That means he and co-buddy
>> have only ONE patent. It's a "mechanical" thingy about
>> bearings. [watch him "argue" that one...:-)]
>
>Military bearings? Timken bearings?

Lube-less bearings...although I'm sure his bearings might have
been disoriented a long time ago when he left his prom sweetie
(hormone-suffering) on a porch while he rushed home to work
CW on raddio after his first license arrived in the mail. :-)

Remember the 24 VDC batteries on WW2 jeeps? :-)

4041. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 16:48:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CED1D46.C273A22B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 43310

Leftover 21 wrote:
>
> In article <8TOG8.29955$D41.1163401@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >news:3CEB9022.6B7C360D@IEEE.org...
> >> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >> > It is blessed hard to be among the elite when the flunkies ignore you.
> >>
> >> Could it be that the 'elite' part is just a wet dream? Respect cannot
> >> be earned by simply passing a minimum requirements exam.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >In a sane and rational universe you are correct. But this is the Amateur
> >Radio universe where people live.
>
> Correction: This is the Amateur Radio universe where CONCEPTS
> and STATES of MIND live, interconnected with lore, mythology,
> held together by the glue of delusion that they are really
> Something above the ordinary.

You aren't a part of the "Amateur Radio universe" despite the
CAPITALIZATION. Your PERSONAL delusion seems to be that you are somehow
associated with amateur radio.

> >People in hobbies behave oddly.
>
> Then you are no better a "representative" of US amateur radio
> than K4YZ.

I don't recall Dick making a claim to represent amateur radio. Both
Steve and Dick, unlike you, are licensed participants in amateur radio.
You continue to stand on the sidewalk advising the workmen on how to
assemble the building.

Dave K8MN

4042. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 17:13:56 UTC
From: szekeres@pitt.edu
Message-ID: <acj7uhctg1@usenet01.srv.cis.pitt.edu>
Source record: 43311

In article <20020522230141.17511.00000413@mb-cv.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote:
>Robert Casey wote:
>
>>Now that I'm done bragging :-), the "extra" license is roughly
>>equal to say a 6 credit college course. Yes, it's an achievement, but
>>not the ultimate achievement.
>
>An extra licence worth 6 credits? I doubt it. In the context of your post, it
>seems humorous, which is fine. If you actually knew the material, it may be
>considered 2 (but probably 1, as a course suppliment) credits for all three

I don't think I ever took a college course, studying "questions"
I took a course for my novice over a several week period, and my Extra
required me being a General for, I forget how many years. I'll give it 8-10
credits minimum. Thats my opinion. I will not mention how many hours
practicing code. Of course i didn't stop there. got all the commercial
radiotelephone and telegraph licenses also. I plum ran out of tests to take!

GregS
N6GS

4043. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 17:14:44 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <8s9H8.406$LC3.33351@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43312

> "Brian P Burke":
> What did SPICE say about Larry wanting
> to get rid of VHF+ frequencies?

SPICE is an equal-opportunity circuit simulator.
It runs stuff from DC to daylight for professionals
and amateurs alike.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4044. Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 17:20:31 UTC
From: Eduardo Hernandez <Ehernandez@utinternetcommsorg.net>
Message-ID: <acj88togo0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43313
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Am getting my Toyota Land Cruiser ready for a month-long
vacation in the outback. In your esteemed opinion, what would
you recommend is the best all around mobile antenna on the market?
We'll be traveling at interstate speeds, as well as 4-wheeling in the
boondocks. My girlfriend is against having any weird looking
antennas on the vehicle which draw attention to us, as she is sometimes
recognized in public. She prefers as low a profile as possible, so what
antenna would best fit all these requirements?

Thanks es 73,

Eduardo "Beans" Hernandez

4045. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 17:49:48 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acja5h$a8d$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 43314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Eduardo Hernandez" <Ehernandez@utinternetcommsorg.net> wrote in message
news:acj88togo0@pita.alt.net...
> Am getting my Toyota Land Cruiser ready for a month-long
> vacation in the outback. In your esteemed opinion, what would
> you recommend is the best all around mobile antenna on the market?

Does Eckerd's let you take time from pushing pills?

> We'll be traveling at interstate speeds, as well as 4-wheeling in the
> boondocks. My girlfriend

Girlfirend? Does you wife Adriana know about her, Eddy?

>is against having any weird looking

Well she lets ~you~ in her land cruiser, Eddy.......

> antennas on the vehicle which draw attention to us, as she is sometimes
> recognized in public. She prefers as low a profile as possible, so what
> antenna would best fit all these requirements?
>
> Thanks es 73,
>
> Eduardo "Beans" Hernandez

Miami Springs High School 1992
Eduardo 'Eddy' Hernandez
(email) Edhern0001@mediaone.net
(married) Married 08-1996 to present
(spouse) Adriana C. Hernandez (MSSH 1990)
(children) Not yet
(pets) Lady (very tiny dog)
(livenow) Hialeah FL 33010 (a long time)
(jobnow) Eckerd Drugs 8+ years
(schools) MDDC-North/FIU-South/NSU-School of Pharmacy
(talents) :-)
(favmemories) Friends, Band
(favteachers) Mr. Shep.

Poor Ed-dildo.

4046. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 17:54:05 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <11aH8.446$LC3.36058@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43315

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CECE174.A93D8B8C@att.net...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > How about Major Major?
>
> Don't laugh, I once knew a Major George R. Minor.
>

My favorite was (Major) General George Washington who was in my graduating
class at Nebroma.

4047. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 18:07:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CED2F9F.2864A227@att.net>
Source record: 43316

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > In the Brave New World where anything older than yesterday is 'legacy' and
> > thus unworthy of anything but discard, yesterday's accomplishment, whatever
> > it was or whatever it meant yesterday, is flushed with prejudice.
>
> Passing a minimum requirements exam and then resting on one's laurels
> does not elicit respect, Dick. Yesterday's accomplishments are old news.
> What have you done for the ARS lately?

Much more to the point, what have YOU, the dope with all
the alleged brains and
competency to actually move your digital agenda forward, if
anything you say can
be believed- certainly doubtful, by your own descriptions.

If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing
done today does either.
I'm sure you'll never understand that basic fact.

4048. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 18:13:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CED312E.5FB7BA7A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43317

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > How about Major Major?
>
> Don't laugh, I once knew a Major George R. Minor.

When I was at Texas A&M, we had a Fish Frogg and a Frog Fisher.
(Fish are first semester freshmen - Frogs are second semester freshmen)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4049. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 18:24:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CED33E8.6C45F5DF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43318

N2EY wrote:
> The behavior of some people on the internet disproves the idea that it is
> somehow difficult to cuss or be insulting using nonvoice modes.

Since netnews is not real time, a posting can be composed and edited to
achieve any desired level of emotionalism. If a poster's hands are shaking
with emotion to the extent that he cannot type, he can wait a few minutes
until his hands quit shaking. One cannot do that with real time CW. Real
time emotional outbursts and CW are simply incompatible.

Extreme emotionalism is also incompatible with real time keyboard modes. The
only reason that extreme emotionalism can be accomplished on a newsgroup is
that the newsgroup is NOT real time and a poster can wait for the physical
manifestations of extreme emotions to subside.

> The main reason hams are so well-behaved on CW is not primarily due to the
> mode itself.

See above. Extreme emotionalism and real time CW are virtually impossible
to accomplish at the same time.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4050. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 18:32:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CED35DA.C163B645@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43319

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > In the Brave New World where anything older than yesterday is 'legacy' and
> > > thus unworthy of anything but discard, yesterday's accomplishment, whatever
> > > it was or whatever it meant yesterday, is flushed with prejudice.
> >
> > Passing a minimum requirements exam and then resting on one's laurels
> > does not elicit respect, Dick. Yesterday's accomplishments are old news.
> > What have you done for the ARS lately?
>
> Much more to the point, what have YOU, the dope with all
> the alleged brains and
> competency to actually move your digital agenda forward, if
> anything you say can
> be believed- certainly doubtful, by your own descriptions.

Over the past year, I have spent more than a thousand hours
developing software. How about you?

> If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing
> done today does either.
> I'm sure you'll never understand that basic fact.

Point is, passing minimum requirements exams are the first baby
steps into amateur radio. Are you satisfied with baby steps?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4051. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 19:28:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523152815.20019.00000196@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 43321

In article <20020523070132.16030.00000139@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>So anyway, why do you always sound like a raving lunatic?
>
>I don't know about "raving lunatic," but someone who thinks that two people
>disagreeing with each other is some sort of mind control has a pretty odd
>view of the world.

"Mind control?" The observation of "raving lunatic" was in response to the type of comment of another. While a bit more exaggerated than might be warranted, such an observation is in no way indicative of "mind control."

Did you forget to wear your aluminum foil hat again?

4052. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 19:28:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523152815.20019.00000195@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 43323

In article <20020521211649.23618.00000429@mb-dh.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>That's the problem when standards are lowered. Those who came
>in after the fact can never attain the status and prestige of those who
>met more comprehensive and challenging license testing requirements.

There is but one true god...and he is Larry?

>They can insist until the end that they are equal to the Pre-Restructuring
>hams, but it will never be the case, and they will always occupy a low
>place on the pecking order among their superiors.

Oopsie, Larry is into gender bendering...Mother Superior.

>Sad, but true.

Poor baby.

4053. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 19:28:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523152816.20019.00000197@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 43320

In article <20020523071301.16030.00000151@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>The best solution is for some Extras to learn to send better.
>
>I never thought I would live to see the day when Brian proposed more code
>testing in Amateur Radio. Who woulda' thunk it?

Please see my previous message.

Brian has NOT proposed "more code testing in amateur radio."

He has commented on the abilities of the ALREADY LICENSED.
Since he wrote "Extra" that signifies a license class which has
the most tests without any prospect of ever having any more
tests to take.

Have you answered Brian's query as to whether or not he should
write more slowly for better reading?

4054. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 19:28:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523152816.20019.00000198@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 43322

In article <20020523070242.16030.00000141@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>But Ed, he's an old, pre-restructuring Extra.
>
>I think that just about ended the usefulness of this discussion.
>
>Do you see everything through the filter of amateur testing?

Brian clearly wrote "old, pre-restructuring Extra." That means one who was already licensed in amateur radio. Further, as a grant of Amateur Extra indicates, the "ultimate" in license testing would have already been accomplished.

Ergo, there is NO "filter of amateur testing" involved.

There IS and remains the mind-set of the "old, pre-restructuring" licensee...which is not that good an attitude, witness some of the old, pre-restructuring licensee correspondents in here.

The ARRL has made many, many mentions in the past in regards to sending "good" (properly formed character spacings) morse code. That predates 1928 and the first publishing of The Amateur's Code.

None of that concerns any "filter of amateur testing" but rather the continuation of what a major membership organization considers to be good radio amateur practice. Why would you want to subvert or misdirect your employer's intentions?

And, why do you always "reply" with questions?

4055. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 19:40:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523154000.21464.00000202@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 43324

In article <3CED1D46.C273A22B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I don't recall Dick making a claim to represent amateur radio. Both
>Steve and Dick, unlike you, are licensed participants in amateur radio.
>You continue to stand on the sidewalk advising the workmen on how to
>assemble the building.

Late but expected response. :-)

Noooo...I'm the "building inspector" watching a lot of AMATEURS
tossing together some gothic opinion architecture that doesn't
stand up.

You don't meet the right "code." YOUR building won't stand.

4056. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 19:40:06 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CED4596.151ADD09@psu.edu>
Source record: 43325

I think this one gets posted on my office wall, Dick!! Do you want
quote attributes? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

Dick Carroll wrote:

> If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing done today does either.

4057. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 20:18:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205231218.4b354d16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43326

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<acaohj6a83@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> ... because the current names of the license levels means absolutely
> nothing. It shows no direction or ranking. Extra what anyways? The words
> Novice License seems pretty clear, Technician is misleading, General could
> go a couple of ways. Advanced makes sense if the General class was the
> starting point but I still think that some form of ranking in the licensure
> as far as the names of the different licenses go would be better. >

OK, how about this:

First off, S25.5 will probably be gone after WRC 2003, so we need to look beyond that. FCC will most probably drop code testing for HF/MF access as soon as S25.5 goes, too.

So the following license structure/test structure is suggested:

1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the names if you don't like them)

2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license class. Some bands may be split by mode only. ("Mode" meaning "narrow/CW/digital" vs. "wide/analog phone-image/digital"

3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs, procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff. Main objective is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150 watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (power level determined by RF exposure limits). Modes are CW, analog voice, PSK31 and many of the other common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or club trustees. Basics get most VHF/UHF and about half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the entry level. Easy to get, lots of privs, yet there's still a reason to upgrade.

4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Intermediates get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires at least one year experience as a Basic.

5) "Full" license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands, etc. except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see below). Full license requires at least one year (preferably two years) as an Intermediate.

6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.

7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character calls. Nobody has to give up an existing callsign.

8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs. Existing VEs are grandfathered.

9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses, Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras become Fulls.

10) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to upgrade, but their time in existing classes counts.

End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges. Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set about one S-unit apart. Current hams would be allowed to use the existing power levels so nobody loses privileges. There are only three license classes and four written tests, so FCC doesn't have more work.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4058. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 20:27:07 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205232025080.12531-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43327

On 23 May 2002, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 05/23/02 01:01 Eastern Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20020523010102.06451.00000023@mb-cm.aol.com>
>
>>The less-than-unity Hertz frequencies ARE used in electronics,
>>namely in biosciences for sensing various body electrical signals....(SNIP)
>
> Oh?
>
> Let's have a reference, Lennie. The SMALLEST reference to frequency I
>find is the Hertz.
>
> Some standard reference book would be fine.
>
> I find milliamps and microamps for doing what you suggest, but not
>"millihertz".

Try also geology - re: earthquakes. Sometimes the period of a travelling surface wave ripple crossing a fixed point is longer than a second.

Same with certain ocean waves.

4059. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 20:34:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CED5254.DAE91B99@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43328

The prefix system used in science and technology permits use with any suffix. Thus things like Megahenry or Gigafarad are valid, though you're not likely to ever need to mention such quantities in ham radio. Or picohertz.

Why does nobody ever say "Megameter" instead of "1000 Kilometers"?

4060. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 21:05:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <SQcH8.2048$Df7.58939710@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43329

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020523080711.19574.00000187@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <miSG8.30281$D41.1179868@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
> >news:fHRG8.36621$Vm2.1877891@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >> Bill Sohl, k2UNK, wrote:
> >>
> >> > IMHO, to the uninitiated, I'd suggest
> >> > that upon hearing the names of the licenses, the
> >> > typical non-ham would probably think the
> >> > Advanced was higher than Extra.
> >>
> >> Yeah, maybe they ought to pile up on each other like:
> >>
> >> Technician
> >> General Technician
> >> Advanced General Technician
> >> Extra Advanced General Technician
> >>
> >> But then we'd all be Tech's, wouldn't we? And the
> >> dogs of egalitarian socialism would have been loosed.
> >>
> >>
> >> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> >> Glendale, Arizona
> >
> >The military beat us to it years ago. If Hans had stayed in he might
make
> >Senior Executive Master Chief someday or perhaps Master Executive Senior
> >Chief. Can we imagine Senior Chief Executive Master Sergeant Roll?
> >
> How about Major Major?
>
> 73 de Jim "Appleby has flies in his eyes", N2EY

How about Major Minor? AF Weather

4061. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 21:19:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <J1dH8.2058$Sk7.59267368@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43330

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0205231218.4b354d16@posting.google.com...
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<acaohj6a83@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> > ... because the current names of the license levels means absolutely
> > nothing. It shows no direction or ranking. Extra what anyways? The
words
> > Novice License seems pretty clear, Technician is misleading, General
could
> > go a couple of ways. Advanced makes sense if the General class was the
> > starting point but I still think that some form of ranking in the
licensure
> > as far as the names of the different licenses go would be better. >
>
> OK, how about this:
>
> First off, S25.5 will probably be gone after WRC 2003, so we need to
> look beyond that. FCC will most probably drop code testing for HF/MF
> access as soon as S25.5 goes, too.

But the FCC will continue to reference obsolete documents for decades to
come (re: morse code specification).

> So the following license structure/test structure is suggested:
>
> 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the names
> if you don't like them)
>
> 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license
class.
> Some bands may be split by mode only. ("Mode" meaning
"narrow/CW/digital"
> vs. "wide/analog phone-image/digital"
>
> 3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
procedures,
> and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff. Main
objective
> is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150 watts on HF/MF
and
> 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (power level determined by RF exposure
limits).

If you make the power levels on the learners permit the lower of 200 watts
or match rf evaluation limits for all bands (vlf, mf, hf, vhf+) I'd be more

inclined to agree. Thats 200 watts on 160M (rf says 500watts) and 50 watts on 10M.

> Modes are CW, analog voice, PSK31 and many of the other common data modes
> like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or club
> trustees. Basics get most VHF/UHF and about half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic
> is meant as the entry level. Easy to get, lots of privs, yet there's still
> a reason to upgrade.

Why are you so hung up on the "upgrade" requirement? Just go directly to full licensing.

> 4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on regs,
> procedures, safety and technical stuff. Intermediates get 300-400 watts
> on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs after qualification
> (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club trustees. Intermediates
> get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum.
> Intermediate requires at least one year experience as a Basic.
>
> 5) "Full" license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs,
> procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some regs
> to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands, etc.
> except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see below). Full
> license requires at least one year (preferably two years) as an
> Intermediate.
>
> 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.
>
> 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or six-character
> calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character calls. Nobody has to
> give up an existing callsign.

Bar codes. Forces all comms to become digital.

> 8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to
> Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs. Existing VEs are
> grandfathered.

Nope, no grandfathering on this. Annual training by VEC.

> 9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses, Generals and

> Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras become Fulls.

Some existing Extras are already fulls. ;^)

> 10) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to upgrade, but
> their time in existing classes counts.
>
> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned as a
21st
> century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but meaningful steps to
reach
> full privileges. Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set
about
> one S-unit apart. Current hams would be allowed to use the existing power
> levels so nobody loses privileges. There are only three license classes
and
> four written tests, so FCC doesn't have more work.
>
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4062. MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 21:35:06 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205231335.52663b3e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43331
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

The latest MURS rules changes now simply limit transmitter power output to 2W, and remove the old 2W ERP restriction:

http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-02-139A1.doc

This effectively raises the ERP limit to about 10W for omni base stations, and about 50W with a directional beam antenna.

With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur Radio just keeps getting less relevant.

Horseshoe7, Stewart, N0MHS
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

4063. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 21:47:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwklvxe.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43332

On 23 May 2002 11:09:07 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>> Why would I want to go to Hawaii? Been thrre, done that, didn't
>> enjoy it at all.
>
>I managed a KH6 trip and loved it! Of course, we were way off the beaten path,
>avoiding the main beaches like the plague. We stayed at a few of the B&Bs, one
>at a nut farm. We got to see the volcano, and did a bit of hiking. The really
>cool part was when we walked about 2 miles to a green-sand beach. For about a
>half hour, we were the only ones there!

My one and only trip to the Islands was a complete bust. It was at the emd of a business trip to Guam at the height of the fuel shortage in early 1974. On the way from the airport to the hotel, my host crashed into the rear end of the car ahead, sending three of us to the hospital. After half a day there being X-rayed, patched up and interviewed by Hawaii 5-0 (actually the accident investigator of Honolulu PD), all I wanted to do was to get to the hotel, pop a pain pill, and go to sleep. No one had any gasoline so my view of the island was confined to the three downtown TV stations that i had to inspect and to the Ala Moana Shopping Center after hours.

I'm not a beach person, so that facet of Hawaii didn't interest me. At the end of the week I still hurt, and I was more than happy to get on a plane for home and bid Aloha to Hawaii.

My wife had enough of the Islands when she and her pre-school son spent four months on Kauai while she was working in the construction crew for the main resort there (Hilton ?) thirty years ago. She has no desire to go back either.

My ex- and her friend escape to the Islands regularly. She's welcome to it.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4064. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 21:47:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwkmjpf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43333

On Thu, 23 May 2002 03:27:58 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:

>Well, my buddy KL0BM used to tell me, "Brian, life is like a $hit sammich,
>the more bread you got, the less $hit you have to eat." I guess if you've
>got the money for a big tower and an 80M beam, you've got the money to hire
>a contractor and to grease the building inspector's palm.

Where in any of these posts did a "big tower" or an "80M beam" or
"greasing" anyone's palm come in? We're talking about doing it by
the book.

Heck, if I'm going to grease someone's palm, or vice versa, it's
going to be while I'm wearing a wire and the State Police tech
squad is in the next house recording it.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4065. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 21:47:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwknawg.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43334

On 23 May 2002 11:05:25 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>> you've got the money to hire
>>a contractor and to grease the building inspector's palm.
>
>I have never had to grease a palm in any of my dealings with local
>governments. Have you, or is this just speculation that it would be
>"common" that hams have to offer bribes to buidling inspectors to be
>able to put up towers?

There are areas of the country where baksheesh ("cost of doing
business" payments to everyone from the delivery truck driver on up)
is expected.

Fortunately I refuse to live in such places or do those
activities.

Perhaps Brian lives in such an area - or has seen it referred to
on TV.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4066. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 21:47:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwknrmh.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43335

On Thu, 23 May 2002 14:47:17 GMT, KØHB wrote:

>> The SMALLEST reference to frequency I find is the Hertz.
>
>In this case Len is correct. Millihertz is a common scientific unit of
>measurement.

Pose this question on an Extra test:

What's the difference between a megaphone and a microphone?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4067. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 21:56:10 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <_zdH8.682$UT.44078@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43336

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CED5254.DAE91B99@ix.netcom.com...
> The prefix system used in science and technology permits use with any
> suffix. Thus things like Megahenry or Gigafarad are valid, though
you're
> not likely to ever need to mention such quantities in ham radio. Or
> picohertz.
>
> Why does nobody ever say "Megameter" instead of "1000 Kilometers"?
>
>
>

Because the obsession with decimalization has to stop somewhere. While I am resigned to Keys and Klicks they are, like most metric units, not exactly people-sized. A mile, in legend 1000 paces of the Roman army, is possible to visualize and whatever else may be said for the Imperial system it does not have the decimal fetish. A Klick can also be visualized and 1000 km trips are not unusual but making sense of of a Megameter is simply impossible without first making a mental translation to 1000 Klicks.

We got a decimal currency via Tom Jefferson who was something of a Francophile and the US Treasury spent the better part of the 19th century trying to stomp out the quarter in favor of the double-dime. They obviously failed miserably selling the bi-quinary fetish that comes of treating ten as an icon.

Life would be a lot simpler if we had been born with 12 fingers and toes.

4068. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 22:17:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <_TdH8.989$cN4.819@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43337

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote

> What's the difference between a megaphone and a microphone?

999,999.999999 Phones

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4069. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 22:19:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <JVdH8.993$cN4.374@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43338
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Eduardo Hernandez" <Ehernandez@utinternetcommsorg.net> wrote in message
news:acj88togo0@pita.alt.net...
> Am getting my Toyota Land Cruiser ready for a month-long
> vacation in the outback. In your esteemed opinion, what would
> you recommend is the best all around mobile antenna on the market?

High Sierra screwdriver.

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4070. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 23:00:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwky2fi.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43339

On Thu, 23 May 2002 22:17:30 GMT, KØHB wrote:

>
>> What's the difference between a megaphone and a microphone?
>
>999,999.999999 Phones

Close. The accepted answer is 10^12 <ggg>

It would have been a giveaway had I said "the relationship
vetween...."

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4071. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-23 23:36:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <j2fH8.1114$cN4.540@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43340

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gwky2fi.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
On Thu, 23 May 2002 22:17:30 GMT, K&#65533;HB wrote:

>
>>> What's the difference between a megaphone and a microphone?
>>
>>999,999.999999 Phones

>Close. The accepted answer is 10^12 <ggg>

I like my answer better.

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4072. Re: The CBer IDENTIFICATION exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 00:10:51 UTC
From: "S. Miller" <stemp-removethis-@gstarusa.com>
Message-ID: <3CED850B.B081DB8F@gstarusa.com>
Source record: 43341

Does the 'Troll-O-Meter' scale go to negative numbers?

stevebg wrote:

> NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
>
> Did you moan or scoff? YOU'RE A CBer.

4073. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 00:21:33 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <ack1td$74l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43342
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Woman beater "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> whined in message
news:acjpog$6an$2@pita.alt.net...
>
> On Thu, 23 May 2002 13:49:48 -0400, AB8MQ@ovis.net wrote:
> :
> : Miami Springs High School 1992
> : Eduardo 'Eddy' Hernandez
> : (email) [snip]
> : (married) Married 08-1996 to present
> : (spouse) Adriana C. Hernandez (MSSH 1990)
> : (children) Not yet
> : (pets) Lady (very tiny dog)
> : (livenow) Hialeah FL 33010 (a long time)
> : (jobnow) Eckerd Drugs 8+ years
> : (schools) MDDC-North/FIU-South/NSU-School of Pharmacy
> : (talents) :-)
> : (favmemories) Friends, Band
> : (favteachers) Mr. Shep.
> :
> : Poor Ed-dildo.
>
> In your\ /

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit "Stagger Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically
admits he has no credibility by his own definition in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

--
From: Bill Saxton (usenetposting@yahoo.com)
Subject: Stagger Lee, Idiot-at-Large
Message-ID: <20010218201817.44909.qmail@web11401.mail.yahoo.com>

"Yes, YOU Stagger Lee:

Idiot-at-Large
Village Idiot
Perpetual Moron

You have shown your ignorance, your inability to
rationalize a situation, your inability to show even
the smallest amount of intelligence.

You speak as a Cyber Cop... Is that what you look at yourself as being? As self-imposed-marshal-of-usenet? Is that your little mission in life? You seek to impose your views on everyone else and to hell with the accepted norms.

Idiot.

Fuck Head.

Loser.

Are you an ignorant fucking WebTV user? You act like it.

First there was AOL'ers, now there is WebTV. It's nice for AOL'ers to finally have someone to pick-on.

You get your No-Code first? Cant do Morse? I bet you dont know the difference between a Zener Diode and a Transistor.

I bet you keep goats in the house for companionship... Or maybe it's just the smell eminating from your boyfriend's ass that smells like a goat.

I bet you suck the jack-bumps off your boyfriend's balls don't you?

You are a sick, sick person. You need help. You need to seek a professional psycho-therapist to help you in your time of need"

4074. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 00:44:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020523204441.01608.00000313@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 43343

>Can you say CB x 2..LOL

Why not, Ham Radio has turned into Cb, might as well make MURS the same way. Besides I have a few Delta S at over 100 Watts that will easily go there, so I might as well put them there. I would probably be able to sell them to some of ther new Murs CB ers for a good price.

4075. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 01:52:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Q1hH8.929$qL4.37078210@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43344

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020523071524.16030.00000152@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >If its OK to read more slowly...
>
> Why would it not be okay for one to read at any speed one wants?
>
> If you need my okay to read slowly, though, I guess I can tell you that it
is
> alright.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

But you've already directed me to do so. Now you give me your permission.
You just gotta have total control over everything.

4076. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 01:53:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <U2hH8.931$sK4.37015848@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43345

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020523071301.16030.00000151@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >The best solution is for some Extras to learn to send better.
>
> I never thought I would live to see the day when Brian proposed more code
> testing in Amateur Radio. Who woulda' thunk it?

Learning and testing are two completely different things, Ed. Better get
with Rosalee and get some learning theory.

4077. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 01:58:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <77hH8.933$_M4.37172374@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43347

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020523000744.21693.00000151@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <UyeG8.136$Zy7.7981157@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020520080641.05958.00000055@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >> In article <boVF8.8261$Vy3.245696807@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>,
"Brian P
> >> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20020518220708.13422.00000105@mb-mb.aol.com...
> >> >
> >> >> Here in PA, I had to specifically ask to see the deed restrictions
> >before
> >> >> making an offer. My RE attorney had to dig them up from the files at
> >the
> >> >> county seat. Even though this house is more than 50 years old, it
has a
> >> >> page and a half of fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing against
> >antennas,
> >> >> though, but a tower might be difficult, as it may be considered a
> >> >> "structure" due to its permanent nature. In fact, I do not know of
any
> >> >> amateur radio towers in Radnor Township. Kinda odd, considering that
> >> >> Radnor was the home of Charlie Stewart.
> >> >
> >> >If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than
cement,
> >it
> >> >might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
> >> >asphalt are not.
> >>
> >> HAW!!! Oh that's a GOOD one!! Almost up to the level of ol' Masa's
> >> promise of April 2, 1998.
> >>
> >> A freestanding tower set in a cubic yard of asphalt won't be permanent,
> >> that's for sure. Not after the first warm day.
> >
> >What's your problem?
>
> I don't have a problem, Brian. I just know enough about the mechanics of

> towers,
> wood poles and foundations to know that asphalt is not a good material for
> foundations. Ever see a house with a poured-asphalt foundation?

I've seen poured concrete foundations cracked and leaking. Do you suppose a
poured asphalt foundation would flex instead of break? Wonder if earthquake
country or NORAD would be interested in a foundation material with a little
give.

> >Even on a warm day, my 12'x30'x3" driveway is stable
> >enough to park heavy equipment on without denting it.
>
> So? A driveway is not the same thing as a tower foundation. How "heavy" is
that
> "heavy equipment"? Does it have rubber tires? How many pounds per square
> inch does it exert when sitting on the driveway?

Your the engineer, or claim to be.

> >> Of course it would probably never actually be erected in the first
place.
> >> Township would never grant the building permit, for one thing. Asphalt
> >> truck wouldn't pour the stuff in the hole, either because they fear
> >> liability or because they were laughing too hard.
> >>
> >> btw, one sets tower bases in concrete, not cement.
> >
> >40lb bags, right?
>
> Ready mix right off the truck.

Not always.

4078. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 01:58:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <C7hH8.935$dN4.37187859@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43346

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020523000743.21693.00000150@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <20020520183437.27747.00000654@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> >>>If you set the base of the tower in a yard of asphalt rather than
cement,
> >it
> >>>might not be considered permanent. Concrete driveways are permanent,
> >>>asphalt are not.
> >
> >>Of course it would probably never actually be erected in the first
place.
> >>Township would never grant the building permit, for one thing.
> >
> >My township would want the same permit for a concrete driveway as an
asphalt
> >one.
>
> Same here.
> >
> >I think he made it all up. :-)
>
> He's just trying to top Cecil in the number-of-posts game.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

How am I doing?

4079. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:06:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <AehH8.941$pQ4.37371004@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43348

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020523070242.16030.00000141@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >But Ed, he's an old, pre-restructuring Extra.
>
> I think that just about ended the usefulness of this discussion.
>
> Do you see everything through the filter of amateur testing?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Yes. Either its relavent or its not.

4080. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:11:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CjhH8.943$4S4.37470368@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43349

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CED0DB9.99CB9DBF@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >
> > >But Ed, he's an old, pre-restructuring Extra.
> >
> > I think that just about ended the usefulness of this discussion.
> >
> > Do you see everything through the filter of amateur testing?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Think Brian forgot the ":-)"

Bob, thanks for the benefit of doubt, but I'm quite serious. The PCTA cannot have it both ways. Either the exam is relavent and is to be relied upon that on old, pre-restructuring era Extra engages in superior Amateur Radio Practice, or it is less than relavent, not to be relied upon. Time for Larry, Dick, and Steve put up, shut up, or suck up.

So far Phil has called this old Extra an idiot.

4081. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:14:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dmhH8.945$PP4.37332311@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43350

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020523070132.16030.00000139@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >So anyway, why do you always sound like a raving lunatic?
>
> I don't know about "raving lunatic," but someone who thinks that two
people
> disagreeing with each other is some sort of mind control has a pretty odd
view
> of the world.

Ed, you're too kind. To say that Larry has an "odd view of the world"
doesn't really get close to his problem.

"Megalomaniac" gets closer.

4082. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:20:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NrhH8.949$BT4.37569836@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43401

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:acgp8g2dit@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message

> These are good, but I am looking for someone in regards to this to
actually
> teach something like that. Self study courses may not always be a good
> solution, as you may not learn the material properly, but a qualified
> (having knowledge in the subject) person can identify gaps or errors in
> knowledge in a class form. God forbid we actually see other hams face to
> face.

Oh, agreed. I once taught a Tech class. Was I qualified? Maybe not. But surrounded by "higher" class amateurs, I was one of the few that was willing. I've set up at some BSA Jamborees, Royal Rangers, etc. I'd like to back out of scoutmaster stuff and just be a merit badge counselor. I'll get there.

Brian

4083. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:21:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tshH8.950$2M4.37119184@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43402

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020523070907.16030.00000148@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
>
> > Why would I want to go to Hawaii? Been thrre, done that, didn't
> > enjoy it at all.
>
> I managed a KH6 trip and loved it! Of course, we were way off the beaten
path,
> avoiding the main beaches like the plague. We stayed at a few of the B&Bs,
one
> at a nut farm. We got to see the volcano, and did a bit of hiking. The
really
> cool part was when we walked about 2 miles to a green-sand beach. For
about a
> half hour, we were the only ones there!
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

You should have taken Bruce to the nut farm.

4084. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:27:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ack8khknt1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43404

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:peZG8.1199$rm3.68009216@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:achl5m$g5g$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> > Yep, that's the ole "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours"
> > The variation on how building depts deal with the public
> > is incredible.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Kick backs are common in the "professions."

Which is a sorry state of affairs.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4085. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:28:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEDA537.1F6A98E5@att.net>
Source record: 43403

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Thu, 23 May 2002 03:27:58 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >Well, my buddy KL0BM used to tell me, "Brian, life is like a $hit sammich,
> >the more bread you got, the less $hit you have to eat

Wow! Freud would laugh himself silly, that from a ham with a callsign of
KL0-'BM'!

4086. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:34:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <DEhH8.953$D_4.38010129@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43406

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CED1D46.C273A22B@earthlink.net...

> I don't recall Dick making a claim to represent amateur radio. Both
> Steve and Dick, unlike you, are licensed participants in amateur radio.
> You continue to stand on the sidewalk advising the workmen on how to
> assemble the building.

Welp Dave, if you PCTAs can rant and rave that Len cannot represent or even comment on amateur related issues, then it only stands to reason that only licensed individuals are capable. Now whether Dick claims to represent amateur radio or not, it becomes irrelevant. By virtue of holding a license he represents amateur radio.

Which way do you want it?

4087. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:35:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEDA6A5.2AE5E4D2@att.net>
Source record: 43405

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020523070242.16030.00000141@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >
> > >But Ed, he's an old, pre-restructuring Extra.
> >
> > I think that just about ended the usefulness of this discussion.
> >
> > Do you see everything through the filter of amateur testing?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Yes. Either its relavent or its not.

Either you're relavent or you're not. You're not.

4088. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:37:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <lHhH8.955$P_4.38022467@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43407

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020523072022.16030.00000153@mb-cr.aol.com...

> Yes, I am consistent, aren't I. It is my belief that the accomplishments
of a
> ham after he or she passes their test

Which test?

4089. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:44:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aOhH8.957$l45.38374598@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43409

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205232025080.12531-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On 23 May 2002, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >>Subject: Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 05/23/02 01:01 Eastern Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <20020523010102.06451.00000023@mb-cm.aol.com>
> >
> >>The less-than-unity Hertz frequencies ARE used in electronics,
> >>namely in biosciences for sensing various body electrical
signals....(SNIP)
> >
> > Oh?
> >
> > Let's have a reference, Lennie. The SMALLEST reference to frequency
I
> >find is the Hertz.
> >
> > Some standard reference book would be fine.
> >
> > I find milliamps and microamps for doing what you suggest, but not
> >"millihertz".
>
> Try also geology - re: earthquakes. Sometimes the period of a travelling
> surface wave ripple crossing a fixed point is longer than a second.
>
> Same with certain ocean waves.

Or weather where there are usually only 3 to 5 waves around the whole earth.

4090. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:44:50 UTC
From: Doug <doug322@texastradersorg.net>
Message-ID: <ack9b3$362$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43408
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flame,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Not only could he not find his ass using both hands, but
Woger would still not find his ass, even if given a map! In fact,
Roger could not pour piss out of a boot if the directions were
printed on the heel!

doug

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:acjpog$6an$2@pita.alt.net...
> In your last post, you listed a Texas address and phone number for
> Eduardo.
>
> Poor Woger. Can't find his own ass using both hands.
>
> ========
> "One of your users has defrauded you, possibly used fraudulent monetary
> means to obtain your services." -- Netcop ab8mq in an anoymous remailer
> letter about Stagger Lee to Chris Caputo of Altopia

4091. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:47:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ack9r1oap1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43411

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:J1dH8.2058$Sk7.59267368@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0205231218.4b354d16@posting.google.com...
> > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:<acaohj6a83@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> > > ... because the current names of the license levels means absolutely
> > > nothing. It shows no direction or ranking. Extra what anyways? The
> words
> > > Novice License seems pretty clear, Technician is misleading, General
> could
> > > go a couple of ways. Advanced makes sense if the General class was
the
> > > starting point but I still think that some form of ranking in the
> licensure
> > > as far as the names of the different licenses go would be better. >
> >
> > OK, how about this:
> >
> > First off, S25.5 will probably be gone after WRC 2003, so we need to
> > look beyond that. FCC will most probably drop code testing for HF/MF
> > access as soon as S25.5 goes, too.
>
> But the FCC will continue to reference obsolete documents for decades to
> come (re: morse code specification).

What obsolete documents does the FCC reference now?

Part 97 makes NO reference at all to S25.5 today. The FCC
acknowledged the existence of S25.5 as the only justification
to retain any code testing at all...BUT that isn't codified into
the regulations.

> > So the following license structure/test structure is suggested:
> >
> > 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
names
> > if you don't like them)
> >
> > 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license
> class.
> > Some bands may be split by mode only. ("Mode" meaning
> "narrow/CW/digital"
> > vs. "wide/analog phone-image/digital"

> >
> > 3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
> procedures,
> > and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff. Main
> objective
> > is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150 watts on HF/MF
> and
> > 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (power level determined by RF exposure
> limits).
>
> If you make the power levels on the learners permit the lower of 200 watts
> or match rf evaluation limits for all bands (vlf, mf, hf, vhf+) I'd be
more
> inclined to agree. Thats 200 watts on 160M (rf says 500watts) and 50
watts
> on 10M.
>
> > Modes are CW, analog voice, PSK31 and many of the other common data
> modes
> > like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or
club
> > trustees. Basics get most VHF/UHF and about half of HF/MF spectrum.
> Basic
> > is meant as the entry level. Easy to get, lots of privs, yet there's
> still
> > a reason to upgrade.
>
> Why are you so hung up on the "upgrade" requirement? Just go directly to
> full licensing.
>
> > 4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on
> regs,
> > procedures, safety and technical stuff. Intermediates get 300-400
> watts
> > on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs after
qualification
> > (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club trustees.
> Intermediates
> > get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or more) of HF/MF
spectrum.
> > Intermediate requires at least one year experience as a Basic.
> >
> > 5) "Full" license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs,
> > procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some
> regs
> > to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands,
etc.
> > except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see below).
> Full
> > license requires at least one year (preferably two years) as an

> > Intermediate.
> >
> > 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.
> >
> > 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
> six-character
> > calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character calls. Nobody
has
> to
> > give up an existing callsign.
>
> Bar codes. Forces all comms to become digital.
>
> > 8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open
to
> > Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs. Existing VEs
are
> > grandfathered.
>
> Nope, no grandfathering on this. Annual training by VEC.

What does a VE need annual training for? The VE's only administer
the tests and grade them...how much annual training is needed
to do that?

> > 9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses,
Generals
> and
> > Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras become Fulls.
>
> Some existing Extras are already fulls. ;^)
>
> > 10) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to upgrade,
but
> > their time in existing classes counts.
> >
> > End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned as
a
> 21st
> > century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but meaningful steps
to
> reach
> > full privileges. Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set
> about
> > one S-unit apart. Current hams would be allowed to use the existing
power
> > levels so nobody loses privileges. There are only three license classes
> and
> > four written tests, so FCC doesn't have more work.
> >
> >

> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

4092. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 02:52:05 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <pVhH8.1051$UT.76176@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43410
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flame,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Not only could a good 6th grader out-insult you, it is directions on the
sole and a spigot in the heel.

BOOOOOOORRRRRRRRRRRRRRRING. and incompetant

"Doug" <doug322@texastradersorg.net> wrote in message
news:ack9b3$362$0@pita.alt.net...
> Not only could he not find his ass using both hands, but
> Woger would still not find his ass, even if given a map! In fact,
> Roger could not pour piss out of a boot if the directions were
> printed on the heel!
>
> doug
>

4093. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 03:13:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hdiH8.975$Wh5.39204167@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43412

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CEDA6A5.2AE5E4D2@att.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020523070242.16030.00000141@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > > From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> > >
> > > >But Ed, he's an old, pre-restructuring Extra.
> > >
> > > I think that just about ended the usefulness of this discussion.
> > >
> > > Do you see everything through the filter of amateur testing?
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > Yes. Either its relavent or its not.
>
> Either you're relavent or you're not. You're not.

It's not that easy, Dick. You, Bruce, and Larry really talk up this
"dumbing down" thing. Its time to pony up and show us something superior.

4094. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 03:16:30 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <igiH8.977$8f5.39030918@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43413

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ack9r1oap1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:J1dH8.2058$Sk7.59267368@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:9f4bfe89.0205231218.4b354d16@posting.google.com...
> > > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:<acaohj6a83@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> > > > ... because the current names of the license levels means absolutely
> > > > nothing. It shows no direction or ranking. Extra what anyways?
The
> > words
> > > > Novice License seems pretty clear, Technician is misleading, General
> > could
> > > > go a couple of ways. Advanced makes sense if the General class was
> the
> > > > starting point but I still think that some form of ranking in the
> > licensure
> > > > as far as the names of the different licenses go would be better. >
> > >
> > > OK, how about this:
> > >
> > > First off, S25.5 will probably be gone after WRC 2003, so we need to
> > > look beyond that. FCC will most probably drop code testing for HF/MF
> > > access as soon as S25.5 goes, too.
> >
> > But the FCC will continue to reference obsolete documents for decades to
> > come (re: morse code specification).
>
> What obsolete documents does the FCC reference now?
>
> Part 97 makes NO reference at all to S25.5 today. The FCC
> acknowledged the existence of S25.5 as the only justification
> to retain any code testing at all...BUT that isn't codified into
> the regulations.

Not in Part 97. Recall the thread where comm lawyer Phil couldn't produce
the ITU document that title 47 references for the specification of Morse
code?

4095. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 03:29:43 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <ackc1k$7uv$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43414
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Eduardo Hernandez" <Ehernandez@utinternetcommsorg.net> wrote in message
news:acj88togo0@pita.alt.net...
> Am getting my Toyota Land Cruiser ready for a month-long
> vacation in the outback. In your esteemed opinion, what would
> you recommend is the best all around mobile antenna on the market?
> We'll be traveling at interstate speeds, as well as 4-wheeling in the
> boondocks. My girlfriend is against having any weird looking
> antennas on the vehicle which draw attention to us, as she is sometimes
> recognized in public. She prefers as low a profile as possible, so what
> antenna would best fit all these requirements?
>
> Thanks es 73,
>
> Eduardo "Beans" Hernandez

Ed. Tho I have little experience with HF mobile antennas, I have read very
good reports about the Outbacker antenna. You might ask for input from
someone who has used it. I understand that grounding to the frame of your
Land Cruiser is very important as is grounding the hood as well.
Keep me up to date if you will.
Who knows? Maybe one day I will want to use my FT-847 as a mobile rig.
Arf!

4096. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 03:43:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEDB6EB.EC10351B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43415
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Arf! Arf!" wrote:
> Ed. Tho I have little experience with HF mobile antennas, I have read very
> good reports about the Outbacker antenna.

In a CA 75m mobile shootout, the Outbacker was 8.5 dB down from well-designed
bugcatchers and screwdrivers. For every 7 watts radiated by the bugcatchers
and screwdrivers, the Outbacker radiated one watt and dissipated six watts
as heat. How can that be called "good"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4097. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 03:52:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CEDB8E4.67733205@earthlink.net>
Source record: 43416

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CED1D46.C273A22B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I don't recall Dick making a claim to represent amateur radio. Both
> >Steve and Dick, unlike you, are licensed participants in amateur radio.
> >You continue to stand on the sidewalk advising the workmen on how to
> >assemble the building.
>
> Late but expected response. :-)
>
> Noooo...I'm the "building inspector" watching a lot of AMATEURS
> tossing together some gothic opinion architecture that doesn't
> stand up.

You aren't "the" or even "a" building inspector. You aren't anything to
amateur radio.

> You don't meet the right "code." YOUR building won't stand.

...thus speaks the sidewalk super.

Dave K8MN

4098. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 04:03:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CEDBB80.9D1B9CB9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 43417

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CED1D46.C273A22B@earthlink.net...
>
> > I don't recall Dick making a claim to represent amateur radio. Both
> > Steve and Dick, unlike you, are licensed participants in amateur radio.
> > You continue to stand on the sidewalk advising the workmen on how to
> > assemble the building.
>
> Welp Dave, if you PCTAs can rant and rave that Len cannot represent or even
> comment on amateur related issues, then it only stands to reason that only
> licensed individuals are capable.

Len has as much chance representing amateur radio as I have of
representing black women or as you have of representing the asphalt
industry.

> Now whether Dick claims to represent
> amateur radio or not, it becomes irrelevant. By virtue of holding a
> license he represents amateur radio.

Really? I'm not buying.

> Which way do you want it?

Neither.

Dave K8MN

4099. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 04:07:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524000750.11232.00000067@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 43418

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gwh90we.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>>> IIRC utility poles require a minimum of 20% of their length buried
>>> in most soils. It just depends on keeping the center of rotation
>>> below ground level.

Yup. The utilities have thoroughly researched the subject, too.

>>So Union Electric buries "masts" in soil and its good engineering practice,
>>but WD4XXX buries his tower base in soil and he's an idiot?
>
> Union Electric treats the pole with creosote to ward off bugs.

In some areas (Florida, for one), the utilities are using precast concrete
utility poles.

> The equivalent for steel, galvanizing, wouldn't last very long
> in dirt..

Yup.

> Anyone who would bury 20% of a steel tower is an idiot
> when the cost of a properly designed and poured concrete base is
> far less than the cost of a section of tower.

The performance will be better, too.
>
> And what building official would issue a permit for a steel tower
> buried in dirt?

Or asphalt.

There is another angle to this. Poorly engineered tower proposals
reflect badly on the ARS. Towers are a matter of public safety,
so a poorly engineered proposal (like using asphalt instead of
concrete) doesn't help the ARS one bit.

73 de Jim, N2EY

All the steel utility towers in the industry
> that I have ever seen in several countries are on concrete footings
> or pads for a reason.
>
>---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

>
>
>
>

4100. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 04:13:54 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <ackekk$dq5$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43419
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20020523173917.181$vZ@newsreader.com...
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
> >>The latest MURS rules changes now simply limit transmitter power
> > > output to 2W, and remove the old 2W ERP restriction:
> > >
> > > http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-02-139A1.doc
> > >
> > > This effectively raises the ERP limit to about 10W for omni base
> > > stations, and about 50W with a directional beam antenna.
> > >
> > > With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> > > Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
> > >
> > > Horseshoe7, Stewart, N0MHS
> > > http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN
> > >
> Can you say CB x 2..LOL
>
> --
> Go Sterling Marlin!

Not so! The Ham freqs. WILL continue to be relevant. Look for the CB'ers to get into these five freqs and ruin them. Two watts? Bah! Since when has a CB'er ever played by the rules? Look for them to buy Ham two meter rigs, modify the TX, buy an amplifier with five watts in, 100 out and modify it, too. They will ruin the MURS frequencies within five years. Mark my words. Remember when CB was licensed and limited to 4 watts? Good concept, but it was doomed for failure from the outset. The MURS frequencies will meet the same fate.
The MURS frequencies will soon be yet another cluster f*ck akin to the eleven meter band, and the FCC will have not the resources to police the miscreants. It will be interesting to see how much interference these "new" CB freqs. cause to the nationwide cable TV system, too.
It will only get worse as power contests, filthy language, arguments, malicious interference and general eleven meter intellect creates havoc on these five frequencies. Ol' Bubba with a cheap, ungrounded station and a gut full of Old Milwaukee is gonna have a ball!
Once the radio mfgrs. get up and running (making $$$) all Hell will break loose. I give it five years, tops, before the rabble rousers ruin it for all.
Gee...yet another FCC idea gone bad.
And the FCC wants to usurp some of OUR bands for commercial interests? This

makes you wonder who the Hell is watching the store, eh?

4101. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 04:17:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <e9jH8.70$3L6.5@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43420
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>

You fail to mention that FCC degraded MURS from Part 90 to the Part 95 (CB) category, removed some previously allowed modes, and specifically requires that the radios be certificated, thus blowing away your outlaw chant about using Yaesu VX-5R.

Bottom line, it's a 2W CB service, good for not much more than a local intercom service. Fine for some limited requirements, but hardly competition to the worldwide capabilities of even a very modest Amateur Radio station.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4102. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 04:41:20 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-a.r.f@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <4AE0BD34DE87A645.C84E30C6C92CA2A3.80C189D9FCF7E613@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43421
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Thu, 23 May 2002 23:13:54 -0500, "Arf! Arf!"
<DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote:

>Once the radio mfgrs. get up and running (making $$$) all Hell will break
>loose.

I'm not all that sure that they will; retail price for a decent VHF FM
HT, allowing for a reasonable profit, probably bottoms out around $30.
Retail for an FRS is around $30. Retail for a low-end CB is around
$50. Which will people want: 14 channels of burping cussing and farty
noises, 40 channels of burping cussing and farty noises, or 5 channels
of burping cussing and farty noises with the occasional Taco Cabana
drive-thru order on one of them?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4103. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 04:45:58 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.m@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <59216AA77429D028.4236CA15885DAD22.895F0DE9EE006D8B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43422
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 23 May 2002 22:43:39 -0500, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>In a CA 75m mobile shootout, the Outbacker was 8.5 dB down from well-designed
>bugcatchers and screwdrivers. For every 7 watts radiated by the bugcatchers
>and screwdrivers, the Outbacker radiated one watt and dissipated six watts
>as heat. How can that be called "good"?

Well, if you're cold...

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4104. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 04:50:03 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CEDA9E2.A7C57885@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43423
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flame,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Richard McCollum wrote:

>
> BOOOOOOORRRRRRRRRRRRRRRING. and incompetant

Then why do you keep reading the posts if you find them so
BOOOOOOOOORRRRRRRRRING?

4105. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 05:00:56 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CEDAC6F.DEF99687@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43424
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:

> With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> Radio just keeps getting less relevant.

But it won't take long for the cb types to turn MURS in another
sewer pit of radio communications.

4106. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 05:09:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524010926.15004.00000468@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43425

>Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/23/02 01:01 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020523010103.06451.00000024@mb-cm.aol.com>

>You did NOT "cite that one person," only Bob Wex.

Duh...Letting yor ignorance out for a stroll again, Lennie? Or is that out for a "troll"...???

>> Nope. Just still can't help but wonder how decrepit and lonely you
>must
>>be to sit in front of your pooter for hours drafting such dribble that does
>>nbothing more than make a fool out of yourself.
>
> :-)

It's good that you can laugh at yourself, Lennie. we've been laughing at you for a long time. Welcome aboard.

>Or, one can wave their AMATEUR
>license around like they are a superior being and pretend they know
>"all about radio."

Only you assert that you know "all about radio", Lennie. And as for my Amateur license, in matters pertaining to Amateur Radio practice and policy, I AM superior to you. By almost 30 years...

>It is still possible for a non-MD "health professional" to become a
>Medical Doctor before reaching 50. Difficult but not impossible.
>That way a claim of "saving lives" could be true instead of taking
>direction from others who are MDs.

Gee, Lennie, I have been awarded no less than four awards for lifesaving...two by the USMC and two by other agencies...for four different acts of same. In not one of them did I need ot confer with a physician. That does not include two pre-hospital deliveries I attended.

Sorry.

>Only if it serves your purpose in achieving (what you think) are
>message points in here.

You're the only "message point" collector, Lennie. It's your program, yet you've never laid out the points rules. And so far, you're not even doing too good in your own game!

4107. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 05:13:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524011322.15004.00000469@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43426

>Subject: Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/23/02 01:01 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020523010101.06451.00000022@mb-cm.aol.com>

>See communications by well-known 1x2s in here...namely K3LT,
>K4YZ, W0EX as the most prolific.

Or see the postings of the 0 x 0, Lennie the Loser, as he out-slanders the rest 10 to 1.

4108. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 05:16:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524011652.15004.00000470@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43427

>Subject: Re: Code Question
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/23/02 15:40 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020523154000.21464.00000202@mb-bj.aol.com>

>You don't meet the right "code." YOUR building won't stand.

It's been there since 1914, Lennie. Stood up pretty good, I'd say.

4109. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 05:22:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524012221.15004.00000471@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43428

>Subject: Re: Millihertz?
>From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 05/23/02 08:16 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3CECDD87.9FD47046@psu.edu>
>
> He's right, Steve. We don't use the term much in radio, but in biology,
>geology, and a few audio fields, the term millihertz is pretty common.

I will take your answer at face value, Mike, however I've been at this a few years now, and I have never seen the term "millihertz" used in any reference for biological monitoring applications.

The "ayes" having been said, I will stand corrected and apreciate the comments, but I would still appreciate some reference as to what application that it is used in "biology". It's not used in any common reference of cardiac monitoring that I am aware of.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4110. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 05:25:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524012502.15004.00000472@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43429

>Subject: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/23/02 17:35 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205231335.52663b3e@posting.google.com>

>
>With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
>Radio just keeps getting less relevant.

No, Stew, only YOU keep getting less relevent.

Once those 5 channels load up with QRM, it will be just like CB....A
kilowatt won't get you ehard across town.

4111. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 05:26:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524012645.15004.00000473@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43430

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-a.r.f@kd5nrh.net
>Date: 05/24/02 00:41 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id:
><4AE0BD34DE87A645.C84E30C6C92CA2A3.80C189D9FCF7E613@lp.airnews.net>

>Which will people want: 14 channels of burping cussing and farty
>noises, 40 channels of burping cussing and farty noises, or 5 channels
>of burping cussing and farty noises with the occasional Taco Cabana
>drive-thru order on one of them?

ROTMFFLMMFAO!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4112. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 06:07:30 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205240604400.12799-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43431
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 23 May 2002 Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>>>The latest MURS rules changes now simply limit transmitter ...
>Can you say CB x 2..LOL

Note that Stewart managed to not post on this topic for about a month. He should be given a medal, then shot, drawn, and quartered for the spammer that he truly is.

Now, go away, Mr. Teaze and go play with your toy radios.

4113. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 06:09:09 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205240608450.12799-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43432
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 24 May 2002, JJ wrote:
>stewart wrote:
>> With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
>> Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>
>But it won't take long for the cb types to turn MURS in another
>sewer pit of radio communications.

You mean with Stewart there, it isn't already?

4114. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 06:13:58 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205240609540.12799-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43433

On Thu, 23 May 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
>The prefix system used in science and technology permits use with any
>suffix. Thus things like Megahenry or Gigafarad are valid, though you're
>not likely to ever need to mention such quantities in ham radio. Or
>picohertz.
>
>Why does nobody ever say "Megameter" instead of "1000 Kilometers"?

Because Kilometer is analogous to a mile, and there is no special name for any quantity of miles. Too many English system users still alive.

Which would you rather say: 9,438 Terameters or 1 light-year?

4115. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 06:17:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205240615490.12799-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43434

On Thu, 23 May 2002, Phil Kane wrote:
>On Thu, 23 May 2002 22:17:30 GMT, KØHB wrote:
>>> What's the difference between a megaphone and a microphone?
>>
>>999,999.999999 Phones
>
> Close. The accepted answer is 10^12 <ggg>
>
> It would have been a giveaway had I said "the relationship
> vetween...."

Ah! Had that been a "true" amateur examination question, he would have only had to pick the correct answer. He had no choices to select from! :-)

"Difference" implies mathematical subtraction, not the ratio of values.

4116. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:20:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <RtoH8.1887$Ob3.95381596@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43435

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CEDA537.1F6A98E5@att.net...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On Thu, 23 May 2002 03:27:58 GMT, Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > >Well, my buddy KL0BM used to tell me, "Brian, life is like a $hit
sammich,
> > >the more bread you got, the less $hit you have to eat
>
> Wow! Freud would laugh himself silly, that from a ham with a callsign of
> KL0-'BM'!

And the "EX" ham.

4117. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:24:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <txoH8.1889$WE3.96611541@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43436

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CEDBB80.9D1B9CB9@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CED1D46.C273A22B@earthlink.net...
> >
> > > I don't recall Dick making a claim to represent amateur radio. Both
> > > Steve and Dick, unlike you, are licensed participants in amateur
radio.
> > > You continue to stand on the sidewalk advising the workmen on how to
> > > assemble the building.
> >
> > Welp Dave, if you PCTAs can rant and rave that Len cannot represent or
even
> > comment on amateur related issues, then it only stands to reason that
only
> > licensed individuals are capable.
>
> Len has as much chance representing amateur radio as I have of
> representing black women or as you have of representing the asphalt
> industry.
>
> > Now whether Dick claims to represent
> > amateur radio or not, it becomes irrelevant. By virtue of holding a
> > license he represents amateur radio.
>
> Really? I'm not buying.
>
> > Which way do you want it?
>
> Neither.
>
> Dave K8MN

Have you consulted Dick on this matter?

4118. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:31:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524063137.26572.00000483@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43437

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
>Radio just keeps getting less relevant.

Is that your explanation of why it continues to grow?

Why do you see doom and gloom for Amateur Radio everywhere you look?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4119. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:33:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524063335.26572.00000484@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43438

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>"Mind control?"

Those were the words Larry used.

Why the rant?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4120. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:35:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524063502.26572.00000485@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43439

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>And, why do you always "reply" with questions?

Why do you want to know? It seems to bother you and I am curious as to why something so innocuous as a mere question would be of concern.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4121. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:37:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524063706.21016.00000515@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43440

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Have you answered Brian's query as to whether or not he should
>write more slowly for better reading?

Why are you asking a question?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4122. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:37:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524063756.21016.00000516@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43441

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>But you've already directed me to do so. Now you give me your permission.
>You just gotta have total control over everything.

If you see it that way, I can't change you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4123. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:39:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524063908.21016.00000518@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43442

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> I never thought I would live to see the day when Brian proposed more code
>> testing in Amateur Radio. Who woulda' thunk it?

>Learning and testing are two completely different things, Ed. Better get
>with Rosalee and get some learning theory.

It was a joke, Brian. It was so obvious that I didn't think it needed a smiley.
I guess I underestimated your ability to see the obvious.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

4124. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:41:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524064109.21016.00000519@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43443

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

> At least if we are talking about the ARRL,
>this is a way we can actually get some activity out of the section
>titleholders.

All of the Section Managers I know work pretty hard. Why do you believe that
they do not do anything and are mere titleholders?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4125. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:42:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524064207.21016.00000521@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43444

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>I will be the first to admit that there is some great strengths and
>abilities I have within the hobby, and there are some weaknesses I would
>like to improve upon.

I agree.

What do you think the weaknesses are and what are you doing to improve upon
them?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4126. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:46:00 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acl6uq$6t5$2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 43448
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.doug-gerry,alt.flame,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Doug" <doug322@texastradersorg.net> wrote in message
news:ack9b3$362$0@pita.alt.net...
> Not

Doug regualrly finds his ass, however, he usually sits there masturbating to kiddie porn that his hard drive is full of, with his free hand jammed up his ass.

4127. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:46:42 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acl6ur$6t5$3@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 43449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.doug-smith,alt.flame,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:pVhH8.1051$UT.76176@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Not only could a good 6th grader out-insult you, it is directions on the
> sole and a spigot in the heel.
>
> BOOOOOOORRRRRRRRRRRRRRRING. and incompetant

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!

4128. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:47:36 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acl6us$6t5$4@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 43450
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.john-perry,alt.flame,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Jizzswallower J" <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> whined in message
news:3CEDA9E2.A7C57885@mailcity.net...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> >
> > BOOOOOOORRRRRRRRRRRRRRRING. and incompetant
>
> Then why do you keep reading the posts if you find them so
> BOOOOOOOOORRRRRRRRRING?

Why do you AIDS-boy?

4129. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:48:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524064812.21016.00000522@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43445

From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam

>There are areas of the country where baksheesh ("cost of doing
> business" payments to everyone from the delivery truck driver on up)
> is expected.

>Perhaps Brian lives in such an area - or has seen it referred to
> on TV.

I have seen some TV news stories about that sort of thing, too. They involved multi-million dollar deals, not some ham wanting to bribe the building inspector so he can put up a tower in asphalt or dirt instead of concrete. I would guess that most "bribable" building inspectors would decide that the risk of being found out, and possibly sued, when such an obvious blantant violation of good engineering practice failed outweighed the paltry bribe that such an "oversight" would fetch on the black market.

In summary, I doubt that any building inspector has been bribed to allow a ham tower to be installed in asphalt or dirt.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4130. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:50:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524065018.21016.00000523@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43446

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing
>done today does either.

My boss doesn't care nearly as much about what I did in the past as he cares about what I am doing right now. If I stopped doing things, the fact that I have done good things in the past would not matter at all.

Does that mean that the things I do today don't stand for anything?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4131. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 10:52:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524065210.21016.00000524@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43447

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>> If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing done today does
>either.

>I think this one gets posted on my office wall, Dick!! Do you want
>quote attributes? 8^)

Would that be like laying on the operating table just before brain surgery and seeing the surgeon wearing a button that says "It doesn't have to be perfect to be good?"

I do have a suggestion; if you put it up in your office, put it where your boss won't see it. :-)

73,
Ed, W1RFI

4132. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 11:21:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524072112.11232.00000073@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 43352

In article <3CED0C33.184C516B@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>>
>> > you've got the money to hire
>> >a contractor and to grease the building inspector's palm.
>>
>> I have never had to grease a palm in any of my dealings with local
>governments.
>> Have you, or is this just speculation that it would be "common" that hams
>have
>> to offer bribes to buidling inspectors to be able to put up towers?
>
>We're having a new kitchen done, and I did the wiring. The electrical
>inspector said it was good except I missed the green pigtail ground wires
>to tie the metal boxes to the safety ground on the outlets. Fail. So
>I put in the pigtails. Later that day the inspector squeezes in another
>visit,
>now I pass. No grease needed. Codes usually have good reasons behind
>them, I imagine that it has been found that the mounting screws to hold
>the outlets to the boxes are sometimes not adequate to pass 20 amps of
>short circuit to ground if that ever happens. So the pigtails do it.
>The cost of the pigtails was far lower than any bribe, and I wouldn't
>insult the inspector attempting a bribe anyway. And then there would
>be the jail aspect on top of that.

Most of what's in the National Electrical Code (NEC) is there because
somebody paid for it with their house - or their life. The pigtail thing is
there for just the reason you specify - mounting screws cannot be
depended on 100% for the safety ground connection.
>
>The FCC doesn't ask civil engineering questions on the ham tests, so
>we should not expect to know enough to successfully install a safe
>tower.

All we really need to know is that most of us don't know enough, so we
find someone who does know enough.

>If you want a tower, the permits and engineering costs are
>a part of the price.

I agree 100%. Proper maintenance and insurance, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4133. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 11:21:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524072113.11232.00000074@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 43351

In article <acgp8j4dit@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Guess the only solution is for me to move, but it is all I can afford at
>this time until things get better financially. Playing catch up on student
>loans and other debts takes a huge amount of my funds. Life's gonna suck
>for the next 3 years or so, but after that it will get better.... I hope.

Sorry to hear that, Ryan. Take heart - it DOES get better. First couple of
years after college were tough for me, too - ham radio for me was 2 meter
FM and building a rig for the day when I'd buy a house.

73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

4134. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 11:40:11 UTC
From: Eduardo Hernandez <EdH@HernandezConsultants31x.org>
Message-ID: <acl8n0$ao2$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 43353
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

Tnx for all the helpful info on mobile antennas, less the usual
tripe from AB8MQ in West Va.

Wogie, one day you may just find that you must get a job and
an education and work for the things you want in life, versus insulting
those who did.

Ed "Beans" Hernandez

4135. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 11:47:40 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wLpH8.1941$LC3.130352@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43354

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205240609540.12799-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Thu, 23 May 2002, Robert Casey wrote:
> >The prefix system used in science and technology permits use with any
> >suffix. Thus things like Megahenry or Gigafarad are valid, though
you're
> >not likely to ever need to mention such quantities in ham radio. Or
> >picohertz.
> >
> >Why does nobody ever say "Megameter" instead of "1000 Kilometers"?
>
> Because Kilometer is analogous to a mile, and there is no special name
for any
> quantity of miles. Too many English system users still alive.
>
> Which would you rather say: 9,438 Terameters or 1 light-year?
>

No one says Megagram either, it's a tonne. People who work for a living
will defeat the decimal fetishists every time.

4136. Re: Dayton reports??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 13:48:38 UTC
From: Jake Brodsky <frussle@erols.com>
Message-ID: <6efseu0qjrri707khrdejm564mvm4sp9bp@4ax.com>
Source record: 43355
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

On Wed, 22 May 2002 20:32:00 GMT, "Milt S" <msamiesnen@hotmail.com>
wrote:

>I've been to the old Cincy-hamfest of years past, darn shame as
>it was almost as big as the original Gaithersburg Md hamfest.
>Same thing happened to the hamfest up in Hamburg NY when it used
>to be held at the County fairgrounds. They moved it, now it's a
>mere shell of it's former self last I heard. Many more have just
>dissappeared without a trace.

Milt, the FAR hamfest moved from Gaithersburg to Bowie MD. It's still
pretty big.

>Cute gimick, but Motorola or Cobra has had a pair
>of waterproof "sport" FRS radios out for close to
>a Year now for $59.95 in a hanging blister-pack
>at WalMart last I looked.

I wouldn't call that a gimmick. That's something worth doing.

>I agree with you 100% on the re-packaging of gear.
>I'm one to peek "under the hood" of new radio gear
>myself. What's "behind" that graphics-filled LCD?

So, you care about such things. But then you continue...

>Yaesu does seem to be the leader in innovation and
>I would put Alinco in as a close second. Kenwood and
>Icom...?...booring! Just expensive bells and whistle
>gadgets in cheap sheet steel boxes. Looking at the electronics
>inside of your average Icom and kenwood reminds me of
>the insides of a Korean VCR that you can get for $65.00
>at Circuit City. (and they REALLY pay 2-3 grand for
>some of this stuff...??!! rotflmao!)
>Yaesu and Alinco are mostly newer design
>SMT with clean layouts and by far a better
>value - Alinco I feel has the best dollar per
>radio value going.

Frankly, I think you're rant lacks basis. Kenwood, Yaesu, and Icom
have been leapfrogging each others achievements for years. To say
that the other's stuff is suddenly "boring" says very little about
what's coming.

In my personal opinion, they're all garbage next to the likes of the Elecraft K2. That's a REAL radio.

>Sad news on Ten-Tec. The Orion shoud be called the Onion.
>Looks like it came off the prototype workbench in the
>Engineering lab - with all the bugs still inside. (?)
>Iam afraid Ten-Tec will be gone by this time next year.
>They used to build great rigs in the late 70's and 80's.
>Easy to work on with readily available replacement parts you
>could get from Digi-key and Mouser electronics if
>needs be. Now their overpricing themselves out of the
>market. What Ten-Tec *needs* to do is return to their roots
>and build rigs like the Triton and Omni-D series again.
>Functional and utilitiarian radio gear that is easy
>to operate, maintain, and has minimal gimicky bells
>and whistles. Stop trying to mimic the Japs, dump all
>this digital pushbutton crap, except for the freq
>display, and put more single-function standard type
>controls. The Omni-D (..of which I own 2 of) are a
>great example. The Paragon was perhaps the best radio
>to ever come out of Tenn.

I have one of those "great rigs" from Ten Tec and the 1970s. The dynamic range was awful, the packaging was flimsy, and the radio itself was hardly a model of stability. This digital push button stuff is the future for mass produced radios. It's cheaper, more stable, and it frankly performs better than most mass produced analog gear.

Yes, you could build an analog radio with better overall performance than a lot of this new digital stuff. But you'd have to invest a lot of careful component selection and tweaking to get it running. And that would cost more, *much* more than you'd be willing to pay.

While criticism of a radio's performance/price ratio is valid, your notions of what's a good construction technique or design choices is pointless. Try building a few radios of your own before spewing this nonsense about other manufacturer's choices.

>I could not agree with you more strongly on the "trinket vendors"!
>If I am going to PAY an admission fee to a flea market (which is
>what Hamvention really is folks!) then I had better see stuff for
>sale that I DO NOT SEE at the local every-weekend flea market
>just down the road, where the admission and parking is free!!

Then don't spend any time or money on them. They'll get the idea and not return. The problem I have with your approach is that determining this sort of thing up front is fraught with problems and potential law suits. Your definition of what a "trinket vendor" is happens to be a judgement call.

>I've never been back to the hamfests that let these
>turkeys into their flea market and I never will.

Good bye.

>I could not make Dayton, and I really hope that
>it is not turning into another consumer
>products junk market dumping ground! It's bad
>enough with all the computer related crap.
>All that needs to happen is for somebody in an
>overloaded mini-van to show up and be allowed to
>start selling cheap imported wristwatches
>on rubber banded styrofoam display cases, and you can
>then kiss the Hamvention goodbye. (please someone
>tell me these wristwatch-dealers did not show up and
>were allowed to set up and sell like they did
>someplace in NC last year!)

What's it to you? If you're offended, don't go. Did you buy any antique radio gear? Were you offended that they were there, even though we're talking about old radios which were left over consumer items from the 1920s and 1930s? Get over it.

If you don't support a hamfest by attending one, then, well, there's always E-Bay. Don't like them? Gee, Mr. Grouch, what do you like? This rant is like cursing at the weather. Grow up.

73,

Jake Brodsky, AB3A mailto:frussle@erols.com
"Beware of the massive impossible!"

4137. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 14:52:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <tssH8.615$AF3.338@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43356

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> I would still appreciate some reference as to what application
> that it is used in "biology".

Following quote from a white paper about determining the gestational age of
an unborn child....

"Fetal heart tones -- first detected by Doppler at 10 to 12
weeks (be sure you have a 3-millihertz Doppler; the
2-millihertz Doppler will not pick up the FHT as early),
fetoscope at 18 to 20 weeks."

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4138. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 14:55:39 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <LvsH8.1655$UT.135104@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43357

Richard McCollum wrote:

> Life would be a lot simpler if we had
> been born with 12 fingers and toes.

8 or 16 would be better - that would
make powers-of-two more intuitive.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net

4139. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 15:16:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEE594E.3505DA8D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43358

K7JEB wrote:
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Life would be a lot simpler if we had
> > been born with 12 fingers and toes.
>
> 8 or 16 would be better - that would
> make powers-of-two more intuitive.

Why didn't God tell our ancestors not to use
thumbs for counting?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4140. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 15:45:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEE5FD5.B903A17D@att.net>
Source record: 43359

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >But you've already directed me to do so. Now you give me your permission.
> >You just gotta have total control over everything.
>
> If you see it that way, I can't change you.

Poor Gadfly can't change himself.

4141. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 15:47:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEE6067.EF4C0539@att.net>
Source record: 43360

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing
> >done today does either.
>
> My boss doesn't care nearly as much about what I did in the past as he cares
> about what I am doing right now. If I stopped doing things, the fact that I
> have done good things in the past would not matter at all.
>
> Does that mean that the things I do today don't stand for anything?
>

So ask that question again tomorrow and the answer will be obvious.

4142. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 15:50:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEE6115.96609CDD@att.net>
Source record: 43361

W1RFI wrote:

> From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> >> If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing done today does
> >either.
>
> >I think this one gets posted on my office wall, Dick!! Do you want
> >quote attributes? 8^)
>
> Would that be like laying on the operating table just before brain surgery and
> seeing the surgeon wearing a button that says "It doesn't have to be perfect to
> be good?"
>
> I do have a suggestion; if you put it up in your office, put it where your boss
> won't see it. :-)

You are really doing a lot to clear up questions about how things are viewed at HQ, Ed. If the past no longer matters, and only what is done today, why not just come out and say so? At least there would no longer be any question about how decisions are made there.

4143. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 15:58:34 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <KqtH8.1751$UT.141059@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43362

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:LvsH8.1655$UT.135104@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > Life would be a lot simpler if we had
> > been born with 12 fingers and toes.
>
> 8 or 16 would be better - that would
> make powers-of-two more intuitive.
>
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
>
>

If powers of 2 were of interest, yes. Bi-Quinary is cool for abaci and
French Acadamicians. But there is something to be said for 3x4, not to
mention 3x4x5, and the ever-popular 3x4x5x6 to get 360 degrees. It's just
the Sumarian in my soul. :-)
>

4144. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 16:41:11 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CEE508A.B7BA39EA@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43363
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.woger-wiseman,alt.flame,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

2test AB8ManyQueers wrote:

> > Then why do you keep reading the posts if you find them so
> > BOOOOOOOOORRRRRRRRRING?
>
> Why do you AIDS-boy?

Where did I say I find the post boring, wogie? I read them because
I like to see you get spanked every time you open your sewer
mouth.

4145. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 16:58:11 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205240858.46173c47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43364
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<e9jH8.70$3L6.5@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

> You fail to mention that FCC degraded MURS from Part 90 to the Part 95 (CB)
> category, removed some previously allowed modes, and specifically requires
> that the radios be certificated, thus blowing away your outlaw chant about
> using Yaesu VX-5R.

However, the restrictions on what types of pre-5/2002 Part 90
certificated radios will be allowed on MURS has been greatly reduced.
Now, most any 2W-under Part 90 radio will be allowed. Along with the
2W Transmitter Output clarification, this was the most important part
of the ruling, as there was great confusion as to what was legal.

> Bottom line, it's a 2W CB service, good for not much more than a local
> intercom service. Fine for some limited requirements, but hardly
> competition to the worldwide capabilities of even a very modest Amateur
> Radio station.

The capabilities of a well built MURS station can now compete with
those of a Technician Class station. Furthermore, MURS users have
certain privileges that Amateurs don't... for example, MURS users can
do business, or download short e-mails of any type of content to their
Mobile PDAs from Internet gateways.

The fact stands - MURS has been made a more capable service, and now
offers capabilities and privileges on the order of those of the
Amateur Technician Class license.

4146. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 17:03:37 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205240903.bf1c8fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43365
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.44.0205240604400.12799-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>...

> Now, go away, Mr. Teaze and go play with your toy radios.

What's wrong with that?

Anyway, the fact is, these radios have far better receiver specs than
do most amateur radios.

So, if you're gonna play - why not play with the best?

- Stewart, N0MHS

4147. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 17:15:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEE754E.AA2C1EF1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43366

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If the past no longer matters, and only what is done today, why not just
> come out and say so?

Because some things done in the past do matter. However, barely
passing a minimum requirements ham radio exam is not one of them.
I'm sorry you place so much significance on achieving a passing
grade on a minimum requirements ham radio exam decades ago. I
don't consider it much of an accomplishment for myself. Why should
I consider it much of an accomplishment for you?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4148. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 17:38:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43367
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> The fact stands - MURS ..... now offers capabilities and privileges
> on the order of those of the Amateur Technician Class license.
>

Not even close to being comparable.

MURS -- 5 specific frequencies, less than 100 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
Tech -- Millions of frequencies 23,962,000 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
Advantage Tech 239,620-to-1

MURS -- One band
Tech -- Seventeen bands
Advantage Tech 17-to-1

MURS -- 2W output
Tech -- 1500W output
Advantage Tech 750-to-1

MURS -- Antenna height 20'
Tech -- No antenna height restriction.
Advantage -- Tech

MURS -- FCC certificated radios only. Modifications illegal.
Tech -- Free to use any purchased, homebrewed, or modified radio without FCC
certification.
Advantage -- Tech

MURS -- Operation restricted by US borders.
Tech -- Reciprocal operating agreements with nations all around the globe.
Advantage -- Tech

I could go on and on, but I'm sure you're getting the picture!

Comparing MURS to even the lowest privileged Amateur Radio license is like
comparing a tricycle to a Lamborghini, and the comparison suffers even worse
when you compare MURS to a General or Extra class Amateur Radio license.

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4149. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 17:55:29 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CEE61F5.B65AA908@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43368
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:

>
> The capabilities of a well built MURS station can now compete with
> those of a Technician Class station.

That is an over statement if I ever saw one. MURS can no way
compete with any part of ham radio, even Tech class stations.

> Furthermore, MURS users have
> certain privileges that Amateurs don't... for example, MURS users can
> do business, or download short e-mails of any type of content to their
> Mobile PDAs from Internet gateways.

Big deal, there are cell phones for business and internet for
e-mails.

>
> The fact stands - MURS has been made a more capable service, and now
> offers capabilities and privileges on the order of those of the
> Amateur Technician Class license.

Really, how many frequencies for MURS as compared to those
available for Tech class licensees? Compare the power levels
allowed by MURS as allowed for Tech Class. You must be dreaming.

4150. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 17:57:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CEE7F17.53C566F0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43369
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:

> The latest MURS rules changes now simply limit transmitter power
> output to 2W, and remove the old 2W ERP restriction:
>
> http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-02-139A1.doc
>
> This effectively raises the ERP limit to about 10W for omni base
> stations, and about 50W with a directional beam antenna.
>
> With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>

True if all you want to do is this one thing. But what other license is
there
that lets you use various different modes in various different kinds of
bands? I could drive home with the 2m rig in the car, and once I'm
home I can work some DX on HF with CW or SSB or amtor or such.

4151. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 17:58:34 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205240958.50295699@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43370
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message news:<ackekk$dq5$0@pita.alt.net>...

This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
wrong. The reason that folks on 11m went to amplifiers was because it
actually helps them increase their communications range - the fact
that they interfere with others when the skip is out is simply a
side-effect. With no skip, there is no incentive to go with
exceedingly higher power in the first place, because it serves
virtually no useful purpose on VHF/UHF.

So - you're going to have to come up with a better argument, this one
just doesn't wash any longer. Thankfully the FCC has figured this
out... too bad many hams haven't.

Stewart - N0MHS

> Not so! The Ham freqs. WILL continue to be relevant. Look for the CB'ers to
> get into these five freqs and ruin them. Two watts? Bah! Since when has a
> CB'er ever played by the rules? Look for them to buy Ham two meter rigs,
> modify the TX, buy an amplifier with five watts in, 100 out and modify it,
> too. They will ruin the MURS frequencies within five years. Mark my words.
> Remember when CB was licensed and limited to 4 watts? Good concept, but it
> was doomed for failure from the outset. The MURS frequencies will meet the
> same fate.
> The MURS frequencies will soon be yet another cluster f*ck akin to the
> eleven meter band, and the FCC will have not the resources to police the
> miscreants. It will be interesting to see how much interference these "new"
> CB freqs. cause to the nationwide cable TV system, too.
> It will only get worse as power contests, filthy language, arguments,
> malicious interference and general eleven meter intellect creates havoc on
> these five frequencies. Ol' Bubba with a cheap, ungrounded station and a gut
> full of Old Milwaukee is gonna have a ball!
> Once the radio mfgrs. get up and running (making $$$) all Hell will break
> loose. I give it five years, tops, before the rabble rousers ruin it for
> all.
> Gee...yet another FCC idea gone bad.
> And the FCC wants to usurp some of OUR bands for commercial interests? This
> makes you wonder who the Hell is watching the store, eh?

4152. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 18:08:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CEE81A5.CFADDD1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43371
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

>
>
> MURS -- Operation restricted by US borders.
> Tech -- Reciprocal operating agreements with nations all around the globe.
> Advantage -- Tech
>
> I could go on and on, but I'm sure you're getting the picture!
>
> Comparing MURS to even the lowest privileged Amateur Radio license is like
> comparing a tricycle to a Lamborghini, and the comparison suffers even worse
> when you compare MURS to a General or Extra class Amateur Radio license.
>

There's the "no business" rule for ham radio. Which is actually an
advantage for hams in that we don't get invaded with business comms
eating up all or bandwidth. Lawsuits over QRM, etc.....

4153. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 18:20:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwmfw8l.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43372

On 24 May 2002 10:33:35 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>>"Mind control?"
>
>Those were the words Larry used.
>
>Why the rant?

Many years ago someone came into the offce to complain about how he
was being ripped off by Silver Mind Control. We all thought that he
was a loonie-=toon and treated him as such, until one of our guys
recognized the name and found out that yes, the telephone directory
listed a Silva Mind Control, and yes, it was a more-or-less legitimate
business (self-improvement school).

To paraphrase the Capital-One TV ad - who's controlling YOUR mind ??

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4154. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 18:30:45 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <c3b5c1bba90f401df8f3e8b2a2659476.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43373
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Heheheh ... sure .... <chuckle chuckle>
Um, what makes you think one can't do e-mail with amateur radio?
Of course, there is fast-scan television (regular tv) as well as slow scan tv. Uhhhh ... I sometimes take my HT (walkie talkie) to work to use during lunch. I've chatted with Australia, England, and other parts of the world ... no, not using internet linking - all rf path. This was with 6 double a alkaline batteries on FM (voice). I've had folks argue that one can't cut through one of those alleged 70,000 watt shoot-out stations. Can't fight the carrier. Hmmmm ... only need to be a short way off the carrier. There are modes that can be copied some 30 dB BELOW the noise level. 50 Hz bandwidths and less (another 20 dB gain). Actually, it should be possible to cut throught that 70,000 watt am signal with 100 watts (properly done, of course). Oh .. internet .. yep, can do that too ... but tell me how you work Australia all rf path on 6 double a alkalines ... with a walkie-talkie .... running all of 4 watts .... into a whip ... and that only requires a tech license. What happens if you have your extra?

BWAaaaaHAHAHAHAHA

try again from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

ps although business use is not what amateur radio is all about, what is it that makes me think that business use is not at all on your mind?

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205240858.46173c47@posting.google.com

> "K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<e9jH8.70$3L6.5@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> > "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > You fail to mention that FCC degraded MURS from Part 90 to the Part 95 (CB)
> > category, removed some previously allowed modes, and specifically requires
> > that the radios be certificated, thus blowing away your outlaw chant about
> > using Yaesu VX-5R.
>
> However, the restrictions on what types of pre-5/2002 Part 90
> certificated radios will be allowed on MURS has been greatly reduced.
> Now, most any 2W-under Part 90 radio will be allowed. Along with the
> 2W Transmitter Output clarification, this was the most important part
> of the ruling, as there was great confusion as to what was legal.
>
> > Bottom line, it's a 2W CB service, good for not much more than a local

> > intercom service. Fine for some limited requirements, but hardly
> > competition to the worldwide capabilities of even a very modest Amateur
> > Radio station.
>
> The capabilities of a well built MURS station can now compete with
> those of a Technician Class station. Furthermore, MURS users have
> certain privileges that Amateurs don't... for example, MURS users can
> do business, or download short e-mails of any type of content to their
> Mobile PDAs from Internet gateways.
>
> The fact stands - MURS has been made a more capable service, and now
> offers capabilities and privileges on the order of those of the
> Amateur Technician Class license.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4155. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 18:42:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <acm1ol$6da$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43374

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:igiH8.977$8f5.39030918@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ack9r1oap1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> > news:J1dH8.2058$Sk7.59267368@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:9f4bfe89.0205231218.4b354d16@posting.google.com...
> > > > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > > news:<acaohj6a83@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> > > > > ... because the current names of the license levels means
absolutely
> > > > > nothing. It shows no direction or ranking. Extra what anyways?
> The
> > > words
> > > > > Novice License seems pretty clear, Technician is misleading,
General
> > > could
> > > > > go a couple of ways. Advanced makes sense if the General class
was
> > the
> > > > > starting point but I still think that some form of ranking in the
> > > licensure
> > > > > as far as the names of the different licenses go would be better.
>
> > > >
> > > > OK, how about this:
> > > >
> > > > First off, S25.5 will probably be gone after WRC 2003, so we need to
> > > > look beyond that. FCC will most probably drop code testing for HF/MF
> > > > access as soon as S25.5 goes, too.
> > >
> > > But the FCC will continue to reference obsolete documents for decades
to
> > > come (re: morse code specification).
> >
> > What obsolete documents does the FCC reference now?
> >
> > Part 97 makes NO reference at all to S25.5 today. The FCC
> > acknowledged the existence of S25.5 as the only justification
> > to retain any code testing at all...BUT that isn't codified into

> > the regulations.
>
> Not in Part 97. Recall the thread where comm lawyer Phil couldn't produce
> the ITU document that title 47 references for the specification of Morse
> code?

OK. And even if he could, that document would
not be a reference for Part 97 requirements. If it was in
any way applicable we'd have heard that a long time ago.

Suffice to say that for amateur regs and S25.5 in particular
there are NO standards specifically identified for morse code
specifications.

That's IMHO.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

On Memorial Day, Please remember....
those that gave their lives so we can enjoy
the freedom to agree, disagree and debate as we
do in this forum.

4156. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 18:52:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <acm2ajeck1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43375

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020524065018.21016.00000523@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing
> >done today does either.
>
> My boss doesn't care nearly as much about what I did in the past as he
cares
> about what I am doing right now. If I stopped doing things, the fact that
I
> have done good things in the past would not matter at all.

Exactly, and all those alphabet soup identifiers (PHD, MA, BA, BS, etc.)
mean nothing once you are inside the organization. It may garner
"some" credibility points in an industry forum meeting, symposium
or whatever, but neither I nor any of my people are evaluated on the
degrees or licenses they hold. Heck, when was the last
time anyone gave a damn about your grade-point in college?

> Does that mean that the things I do today don't stand for anything?

The things you do today are pretty much all that counts
in industry. You might get by with a slack year of
accomplishments because you have had a long track
record of being a positive contributor, but that can't and
shouldn't last very long if your current job performance
doesn't meet a satisfactory level.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4157. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 18:52:06 UTC
From: Roger Conroy <rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <acm2ob$11e$1@ctb-nnrp1.saix.net>
Source record: 43377
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I agree - lets see a MURS operator do a moonbounce!!!!! Then we'll start
taking comparisons seriously.
73
Roger ZR1RC

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > The fact stands - MURS ..... now offers capabilities and privileges
> > on the order of those of the Amateur Technician Class license.
> >
>
> Not even close to being comparable.
>
> MURS -- 5 specific frequencies, less than 100 Kilohertz of total
bandwidth.
> Tech -- Millions of frequencies 23,962,000 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
> Advantage Tech 239,620-to-1
>
> MURS -- One band
> Tech -- Seventeen bands
> Advantage Tech 17-to-1
>
> MURS -- 2W output
> Tech -- 1500W output
> Advantage Tech 750-to-1
>
> MURS -- Antenna height 20'
> Tech -- No antenna height restriction.
> Advantage -- Tech
>
> MURS -- FCC certificated radios only. Modifications illegal.
> Tech -- Free to use any purchased, homebrewed, or modified radio without
FCC
> certification.
> Advantage -- Tech
>
> MURS -- Operation restricted by US borders.
> Tech -- Reciprocal operating agreements with nations all around the globe.
> Advantage -- Tech

>
> I could go on and on, but I'm sure you're getting the picture!
>
> Comparing MURS to even the lowest privileged Amateur Radio license is like
> comparing a tricycle to a Lamborghini, and the comparison suffers even
worse
> when you compare MURS to a General or Extra class Amateur Radio license.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> ��� SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

4158. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 18:54:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <acm2fvfgr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43376

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020524011652.15004.00000470@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Code Question
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 05/23/02 15:40 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020523154000.21464.00000202@mb-bj.aol.com>
>
> >You don't meet the right "code." YOUR building won't stand.
>
> It's been there since 1914, Lennie. Stood up pretty good, I'd say.

Gee, and there are all those buildings, castles, and other
structures built in Europe that were constructed
without the aid of "building codes". Guess they didn't
know that they should have followed some code.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4159. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 19:21:24 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acm5bgelj0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.eduardo-hernandez

"Ed-dildo Hernandez" <EdH@HernandezConsultants31x.org> whined in message news:acl8n0$ao2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> Tnx for all the helpful info on mobile antennas, [whine]

Ed-dildo, doesn't it just gall you that you have to work that pizza delivery job, knowing how unskilled and unemployable a product of two drug addicts like you are?

Besides, the last mobile antenna you "acquired" was from you stealing it off another ham's car.

Perhaps if you had some balls, and posted under your real name, you might have some credibility. Does your fat hog wife still work a the cosmetics counter, she does look like Fat "Mimi" from the "Drew Carey Show."

4160. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 19:22:27 UTC
From: randy_NO_SPAM_PLEASE_@frs-usa.com
Message-ID: <b03b87e2.0205241122.5e74af4a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43378
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message news:<ackekk$dq5>
> Not so! The Ham freqs. WILL continue to be relevant. Look for the CB'ers to
> get into these five freqs and ruin them. Two watts? Bah! Since when has a
> CB'er ever played by the rules? Look for them to buy Ham two meter rigs,
> modify the TX, buy an amplifier with five watts in, 100 out and modify it,
> too. They will ruin the MURS frequencies within five years. Mark my words.
> Remember when CB was licensed and limited to 4 watts? Good concept, but it
> was doomed for failure from the outset. The MURS frequencies will meet the
> same fate.

You're right on the money! I said this long ago. The MURS will be
adopted by the truckers and you can bet your bottom dollar that all 5
MURS frequencies will sound like CB Ch. 19.

Randy
http://www.frs-usa.com

4161. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 20:09:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205241209.6bdb9243@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43380

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CED33E8.6C45F5DF@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > The behavior of some people on the internet disproves the idea that it is
> > somehow difficult to cuss or be insulting using nonvoice modes.
>
> Since netnews is not real time, a posting can be composed and edited to
> achieve any desired level of emotionalism.

That's true. However, "emotionalism" and cussing/insulting are not the same
thing.

> If a poster's hands are shaking
> with emotion to the extent that he cannot type, he can wait a few minutes
> until his hands quit shaking.

That's true. But it is quite obvious that many people are able to type
cusses, insults and other objectionable stuff.

> One cannot do that with real time CW.

That's true.

> Real time emotional outbursts and CW are simply incompatible.

Not true. Not everyone is affected by "emotionalism" in the same way.
>
> Extreme emotionalism is also incompatible with real time keyboard modes.

Yet people manage to type all kids of stuff.

> The
> only reason that extreme emotionalism can be accomplished on a newsgroup is
> that the newsgroup is NOT real time and a poster can wait for the physical
> manifestations of extreme emotions to subside.

Some people post in real-time.
>
> > The main reason hams are so well-behaved on CW is not primarily due to the
> > mode itself.
>
> See above. Extreme emotionalism and real time CW are virtually impossible
> to accomplish at the same time.

"Extreme emotionalism" and bad on-air behavior are not the same thing.

In addition, the "extreme emotionalism" reactions would have to happen
when the person is sending.

Some people manage to behave very badly using voice modes, too.

An interesting hypothesis, Cecil, but it has no basis in fact. The main reason hams are so well-behaved on CW is not primarily due to the mode itself. It's due to the culture and tradition of behavior that is part and parcel of CW operation. That culture and tradition deserves to be preserved. Some of us are busy preserving it by using CW as much as possible, and helping/encouraging others to do so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4162. Re: Important information regarding your usenet service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 20:37:08 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CEEA474.59B34BD5@psu.edu>
Source record: 43381

I've seen it all now! ATnT spams usenet! This message is in every group
I subscribe to. Sheesh.

-Mike KB3EIA -

customer.support@broadband.att.com wrote:
>
> On June 6th, 2002 AT&T Broadband will restructure the configuration of the
> servers, which provide access to Usenet newsgroups.
>
> As a result, you will need to update your newsgroup settings. If you fail to
> update your settings will be unable to download new messages, post new messages
> or post replies to existing messages to newsgroups.

4163. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 20:44:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEEA5E9.7754F212@att.net>
Source record: 43382

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If the past no longer matters, and only what is done today, why not just
> > come out and say so?
>
> Because some things done in the past do matter. However, barely
> passing a minimum requirements ham radio exam is not one of them.

Get it right- the extra class exam was not a minimum requirements ham radio exam, it was a rather comprehensive test.

>
> I'm sorry you place so much significance on achieving a passing
> grade on a minimum requirements ham radio exam decades ago.

I'm sorry you're so dense you fail to understand anything about the subject. Particularly that it wasn't the passing of a test that was NOT a minimum requirements test, rather the most extensive test available. Rather than merely "passing a minimal test" it was what was learned and accomplished enroute to that test that matters. I know, today virtually no learning is necessary. Maybe that's why you only recently made it.

> I
> don't consider it much of an accomplishment for myself.

Of course not, your Extra Lite means little to you or anyone else.

> Why should
> I consider it much of an accomplishment for you?

You sure are anxious to spend a lot of your time discussing it, particularly in your repeated assertions that it was a "minimum requirements" test. Could it be that you don't say what you really believe? Surely not!

4164. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 20:45:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <acm8os$73o$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43383
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Not really...it means we can get rid of those that want to order a pizza via the autopatch, those that have no idea at all what ham radio is supposed to be, and maybe we could use some thinning out and getting back to basic. Then maybe the un-informed crabbing about what the 'service' is all about will stop because those that are left will actually have read part 97.

Dan/W4NTI

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:5f4fe4c2.0205231335.52663b3e@posting.google.com...

> With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>
>
> Horseshoe7, Stewart, N0MHS
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

4165. Re: How come you guys aren't at Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 21:06:05 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <1XxH8.1222$3L6.142@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43384

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote

> I was referring to the local level, possibly having a regional arrangement
> within the states to do this. At least if we are talking about the ARRL,
> this is a way we can actually get some activity out of the section
> titleholders.

In my area the hardest working hams are the "titleholders". In the case of our SM, KM0D, SEC, N0ZOD, and STM, W0LAW, I know of no hams who contribute more time and energy to the PICON than that trio. We have guys like that to thank for the huge success of Amateur Radio as a force for public good during times like the recovery from recent disastrous floods and tornados in our area.

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4166. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 21:09:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <r_xH8.2785$fa4.77000830@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43385

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020524063908.21016.00000518@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> I never thought I would live to see the day when Brian proposed more
code
> >> testing in Amateur Radio. Who woulda' thunk it?
>
> >Learning and testing are two completely different things, Ed. Better get
> >with Rosalee and get some learning theory.
>
> It was a joke, Brian. It was so obvious that I didn't think it needed a
smiley.
> I guess I underestimated your ability to see the obvious.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, you've been on here too long. You're starting to get the same crappy
attitude as everyone else.

4167. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 21:15:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <84yH8.2788$d64.76759177@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43386

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:acm1ol$6da$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...

> OK. And even if he could, that document would
> not be a reference for Part 97 requirements. If it was in
> any way applicable we'd have heard that a long time ago.
>
> Suffice to say that for amateur regs and S25.5 in particular
> there are NO standards specifically identified for morse code
> specifications.

Part 97 requires a Morse Code test for several of the licenses. Part 97
doesn't say what Morse Code is.

4168. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 21:29:48 UTC
From: "Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.net>
Message-ID: <3CEEB0D7.7030405@dioxine.net>
Source record: 43387
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

All this talk about MURS, like it has anything to do
with what most people consider amateur radio! Amateur
radio is much more than simply transmitting and
receiving. Heavens!

If I need convenient, reliable communications with
other people, I use a cell phone. Sure, under
extraordinary circumstances, amateur radio may be
more reliable, but 99.9% of the time, I'm
way better off with my cell phone than my ham radio.

Dana K6JQ
k6jq@arrl.net

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> Not really...it means we can get rid of those that want to order a pizza via
> the autopatch, those that have no idea at all what ham radio is supposed to
> be, and maybe we could use some thinning out and getting back
> to basic. Then maybe the un-informed crabbing about what the 'service' is
> all about will stop because those that are left will actually have read part
> 97.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5f4fe4c2.0205231335.52663b3e@posting.google.com...
>
>
>>With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
>>Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>>
>>
>>Horseshoe7, Stewart, N0MHS
>>http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN
>
>
>

4169. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 21:35:38 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205242134370.13110-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43388
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 24 May 2002, stewart wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.44.0205240604400.12799-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>...
>
>> Now, go away, Mr. Teaze and go play with your toy radios.
>
>What's wrong with that?
>
>Anyway, the fact is, these radios have far better receiver specs than
>do most amateur radios.
>
>So, if you're gonna play - why not play with the best?

...But as NON-AMATEUR radios, this crap has no reason being on the amateur
newsgroups. (I will let the crossposted groups' readers for other services
make their own objections).

4170. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 21:40:11 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205242136410.13110-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43389
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 24 May 2002, KØHB wrote:
>Not even close to being comparable. ....
>
>Comparing MURS to even the lowest privileged Amateur Radio license is like
>comparing a tricycle to a Lamborghini, and the comparison suffers even worse
>when you compare MURS to a General or Extra class Amateur Radio license.

With the standards Hans used, MURS even is disavantaged as compared to CB class D (27MHz)! However, for that mode, the only advantage is more latitude on signal content (digital is allowed).

Now that we've established that it's worse than CB, you really need to go back to that dream you call life and tell yourself that everything will be OK, even after the labatomy.

4171. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 21:52:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CCyH8.2795$yh4.77448474@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43390

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:acm2fvfgr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020524011652.15004.00000470@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: Code Question
> > >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > >Date: 05/23/02 15:40 Eastern Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <20020523154000.21464.00000202@mb-bj.aol.com>
> >
> > >You don't meet the right "code." YOUR building won't stand.
> >
> > It's been there since 1914, Lennie. Stood up pretty good, I'd say.
>
> Gee, and there are all those buildings, castles, and other
> structures built in Europe that were constructed
> without the aid of "building codes". Guess they didn't
> know that they should have followed some code.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

If I went to buy one I would insist they bring it up to code.

4172. Re: Millihertz?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 21:57:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205242147310.13110-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43391

On Fri, 24 May 2002, K7JEB wrote:
>Richard McCollum wrote:
>
>> Life would be a lot simpler if we had
>> been born with 12 fingers and toes.
>
>8 or 16 would be better - that would
>make powers-of-two more intuitive.

But with 12, one can count by 2' or by 3's.

30 is the lowest "simplist" number, with factors 2, 3, and 5. Counting is then intuitive by 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 15. [primes skipped are 7, 11, and 13, any of their multiples, plus 4, 8, 9, and 12.]

4173. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:15:31 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3ceeb3fb.1153150@news.cet.com>
Source record: 43392
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <5f4fe4c2.0205240958.50295699@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message
news:<ackekk$dq5$0@pita.alt.net>...
>
>This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
>will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
>become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
>wrong. The reason that folks on 11m went to amplifiers was because it
>actually helps them increase their communications range

That's a load of horseshit that a vulture wouldn't touch. You can't
work what you can't hear, and the only way to find a signal near the
noise floor is to improve your antenna. Even if the "other guy" gets a
linear, you still have limited range because of the crappy propagation
of the band. The only reason people buy linears is because of the
king-of-the-hill mentality that most of us abandoned after grade
school.

> - the fact
>that they interfere with others when the skip is out is simply a
>side-effect. With no skip, there is no incentive to go with
>exceedingly higher power in the first place, because it serves
>virtually no useful purpose on VHF/UHF.

Amps interfere with others, skip or not. Part of the "skip" they
complain about is bleeding from overmodulated radios and crappy amps,
and part of it is the normal increase in the noise floor from local
signals as the band use increases in the daytime hours. Anyone with a
scanner knows the latter is true because the exact same thing happens
with the cordless phone channels. So considering both those problems,
I can just about guarantee you that the same thing is going to happen
on FRS and MURS as it happened on the CB. And they will use the same
lame arguments to justify the use of amps, and for freebanding on
nearby freqs.

>So - you're going to have to come up with a better argument, this one
>just doesn't wash any longer. Thankfully the FCC has figured this
>out... too bad many hams haven't.

The FCC wears blinders to both reality and criticizm. When the abuses
with CB became excessive they ignored the problem and dropped the
license requirement. Their current reasoning for FRS is that they
implemented manufacturing requirements that would prevent abuse, but

they totally ignore the resourcefulness and determination of the pirates, as well as the historically high profits from illegal radio equipment. The existence of any band with little or no enforcement is just asking for trouble, and the abuses will continue until the Commission pulls their heads out of [the sand].

4174. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:21:27 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205241421.45686ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43393
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > The fact stands - MURS ..... now offers capabilities and privileges
> > on the order of those of the Amateur Technician Class license.
> >
>
> Not even close to being comparable.
>
> MURS -- 5 specific frequencies, less than 100 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
> Tech -- Millions of frequencies 23,962,000 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
> Advantage Tech 239,620-to-1
>
> MURS -- One band
> Tech -- Seventeen bands
> Advantage Tech 17-to-1

For the most part, there is very little action on any VHF/UHF band
other than 2m.

> MURS -- 2W output
> Tech -- 1500W output
> Advantage Tech 750-to-1

Unless your doing something bizarre, like EME, anything over 5W is
basically overkill. 2W TPO is decent, if you've got a good antenna.

And even 2m has gone dormant in recent years. Other than a few
high-level repeaters, the band is virtually unused.

Stewart - N0MHS

4175. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:26:06 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.com>
Message-ID: <26zH8.130793$Q42.6570780@typhoon.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 43394
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
news:3ceeb3fb.1153150@news.cet.com...
> In <5f4fe4c2.0205240958.50295699@posting.google.com>,
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message
news:<ackekk$dq5$0@pita.alt.net>...
> >
> >This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
> >will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
> >become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
> >wrong. The reason that folks on 11m went to amplifiers was because it
> >actually helps them increase their communications range
>
> That's a load of horseshit that a vulture wouldn't touch. You can't
> work what you can't hear, and the only way to find a signal near the
> noise floor is to improve your antenna. Even if the "other guy" gets a
> linear, you still have limited range because of the crappy propagation
> of the band. The only reason people buy linears is because of the
> king-of-the-hill mentality that most of us abandoned after grade
> school.
>
> > - the fact
> >that they interfere with others when the skip is out is simply a
> >side-effect. With no skip, there is no incentive to go with
> >exceedingly higher power in the first place, because it serves
> >virtually no useful purpose on VHF/UHF.
>
> Amps interfere with others, skip or not. Part of the "skip" they
> complain about is bleeding from overmodulated radios and crappy amps,
> and part of it is the normal increase in the noise floor from local
> signals as the band use increases in the daytime hours. Anyone with a
> scanner knows the latter is true because the exact same thing happens
> with the cordless phone channels. So considering both those problems,
> I can just about guarantee you that the same thing is going to happen
> on FRS and MURS as it happened on the CB. And they will use the same
> lame arguments to justify the use of amps, and for freebanding on
> nearby freqs.
>
> >So - you're going to have to come up with a better argument, this one
> >just doesn't wash any longer. Thankfully the FCC has figured this
> >out... too bad many hams haven't.
>

> The FCC wears blinders to both reality and criticizm. When the abuses
> with CB became excessive they ignored the problem and dropped the
> license requirement. Their current reasoning for FRS is that they
> implemented manufacturing requirements that would prevent abuse, but
> they totally ignore the resourcefulness and determination of the
> pirates, as well as the historically high profits from illegal radio
> equipment. The existence of any band with little or no enforcement is
> just asking for trouble, and the abuses will continue until the
> Commission pulls their heads out of [the sand].
>

So Sparky, got any suggestions on building a dual band amp for FRS and MURS?
Oh wait, nevermind, Mirage already makes those. TeeHee!

4176. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:34:53 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205241434.397a6fb2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43395
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3CEE7F17.53C566F0@ix.netcom.com>...

> >
> > With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> > Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
> >
>
> True if all you want to do is this one thing. But what other license is
> there
> that lets you use various different modes in various different kinds of
> bands? I could drive home with the 2m rig in the car, and once I'm
> home I can work some DX on HF with CW or SSB or amtor or such.

Most people nowadays go on the Internet when they get home, and can
reliably talk just about anywhere in the world for free.

But, in any event, I'm basically comparing MURS to Amateur Technician
2m... there is now very little difference between the two. Hams have
repeaters, but most of them go unused these days, and any of the good
ones cost you money - so you might as well get a cell phone.

The biggest kicker is that, with ham radio, you can't even talk to
your friends, family members, and co-workers. This is why I've
continued to push for re-opening up the Novice Class as a no-code
VHF/UHF-only license - at least you would have somebody to talk to on
VHF/UHF.

Stewart - N0MHS

4177. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:35:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524183506.17546.00000626@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43396

From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET

>I could go on and on, but I'm sure you're getting the picture!

I can't speak for Stewart, but the "ham radio is doomed" brigade will not get the picture; they will move onto something else that lets them preach the gloom. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4178. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:40:43 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205241440.35a2d57a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43397
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> wrote in message news:<3CEE61F5.B65AA908@mailcity.net>...
> stewart wrote:
>
> >
> > The capabilities of a well built MURS station can now compete with
> > those of a Technician Class station.
>
> That is an over statement if I ever saw one. MURS can no way
> compete with any part of ham radio, even Tech class stations.

I disagree, for the average Tech with a 2m handheld, a 2.1m hanheld
will compete quite nicely.

> > Furthermore, MURS users have
> > certain privileges that Amateurs don't... for example, MURS users can
> > do business, or download short e-mails of any type of content to their
> > Mobile PDAs from Internet gateways.
>
> Big deal, there are cell phones for business and internet for
> e-mails.

... and they cost $$$$ MURS is free.

> >
> > The fact stands - MURS has been made a more capable service, and now
> > offers capabilities and privileges on the order of those of the
> > Amateur Technician Class license.
>
> Really, how many frequencies for MURS as compared to those
> available for Tech class licensees? Compare the power levels
> allowed by MURS as allowed for Tech Class. You must be dreaming.

Anything over 5W is overkill for anything other than bizarre
applications like EME... 2W is plenty with a couple of good antennas
at each end of the link.

Stewart - N0MHS

4179. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:40:56 UTC
From: "Dana H. Myers" <dana@dioxine.net>
Message-ID: <3CEEC15D.6090905@dioxine.net>
Source record: 43398
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:

> But, in any event, I'm basically comparing MURS to Amateur Technician
> 2m... there is now very little difference between the two. Hams have
> repeaters, but most of them go unused these days, and any of the good
> ones cost you money - so you might as well get a cell phone.

This statement strikes me as rather ignorant of reality.
If you're having fun using MURS, knock yourself out. If
MURS is as good as ham radio for you, that's your thing.
It just doesn't seem to make much sense for most of the
people I know in ham radio.

Dana

4180. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:42:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524184203.17546.00000627@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43399

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>HQ, Ed. If the past no longer matters, and only what is done today, why not
>just
>come out and say so? At least there would no longer be any question about
>how
>decisions are made there.

Yes, Dick; I will gladly tell you that ARRL believes that it must continue to accomplish things on ham radio, every day, and not stop because it has done good things in the past.

Does that help?

Did you really need someone to explain that to you? If so, things must be getting pretty bad for you and I hope you feel better soon.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4181. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:43:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524184312.17546.00000628@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43400

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>Get it right- the extra class exam was not a minimum requirements ham radio
>exam, it was a rather comprehensive test.

If hams were expected to continue accomplishing things after they passed the
exam, it was a minimum requirement test.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4182. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:44:44 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205242240040.13151-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43451
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 24 May 2002, stewart wrote:
>Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3CEE7F17.53C566F0@ix.netcom.com>...
>> > With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
>> > Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>> >
>>
>> True if all you want to do is this one thing. But what other license is
>> there
>> that lets you use various different modes in various different kinds of
>> bands? I could drive home with the 2m rig in the car, and once I'm
>> home I can work some DX on HF with CW or SSB or amtor or such.
>
>Most people nowadays go on the Internet when they get home, and can
>reliably talk just about anywhere in the world for free.

FOR FREE? If you mean via the computer, there's still the ISP monthly charge
or its equvalent (the DSL line, cable modem, T1, or whatever). Who provides
that for free? If you meant free = "no additional charge", you failed to
account for the hidden monthly charges I just stated. Then, there's the
indirect charges, such as the electric bill (most people pay a power company,
or for gas for their generator, etc....).

>But, in any event, I'm basically comparing MURS to Amateur Technician
>2m... there is now very little difference between the two. Hams have
>repeaters, but most of them go unused these days, and any of the good
>ones cost you money - so you might as well get a cell phone.

Maybe they only go unused when you're around because no one wants to talk to
you, or like the people on this group, they've already "heard it all" from you!

>The biggest kicker is that, with ham radio, you can't even talk to
>your friends, family members, and co-workers. This is why I've
>continued to push for re-opening up the Novice Class as a no-code
>VHF/UHF-only license - at least you would have somebody to talk to on
>VHF/UHF.

4183. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:45:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524184549.22762.00000390@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43452

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>Anyway, the fact is, these radios have far better receiver specs than
>do most amateur radios.

Can you cite the specs for a few of the receivers here so we can compare them
to those of Amateur equipment?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4184. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:47:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524184756.22762.00000391@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 43453

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>> Does that mean that the things I do today don't stand for anything?

> So ask that question again tomorrow and the answer will be obvious.

I don't even understand what that statement means.

But I'll bite.

Do the things I did the day before yesterday not stand for anything?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4185. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 22:56:21 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205241456.69dce605@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43454
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<c3b5c1bba90f401df8f3e8b2a2659476.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...

> Heheheh ... sure .... <chuckle chuckle>
> Um, what makes you think one can't do e-mail with amateur radio?
> Of course, there is fast-scan television (regular tv) as well as slow
> scan tv. Uhhhh ... I sometimes take my HT (walkie talkie) to work to
> use during lunch. I've chatted with Australia, England, and other
> parts of the world ... no, not using internet linking - all rf path.
> This was with 6 double a alkaline batteries on FM (voice). I've had
> folks argue that one can't cut through one of those alleged 70,000 watt
> shoot-out stations. Can't fight the carrier. Hmmmm ... only need to
> be a short way off the carrier. There are modes that can be copied some
> 30 dB BELOW the noise level. 50 Hz bandwidths and less (another 20 dB
> gain). Actually, it should be possible to cut throught that 70,000 watt
> am signal with 100 watts (properly done, of course). Oh .. internet ..
> yep, can do that too ... but tell me how you work Australia all rf path
> on 6 double a alkalines ... with a walkie-talkie .... running all of 4
> watts .... into a whip ... and that only requires a tech license. What
> happens if you have your extra?
>
> BWAaaaaHAHAHAHAHA

Do you have some kind of point?

> try again from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> ps although business use is not what amateur radio is all about, what is
> it that makes me think that business use is not at all on your mind?

Absolutely. What is wrong with that? Again, do you have some kind of
point? I suppose not... and it seems that is the underlying problem
these days with Amateur Radio - it is basically pointless.

Stewart - N0MHS

4186. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 23:11:11 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205241511.6a6f64b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43455
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Roger Conroy" <rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<acm2ob$11e$1@ctb-nnrp1.saix.net>...
> I agree - lets see a MURS operator do a moonbounce!!!!! Then we'll start
> taking comparisons seriously.

Moonbounce? Have you completely lost all touch with reality? The
fact that is basically all Amateur Radio seems to have to offer on
VHF/UHF for a Technician operator PROOVES how irrelevant ham radio is
becoming

Repeaters, maybe... but moonbounce? Give me a break.

Stewart - N0MHS

P.S. You can already do repeaters on GMRS, and I suspect that MURS
will eventually be expanded to allow low-level repeaters on certain
new frequencies... I'm been pushing the idea of a crossband VHF/UHF
repeater capability, so Joe Average homeowner can set up a repeater
site inexpensively.

4187. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 23:23:06 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <12A78BE921DA8AA0.7094819E13DB5FE3.6854E0C42066A42E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43456
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 24 May 2002 17:38:38 GMT, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:

>MURS -- 5 specific frequencies, less than 100 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
>Tech -- Millions of frequencies 23,962,000 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
>Advantage Tech 239,620-to-1

Aren't you forgetting the "All above 300GHz," which technically means
that Techs have an infinite amount of bandwidth? (Though building
those 300nm yagis can be a pain in the ass)

Also don't forget the little bonuses like IRLP, other link systems,
and in general, the ease of finding repeaters on 2m and 70cm. Even if
they allow repeaters on MURS, you won't be able to find enough of them
to give reliable comms over more than a couple of miles.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4188. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-24 23:26:35 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <8D9B12C89638CC30.69FBAE998BAAE243.A6D6DF330576D1BC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43457
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 24 May 2002 10:58:34 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
>will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
>become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
>wrong.

Nope, it just hasn't had time yet. There are still way too many
people out there that aren't familiar with FRS. Once they start
fiddling with it, some of them will start ruining it, and it will be
all downhill from there.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4189. Re: So the ARRL does nothing for you...eh?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 00:07:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020524200753.02802.00000199@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 43459

In article <121e5da4ff50926ed8bac697a25392eb.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>You oughta see what construction companies go through putting up street
>lighting or traffic signals - the state inspector is right there taking
>a sample of the concrete before it is even poured! Specs are there for
>every bolt and nut. Sure, we get wind, but get some ice on the signals
>and then get 73 mph winds (like we got earlier this year) and you begin
>to realize why this isn't a joking matter.

Yup.

There is also the cost factor. It costs far less to do it right the first time rather than have to redo after wind and/or ice.

> Frankly, a small beam and a
>35 foot tower might not be all that serious; putting up a BIG antenna
>or array on an 80 foot tower - I'd hire a commercial firm and expect to
>pay pretty big money - but I'd sleep well at night.

The 35 foot tower can make quite a mess if it falls. And the cost factor is still considerable. What's a good price for a 35 foot tower, small tribander, masts and fittings, rotor, cables and miscellaneous? The cost of a proper
foundation, the necessary permits and professional review are peanuts compared to the big items.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4190. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 00:08:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEED5C5.539B39E@att.net>
Source record: 43458

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >HQ, Ed. If the past no longer matters, and only what is done today, why not
> >just
> >come out and say so? At least there would no longer be any question about
> >how
> >decisions are made there.
>
> Yes, Dick; I will gladly tell you that ARRL believes that it must continue to
> accomplish things on ham radio, every day, and not stop because it has done
> good things in the past.
>
> Does that help?
>
> Did you really need someone to explain that to you? If so, things must be
> getting pretty bad for you and I hope you feel better soon.

You are plainly stating that what happens today won't matter tomorrow, and you
can't understand that's what your saying.
If Newington runs on that kind of juice no wonder they stumble around so much up
there.

4191. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 00:09:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEED61E.9AE251C8@att.net>
Source record: 43460

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >Get it right- the extra class exam was not a minimum requirements ham radio
> >exam, it was a rather comprehensive test.
>
> If hams were expected to continue accomplishing things after they passed the
> exam, it was a minimum requirement test.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Would you care to quote any such expectations in Part 97? They're not there,
nor any requirement whatever beyond requirements for each level of license.

4192. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 00:32:43 UTC
From: hoodat <hoodat@hoodatHerbieNrOne.com>
Message-ID: <acmm00$gj8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43461
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flame,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

AB8MQ@OVIS.NET peered out at the street from behind his
mommy's curtains, then broke into a profuse sweat when he saw
Steve's truck coming down the street, then vomited the following:
<<<Wogie's usual tripe>>>

<<<<plonk>>>>

4193. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 00:38:17 UTC
From: DougSlug <dw_firewall@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Z1BH8.134907$ja.38409001@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 43462
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Less relevant? Relevant to what?

I'm a little disappointed, Stewart...I didn't think flagrant trolling was
your style.

- Doug

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote:
> Amateur Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>
> Horseshoe7, Stewart, N0MHS

4194. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 00:40:35 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <74BH8.2157$nP7.111589586@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43463

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CEED61E.9AE251C8@att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
> >
> > >Get it right- the extra class exam was not a minimum requirements ham
radio
> > >exam, it was a rather comprehensive test.
> >
> > If hams were expected to continue accomplishing things after they passed
the
> > exam, it was a minimum requirement test.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Would you care to quote any such expectations in Part 97? They're not
there,
> nor any requirement whatever beyond requirements for each level of
license.

Please be sure to let Larry in on your dirty little secret. He has some
expectation that Technicians are supposed to do even more than the Extras
don't do.

4195. Re: Important information regarding your usenet service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 00:47:55 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%aBH8.2749$UT.192211@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43464

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CEEA474.59B34BD5@psu.edu...
> I've seen it all now! ATnT spams usenet! This message is in every group
> I subscribe to. Sheesh.
>
>
>
>
> -Mike KB3EIA -
>

Yes and I was going to gripe about it until I realized it was Broadband which they sold off.

As a dial-up customer with what remains of the real Ma Bell I get a front-end screen that lets me zap the Korean crap, etc. with a smile on my face.

Now if we could only have the one zap the spam of the other.

4196. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 00:55:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <siBH8.2166$SF7.111032518@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43465
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Do if you got about 300 murs talkies and fastened them at the correct spacing interval to a fiberglass boom, and had a way to key then all simultaneously...

"Roger Conroy" <rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:acm2ob$11e$1@ctb-nnrp1.saix.net...
> I agree - lets see a MURS operator do a moonbounce!!!!! Then we'll start
> taking comparisons seriously.
> 73
> Roger ZR1RC
>
>
> "K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
> news:yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > The fact stands - MURS ..... now offers capabilities and privileges
> > > on the order of those of the Amateur Technician Class license.
> > >
> >
> > Not even close to being comparable.
> >
> > MURS -- 5 specific frequencies, less than 100 Kilohertz of total
> bandwidth.
> > Tech -- Millions of frequencies 23,962,000 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
> > Advantage Tech 239,620-to-1
> >
> > MURS -- One band
> > Tech -- Seventeen bands
> > Advantage Tech 17-to-1
> >
> > MURS -- 2W output
> > Tech -- 1500W output
> > Advantage Tech 750-to-1
> >
> > MURS -- Antenna height 20'
> > Tech -- No antenna height restriction.
> > Advantage -- Tech
> >
> > MURS -- FCC certificated radios only. Modifications illegal.
> > Tech -- Free to use any purchased, homebrewed, or modified radio without

> FCC
> > certification.
> > Advantage -- Tech
> >
> > MURS -- Operation restricted by US borders.
> > Tech -- Reciprocal operating agreements with nations all around the
globe.
> > Advantage -- Tech
> >
> > I could go on and on, but I'm sure you're getting the picture!
> >
> > Comparing MURS to even the lowest privileged Amateur Radio license is
like
> > comparing a tricycle to a Lamborghini, and the comparison suffers even
> worse
> > when you compare MURS to a General or Extra class Amateur Radio license.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > ��� SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

4197. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 01:25:32 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3ceee73b.2461793@news.cet.com>
Source record: 43466
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <26zH8.130793$Q42.6570780@typhoon.austin.rr.com>, "Randy"
<rchapman8@houston.rr.com> wrote:

<snip>
>So Sparky, got any suggestions on building a dual band amp for FRS and MURS?
>Oh wait, nevermind, Mirage already makes those. TeeHee!

What do you call that -- flaming spam?

BTW Randy, it's been so long since you ducked the issue, I can't
remember if you said one-way skip causes -more- or -less- interference
than two-way skip. So which is it?

4198. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 01:37:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020524213714.28084.00000198@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 43467

In article <20020523010102.06451.00000023@mb-cm.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>Your "experience" in electronics seems limited to that of
>amateur radio at a rather primitive level.

Lennie:

At last you get *something* about me right! Yes, I am an AMATEUR radio operator. As in a non-professional. Never made a dime in electronics, except when I was the Asst. Mangler of a Radio Shack store.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4199. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 01:43:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwmxepp.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43468
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 24 May 2002 09:58:11 -0700, stewart wrote:

>The fact stands - MURS has been made a more capable service, and now
>offers capabilities and privileges on the order of those of the
>Amateur Technician Class license.

The fact stands - the only reason that there is a "MURS" is that folks went to the nearest CostCo or BestBuy and bought the JobComm or Color-Dot radios which were intended for small business use WITH A LICENSE and then started using them without benefit of same. This is criminal behavior no better than the ham-band "bootlegger" or the broadcast "pirate".

The Commish'- to my deep disgust - was more interested in getting more economists and phone-company=merger specialists on board - folks who had no concept of what radio regulation was all about or should be - than in putting more law enforcement agents on the streets to clean up the mess, and the rest is history.

Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will turn chicken and leave you alone.

The second method makes me sick.

<Enough ranting>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4200. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 01:43:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwmxloq.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43469
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 24 May 2002 10:58:34 -0700, stewart wrote:

>So - you're going to have to come up with a better argument, this one
>just doesn't wash any longer. Thankfully the FCC has figured this
>out... too bad many hams haven't.

The FCC created MURS because Washington didn't want to bother
enforcing the rules. See my other post(s).

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4201. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 01:51:22 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <u6CH8.43700$db7.1534281@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43470
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
news:3ceeb3fb.1153150@news.cet.com...0
> In <5f4fe4c2.0205240958.50295699@posting.google.com>,
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
> >will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
> >become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
> >wrong. The reason that folks on 11m went to amplifiers was because it
> >actually helps them increase their communications range
>
> That's a load of horseshit that a vulture wouldn't touch. You can't
> work what you can't hear, and the only way to find a signal near the
> noise floor is to improve your antenna. Even if the "other guy" gets a
> linear, you still have limited range because of the crappy propagation
> of the band. The only reason people buy linears is because of the
> king-of-the-hill mentality that most of us abandoned after grade
> school.

On HF, the best approach is to use the same amount of power as the station you're trying to communicate with, and use the best antenna possible. The same hold true on VHF, except that at a certain point, increasing power will do you no good, because the other station is out of LOS.

The point is - Amps are more useful on HF because of beyond LOS propagation - therefore they exist... it really does no good to use amps on VHF - their are of course a number of ways to increase LOS comm range, increasing Tx power is one of the least efficient(and ineffective after a certain point). I've written a web page about the whole deal:

http://www.geocities.com/horseshoe7/repeat.html

So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using amps on VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS. You tried to apply my statement in the wrong context, and got yourself 360 degrees turned around - you tried to argue with me, but just ended up agreeing with me.

stewart - horseshoe7 - n0mhs

4202. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 01:52:39 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <H7CH8.43701$db7.1534480@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43471
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Randy A. Hefner" <randy_NO_SPAM_PLEASE_@frs-usa.com> wrote in message

> You're right on the money! I said this long ago. The MURS will be
> adopted by the truckers and you can bet your bottom dollar that all 5
> MURS frequencies will sound like CB Ch. 19.

Yes, Randy, you keep saying it but it has NEVER HAPPENED.

> Randy

4203. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 01:56:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CEEEF3C.F16BFCE9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 43472

stewart wrote:
>
> "K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> > "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > The fact stands - MURS ..... now offers capabilities and privileges
> > > on the order of those of the Amateur Technician Class license.
> > >
> >
> > Not even close to being comparable.
> >
> > MURS -- 5 specific frequencies, less than 100 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
> > Tech -- Millions of frequencies 23,962,000 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
> > Advantage Tech 239,620-to-1
> >
> > MURS -- One band
> > Tech -- Seventeen bands
> > Advantage Tech 17-to-1
>
> For the most part, there is very little action on any VHF/UHF band
> other than 2m.

So we're to forgive your ignorance of the numerous users of FM at 440
megs and of those who use CW and SSB on 50, 144, 222, 432 and above.

> > MURS -- 2W output
> > Tech -- 1500W output
> > Advantage Tech 750-to-1
>
> Unless your doing something bizarre, like EME, anything over 5W is
> basically overkill. 2W TPO is decent, if you've got a good antenna.

That's preposterous. I have a good antenna and I can't work Minnesota
from here in West Virginia on 144 or 432 with five watts. I can do it
under certain conditions on 432 with 100w. I'll be able to do it
frequently with a KW. Even on 2m FM using repeaters, a 5 watt mobile
signal isn't going to cut it in this hilly terrain unless I'm on top one
of the hills.

> And even 2m has gone dormant in recent years. Other than a few
> high-level repeaters, the band is virtually unused.

Two meters isn't dormant but we seem to have more repeaters than we have
a need for. The band, despite your claims made from limited exposure,

is not "virtually unused".

Dave K8MN

4204. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 01:56:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CEED2C9.172E6346@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43473
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:

>
> For the most part, there is very little action on any VHF/UHF band
> other than 2m.

You really should get a vhf/uhf radio that actually receives and
listen again.

4205. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:05:26 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3ceef008.4714762@news.cet.com>
Source record: 43474
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <cuvyxnansvbet.gwmxepp.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop> wrote:

>On 24 May 2002 09:58:11 -0700, stewart wrote:
>
>>The fact stands - MURS has been made a more capable service, and now
>>offers capabilities and privileges on the order of those of the
>>Amateur Technician Class license.
>
> The fact stands - the only reason that there is a "MURS" is that
> folks went to the nearest CostCo or BestBuy and bought the JobComm
> or Color-Dot radios which were intended for small business use WITH
> A LICENSE and then started using them without benefit of same. This
> is criminal behavior no better than the ham-band "bootlegger" or the
> broadcast "pirate".
>
> The Commish'- to my deep disgust - was more interested in getting
> more economists and phone-company=merger specialists on board -
> folks who had no concept of what radio regulation was all about or
> should be - than in putting more law enforcement agents on the
> streets to clean up the mess, and the rest is history.

True story.

> Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
> with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
> does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
> turn chicken and leave you alone.

I think it depends on which lobbyist carries the most cash. A harsh
accusation to be sure, but many of the Commission's decisions in the
past few years are inconsistent with any other method of management.

4206. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:07:29 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <BICH8.43703$db7.1536780@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43475

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020524184549.22762.00000390@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>
> >Anyway, the fact is, these radios have far better receiver specs than
> >do most amateur radios.
>
> Can you cite the specs for a few of the receivers here so we can compare
them
> to those of Amateur equipment?

Here is the current web page for the Motorola GM300:

http://www.motorola.com/cgiss/LA/products/conventional/english/mobile/gm300/
specs.html

I use model MOGMCOSIC2 A
1-10W, 146-174Mhz

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4207. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:11:25 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <hpCH8.43706$db7.1537314@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43476

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020524063137.26572.00000483@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>
> >With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> >Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>
> Is that your explanation of why it continues to grow?
>
> Why do you see doom and gloom for Amateur Radio everywhere you look?

I just say it is getting less relevant... you can draw your own conclusions.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4208. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:20:36 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <acmsc2$7b8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43477
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3CEC3CDB.EEF43F4B@mailcity.net...
>
>
> 2test wogie banged on his keyboard and attempted to write:
>
> > Maybe you should get a second one, that way, you can get a keybaord
that has a comma key Or at least English lessons, you Mexican refugee.
> ^^^^^^^
> You as well, wogie, there should be a comma after the word "key"
> and the word "or" should not be capitalized. You really should not
> post when you are in your drunken stupor.

There also should not be a comma after way.

4209. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:27:17 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ECH8.43711$db7.1538638@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43478
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"DougSlug" <dw_firewall@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:Z1BH8.134907$ja.38409001@news02.optonline.net...
> Less relevant? Relevant to what?

> I'm a little disappointed, Stewart...I didn't think flagrant trolling was
> your style.

Are you kidding me? I've put out some WHOPPERS over the years on rrap. See below for an example of one: "synthetic ionization of the ionosphere".

But, I do think that the VHF/UHF ham frequencies are being wasted, and we need to reinvoke NOVICE class as a no-code VHF/UHF only license... or, simply expand services like FRS and MURS. 11m CB is a red-herring and has virtually nothing to do with VHF/UHF.

****
Tech advances force FCC to consider Ham HF freq auction:

WASHINGTON (AP) - Spurred by the many recent advancements in the Laser ionization technology field, the ITI Corporation (Ionization Technologies, Inc. - Fairfax, VA) has proven that it is now economically feasible to synthetically ionize specific areas of the ionosphere, opening up new many new reliable and low-cost telecommunications applications.

The best frequencies for utilizing this technology lie in the HF portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. While the HF portion of the frequency spectrum has long since been allocated to specific purposes; there are many HF frequencies which could be re-allocated to better serve the nation. The Federal Communication Commission(FCC) is considering re-allocating at least half of the Amateur Radio Service's current HF frequency spectrum to the newly proposed ISS(Ionization Skip Service), where it can better serve the public's telecommunications needs.

Stewart Robertson, President of ITI, says; "The older naturally-induced HF skip communication techniques essentially waste 99.9% of the HF bandwidth, and communications are generally of very poor quality, very unreliable, and end up causing wide-spread interference. Using the new synthetic ionization techniques, we can specifically direct RF energy over great distances, wherever we want it, anytime we want it. Communications are no longer predicated on solar activity - we can now directly and safely control ionization evels in specific areas of the ionosphere, opening up all kinds of new possibilites in reliable long-range communications applications."

4210. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:35:32 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3ceef1e6.5191950@news.cet.com>
Source record: 43480
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <u6CH8.43700$db7.1534281@news2.west.cox.net>, "horseshoe7"
<horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
>news:3ceeb3fb.1153150@news.cet.com...0
>> In <5f4fe4c2.0205240958.50295699@posting.google.com>,
>> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>>
>> >This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
>> >will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
>> >become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
>> >wrong. The reason that folks on 11m went to amplifiers was because it
>> >actually helps them increase their communications range
>>
>> That's a load of horseshit that a vulture wouldn't touch. You can't
>> work what you can't hear, and the only way to find a signal near the
>> noise floor is to improve your antenna. Even if the "other guy" gets a
>> linear, you still have limited range because of the crappy propagation
>> of the band. The only reason people buy linears is because of the
>> king-of-the-hill mentality that most of us abandoned after grade
>> school.
>
>On HF, the best approach is to use the same amount of power as the station
>you're trying to communicate with, and use the best antenna possible. The
>same hold true on VHF, except that at a certain point, increasing power will
>do you no good, because the other station is out of LOS.
>
>The point is - Amps are more useful on HF because of beyond LOS
>propagation - therefore they exist... it really does no good to use amps on
>VHF - their are of course a number of ways to increase LOS comm range,
>increasing Tx power is one of the least efficient(and ineffective after a
>certain point). I've written a web page about the whole deal:
>
>http://www.geocities.com/horseshoe7/repeat.html
>
>So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using amps on
>VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS. You tried to apply my statement in the
>wrong context, and got yourself 360 degrees turned around - you tried to
>argue with me, but just ended up agreeing with me.
>
>stewart - horseshoe7 - n0mhs

Maybe you are not familiar with the mentality of these idiots. Regarding amps, the most important thing is "swang", referring to needle movement. They start by modifying their radios. The modulation limiter is disabled so they can sound "louder", irrespective of splatter and harmonics. Then they run the output to a Class C driver with the intention of re-modulating the carrier just to get the peak power higher. Then it gets sent to the final amp, which is usually just a box filled with push-pull power transistors and wired in parallel. These amps are not designed for linearity, but for raw power. They are not intended for communication, but for "stepping power". Have you ever attended a "keydown"? It is a contest to see which amp is louder, and intelligibility of the audio is almost irrelevant: Two mobiles are set up on a line, they rev the motors and key away at the same time. The winner is the one that is heard above the other. Forget ERP or linearity, it's nothing more than an RF drag race.

Now we all know that ground-wave propogation on 11m sucks almost as bad as VHF and skip is very inconsistent, which is probably why the hams abandoned it years ago. Just like VHF, 11m has a limit as to how much power is practical, yet amps in excess or 1000 watts are commonly used by IOs.

Not only that, but there is a lot of money to be made by making and selling illegal radio equipment. They already know that some people will be violating the laws on the band, so all they need to do is convince them that what they need is a bigger amp. That's not hard to do, even if a bigger amp provides no practial benefit whatsoever, because they will tap the competitive nature of people: "My amp is bigger than YOUR amp!" It works. Just look at how many illegal amps are for sale on the net.

The point is that they don't care about any sort of practical communication, they are only interested in doing whatever gets their rocks off, to the detriment of anyone else using the band, and they will do so while laughing in the face of the US Government. Unless the FCC decides to police the bands, the same thing will happen on MURS and FRS, because that's the way people are.

4211. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:38:24 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3ceef8c8.6953999@news.cet.com>
Source record: 43481
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <5f4fe4c2.0205241421.45686ba@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
>>
>> >
>> > The fact stands - MURS ..... now offers capabilities and privileges
>> > on the order of those of the Amateur Technician Class license.
>> >
>>
>> Not even close to being comparable.
>>
>> MURS -- 5 specific frequencies, less than 100 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
>> Tech -- Millions of frequencies 23,962,000 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
>> Advantage Tech 239,620-to-1
>>
>> MURS -- One band
>> Tech -- Seventeen bands
>> Advantage Tech 17-to-1
>
>For the most part, there is very little action on any VHF/UHF band
>other than 2m.

Maybe in the wilds of Alaska...

>> MURS -- 2W output
>> Tech -- 1500W output
>> Advantage Tech 750-to-1
>
>Unless your doing something bizarre, like EME, anything over 5W is
>basically overkill. 2W TPO is decent, if you've got a good antenna.
>
>And even 2m has gone dormant in recent years. Other than a few
>high-level repeaters, the band is virtually unused.

Hardly. It's used quite a bit in just about every metro area I have
traveled through. Have you tried hooking up your antenna?

4212. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:51:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020524225136.28084.00000199@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 43485

In article <acj88togo0@pita.alt.net>, "Eduardo Hernandez"
<Ehernandez@utinternetcommsorg.net> writes:

> Am getting my Toyota Land Cruiser ready for a month-long
>vacation in the outback. In your esteemed opinion, what would
>you recommend is the best all around mobile antenna on the market?
>We'll be traveling at interstate speeds, as well as 4-wheeling in the
>boondocks. My girlfriend is against having any weird looking
>antennas on the vehicle which draw attention to us, as she is sometimes
>recognized in public. She prefers as low a profile as possible, so what
>antenna would best fit all these requirements?

Ed:

My recommendations:

1.) Stick a big 'ole screwdriver antenna on the Land Cruiser.

2.) Get a new YL-friend.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4213. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:51:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020524225137.28084.00000202@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 43482

In article <ackekk$dq5$0@pita.alt.net>, "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
writes:

>> > http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-02-139A1.doc

What's up with this "foss" thang in all the FCC's URL's?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4214. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:51:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020524225137.28084.00000201@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 43483

In article <5f4fe4c2.0205240858.46173c47@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>
>The fact stands - MURS has been made a more capable service, and now
>offers capabilities and privileges on the order of those of the
>Amateur Technician Class license.
>

ROTFLMFAO!!! I'd like to see someone get VUCC using a 2-watt
MURS HT!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4215. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 02:51:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020524225137.28084.00000200@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 43484

In article <yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:

>Comparing MURS to even the lowest privileged Amateur Radio license is like
>comparing a tricycle to a Lamborghini, and the comparison suffers even worse
>when you compare MURS to a General or Extra class Amateur Radio license.

Hansl:

You forgot the "-lite" at the end of the above-mentioned license classes
for those licensed after 4/15/00.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4216. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:00:40 UTC
From: Jar Jar Binks <Anon@anon.com>
Message-ID: <acmun4$hc7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43486
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:e9jH8.70$3L6.5@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> > Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
> >
>
> You fail to mention that FCC degraded MURS from Part 90 to the Part 95
(CB)
> category, removed some previously allowed modes, and specifically requires
> that the radios be certificated, thus blowing away your outlaw chant about
> using Yaesu VX-5R.
>
> Bottom line, it's a 2W CB service, good for not much more than a local
> intercom service. Fine for some limited requirements, but hardly
> competition to the worldwide capabilities of even a very modest Amateur
> Radio station.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans. That is what 11 Mtr. CB was allegedly designed to do many years ago.
As goes the 11 Mtr. bands, so also will go the MURS frequencies.

4217. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:04:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <acmv67ger1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43490

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:84yH8.2788$d64.76759177@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:acm1ol$6da$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> > OK. And even if he could, that document would
> > not be a reference for Part 97 requirements. If it was in
> > any way applicable we'd have heard that a long time ago.
> >
> > Suffice to say that for amateur regs and S25.5 in particular
> > there are NO standards specifically identified for morse code
> > specifications.
>
> Part 97 requires a Morse Code test for several of the licenses. Part 97
> doesn't say what Morse Code is.

Which is why there has never been any issue with
5 wpm being compliant with the treaty.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4218. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:06:19 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <LcDH8.43727$db7.1547208@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43487
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

> Maybe you are not familiar with the mentality of these idiots.
> Regarding amps, the most important thing is "swang", referring to
> needle movement. They start by modifying their radios. The modulation
> limiter is disabled so they can sound "louder", irrespective of
> splatter and harmonics. Then they run the output to a Class C driver
> with the intention of re-modulating the carrier just to get the peak
> power higher. Then it gets sent to the final amp, which is usually
> just a box filled with push-pull power transistors and wired in
> parallel. These amps are not designed for linearity, but for raw
> power. They are not intended for communication, but for "stepping
> power". Have you ever attended a "keydown"? It is a contest to see
> which amp is louder, and intelligibility of the audio is almost
> irrelevant: Two mobiles are set up on a line, they rev the motors and
> key away at the same time. The winner is the one that is heard above
> the other. Forget ERP or linearity, it's nothing more than an RF drag
> race.
>
> Now we all know that ground-wave propogation on 11m sucks almost as
> bad as VHF and skip is very inconsistent, which is probably why the
> hams abandoned it years ago. Just like VHF, 11m has a limit as to how
> much power is practical, yet amps in excess or 1000 watts are commonly
> used by IOs.
>
> Not only that, but there is a lot of money to be made by making and
> selling illegal radio equipment. They already know that some people
> will be violating the laws on the band, so all they need to do is
> convince them that what they need is a bigger amp. That's not hard to
> do, even if a bigger amp provides no practial benefit whatsoever,
> because they will tap the competitive nature of people: "My amp is
> bigger than YOUR amp!" It works. Just look at how many illegal amps
> are for sale on the net.
>
> The point is that they don't care about any sort of practical
> communication, they are only interested in doing whatever gets their
> rocks off, to the detriment of anyone else using the band, and they
> will do so while laughing in the face of the US Government. Unless the
> FCC decides to police the bands, the same thing will happen on MURS
> and FRS, because that's the way people are.

I agree with a lot of what you are saying. I just don't think the amplifier issue can be extended to MURS/FRS/GMRS - the fact is, we just aren't seeing it happening.

If I see this kind of nonsense on MURS, I'll DF the fool, and turn 'em in.

Now, I'll have to admit, I live in San Diego, and what I have seen are some Mexicans running over-amplified setups on 154.600, but I'm not going to go down to Mexico with DF-equipment - the TJ cops would just end up busting me down there.

Stewart - N0MHS

4219. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:06:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwn3fru.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43488
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 24 May 2002 15:21:27 -0700, stewart wrote:

>And even 2m has gone dormant in recent years. Other than a few
>high-level repeaters, the band is virtually unused.

Not here - 2m is highly used both for voice and for data (packet)
and 440 MHz is not far behind.

The metro area is not one of the country's mega-centers but we do
have lots of active hams.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4220. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:06:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwn3mcv.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43489
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 24 May 2002 16:11:11 -0700, stewart wrote:

>I'm been pushing the idea of a crossband VHF/UHF
>repeater capability, so Joe Average homeowner can set up a repeater
>site inexpensively.

"Ham Radio for the Non-qualified". <retch>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4221. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:11:33 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <FhDH8.43729$db7.1548292@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43491

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020524225137.28084.00000202@mb-fo.aol.com...

> >> > > What's up with this "foss" thang in all the FCC's URL's?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Apparently is a waterfall in Iceland.

Stewart - N0MHS

4222. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:16:54 UTC
From: Jar Jar Binks <Anon@anon.com>
Message-ID: <acmvli$jc3$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43492
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > The fact stands - MURS ..... now offers capabilities and privileges
> > on the order of those of the Amateur Technician Class license.
> >
>
> Not even close to being comparable.
>
> MURS -- 5 specific frequencies, less than 100 Kilohertz of total
bandwidth.
> Tech -- Millions of frequencies 23,962,000 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
> Advantage Tech 239,620-to-1
>
> MURS -- One band
> Tech -- Seventeen bands
> Advantage Tech 17-to-1
>
> MURS -- 2W output
> Tech -- 1500W output
> Advantage Tech 750-to-1
>
> MURS -- Antenna height 20'
> Tech -- No antenna height restriction.
> Advantage -- Tech
>
> MURS -- FCC certificated radios only. Modifications illegal.
> Tech -- Free to use any purchased, homebrewed, or modified radio without
FCC
> certification.
> Advantage -- Tech
>
> MURS -- Operation restricted by US borders.
> Tech -- Reciprocal operating agreements with nations all around the globe.
> Advantage -- Tech
>
> I could go on and on, but I'm sure you're getting the picture!
>
> Comparing MURS to even the lowest privileged Amateur Radio license is like

> comparing a tricycle to a Lamborghini, and the comparison suffers even
worse
> when you compare MURS to a General or Extra class Amateur Radio license.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> ��� SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
>

Well done! Kudos to you!

4223. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:21:17 UTC
From: Jar Jar Binks <Anon@anon.com>
Message-ID: <acmvtpjsa0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43493
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Oops! Someone must have left the back door open and in wandered the white trash.

"AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:acm5bgelj0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Ed-dildo Hernandez" <EdH@HernandezConsultants31x.org> whined in message
> news:acl8n0$ao2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > Tnx for all the helpful info on mobile antennas, [whine]
>
> Ed-dildo, doesn't it just gall you that you have to work that pizza delivery
> job, knowing how unskilled and unemployable a product of two drug addicts
> like you are?
>
> Besides, the last mobile antenna you "acquired" was from you stealing it off
> another ham's car.
>
> Perhaps if you had some balls, and posted under your real name, you might
> have some credibility. Does your fat hog wife still work a the cosmetics
> counter, she does look like Fat "Mimi" from the "Drew Carey Show."
>
>

4224. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:21:39 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7rDH8.3642$LC3.221047@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43494
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Anyone doubting the veracity of Frank's comments is invited to gaze in
wonderment at
http://mywebpages.comcast.net/naughtydog/ndamps.html

"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
news:3ceef1e6.5191950@news.cet.com...
>
> Maybe you are not familiar with the mentality of these idiots.
> Regarding amps, the most important thing is "swang", referring to
> needle movement. They start by modifying their radios. The modulation
> limiter is disabled so they can sound "louder", irrespective of
> splatter and harmonics. Then they run the output to a Class C driver
> with the intention of re-modulating the carrier just to get the peak
> power higher. Then it gets sent to the final amp, which is usually
> just a box filled with push-pull power transistors and wired in
> parallel. These amps are not designed for linearity, but for raw
> power. They are not intended for communication, but for "stepping
> power". Have you ever attended a "keydown"? It is a contest to see
> which amp is louder, and intelligibility of the audio is almost
> irrelevant: Two mobiles are set up on a line, they rev the motors and
> key away at the same time. The winner is the one that is heard above
> the other. Forget ERP or linearity, it's nothing more than an RF drag
> race.
>
> Now we all know that ground-wave propogation on 11m sucks almost as
> bad as VHF and skip is very inconsistent, which is probably why the
> hams abandoned it years ago. Just like VHF, 11m has a limit as to how
> much power is practical, yet amps in excess or 1000 watts are commonly
> used by IOs.
>
> Not only that, but there is a lot of money to be made by making and
> selling illegal radio equipment. They already know that some people
> will be violating the laws on the band, so all they need to do is
> convince them that what they need is a bigger amp. That's not hard to
> do, even if a bigger amp provides no practial benefit whatsoever,
> because they will tap the competitive nature of people: "My amp is
> bigger than YOUR amp!" It works. Just look at how many illegal amps
> are for sale on the net.
>
> The point is that they don't care about any sort of practical
> communication, they are only interested in doing whatever gets their
> rocks off, to the detriment of anyone else using the band, and they
> will do so while laughing in the face of the US Government. Unless the

> FCC decides to police the bands, the same thing will happen on MURS
> and FRS, because that's the way people are.
>

4225. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:22:14 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.com>
Message-ID: <GrDH8.40919$9z5.2632569@typhoon.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 43495
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
news:3ceee73b.2461793@news.cet.com...
> In <26zH8.130793$Q42.6570780@typhoon.austin.rr.com>, "Randy"
> <rchapman8@houston.rr.com> wrote:
>
> <snip>
> >So Sparky, got any suggestions on building a dual band amp for FRS and
MURS?
> >Oh wait, nevermind, Mirage already makes those. TeeHee!
>
> What do you call that -- flaming spam?
>
> BTW Randy, it's been so long since you ducked the issue, I can't
> remember if you said one-way skip causes -more- or -less- interference
> than two-way skip. So which is it?
>

You said that, I did not.

4226. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:26:11 UTC
From: Jar Jar Binks <Anon@anon.com>
Message-ID: <acn071$kc3$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43496
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com> wrote in message
news:acm8os$73o$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> Not really...it means we can get rid of those that want to order a pizza
via
> the autopatch, those that have no idea at all what ham radio is supposed
to
> be, and maybe we could use some thinning out and getting back
> to basic. Then maybe the un-informed crabbing about what the 'service' is
> all about will stop because those that are left will actually have read
part
> 97.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Then all that will be left will be the sour-puss old farts who argue, piss,
moan, threaten, call names, live in the past, etc. You know...like the types
that got booted off 14.313? For "crabbing"?

4227. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:33:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CEEE97A.DA3447D5@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43497
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"Arf! Arf!" wrote:
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> wrote in message
> news:3CEC3CDB.EEF43F4B@mailcity.net...
> >
> >
> > 2test wogie banged on his keyboard and attempted to write:
> >
> > > Maybe you should get a second one, that way, you can get a keybaord
> that has a comma key Or at least English lessons, you Mexican refugee.
> > ^^^^^^^
> > You as well, wogie, there should be a comma after the word "key"
> > and the word "or" should not be capitalized. You really should not
> > post when you are in your drunken stupor.
>
> There also should not be a comma after way.

Now you are going to get 2test wogie all upset over his
punctuation again.

4228. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:35:20 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEF0678.3060508@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43498

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>
>
>>They can insist until the end that they are equal to the Pre-Restructuring
>>hams, but it will never be the case, and they will always occupy a low
>>place on the pecking order among their superiors. Sad, but true.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>
> Larry, do you axeually believe this crap?

How can it be any different? It is for the same reason that a Harvard or MIT graduate will be more sought after and receive a much higher starting salary than, say, a graduate from Milton university in northern Wisconsin, which typically accepts the lower 25% of a high school graduating class, just for the money. Now, the 5 wpm Extra may be a great ham and all that but first impressions are based upon what you know about a person. If all people know is that a person needed to do to become an extra is to pass a laughable 5 wpm code test, (why even bother?) then right off the bat he/she is not a coded ham, therefore he/she must be something less than a coded ham who had to meet a much higher standard. This, Brian, is a matter of public knowledge. Deal with it.

de KR4AJ

4229. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:36:13 UTC
From: Rood <FRS@myrigs.com>
Message-ID: <acn0prljq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43499
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:8D9B12C89638CC30.69FBAE998BAAE243.A6D6DF330576D1BC@lp.airnews.net...
> On 24 May 2002 10:58:34 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
> >will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
> >become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
> >wrong.
>
> Nope, it just hasn't had time yet. There are still way too many
> people out there that aren't familiar with FRS. Once they start
> fiddling with it, some of them will start ruining it, and it will be
> all downhill from there.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> http://www.kd5nrh.net

The FRS freqs in our area are not overly busy, but what is heard on them is
a precursor of what is to come. Cussing, arguing, name-calling, et al are
already happening. It will only grow worse and MURS will soon follow suit.
To believe otherwise is foolish and myopic.

4230. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:43:46 UTC
From: Rood <FRS@myrigs.com>
Message-ID: <acn182meh0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43500
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"BobC" <123@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:uettke31foteec@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "horseshoe7" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:H7CH8.43701$db7.1534480@news2.west.cox.net...
> >
> > "Randy A. Hefner" <randy_NO_SPAM_PLEASE_@frs-usa.com> wrote in message
> >
> > > You're right on the money! I said this long ago. The MURS will be
> > > adopted by the truckers and you can bet your bottom dollar that all 5
> > > MURS frequencies will sound like CB Ch. 19.
> >
> > Yes, Randy, you keep saying it but it has NEVER HAPPENED.
> >
> > > Randy
>
> Does anybody know first hand if truckers are presently or going to use
MURS
> or FRS?
>
> Are you CB/Hamster dealers persuing this avenue and presenting it to
> truckers?
>
> If there's more than just a handfull of same company truckers using it, I
> would also use it.
>
> Personally, I've always liked the idea of a few fm channels in the VHF/UHF
> regions just for truckers.
>
> If there's a migration to MURS by truckers in general, it will be to
escape
> the present CH19 blatherings of hi power idiots and base stations whose
sole
> function in life is to cause interference just for the sake of it. I agree
> that if it becomes more than a fad, the MURS ch.'s will most likely end up
> sounding like the present CB 19 but it should be a long while before that
> happens.

I wonder how long it will be before we hear "Roger Beeps" and echo boxes on
MURS?

4231. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:43:47 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <TLDH8.43741$db7.1552996@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43501
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >I'm been pushing the idea of a crossband VHF/UHF
> >repeater capability, so Joe Average homeowner can set up a repeater
> >site inexpensively.
>
> "Ham Radio for the Non-qualified". <retch>

Oh come off it - GMRS is working out just fine.

> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4232. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:48:28 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEF098C.7050404@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43502

W1RFI wrote:

>
> Yes, Dick; I will gladly tell you that ARRL believes that it must continue to
> accomplish things on ham radio, every day, and not stop because it has done
> good things in the past.
>
> Does that help?
>
> Did you really need someone to explain that to you? If so, things must be
> getting pretty bad for you and I hope you feel better soon.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

Ed, when will the ARRL start insisting on excellence rather than the current

dumbing down of the test structure? Sorry for the direct question but I do not

want to beat around the bush. ARRL may have done some good but they have
done irreparable damage to the culture of ham radio. For every one
good operator they have attracted, mostly on VHF, they have attracted 10
qwarmers on HF that are dragging HF to the ground...but then again, ARRL
seems to prefer the VHF/UHF + frequencies anyway.

4233. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:50:41 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <lSDH8.43744$db7.1553896@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43503
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:8D9B12C89638CC30.69FBAE998BAAE243.A6D6DF330576D1BC@lp.airnews.net...
> On 24 May 2002 10:58:34 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
> >will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
> >become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
> >wrong.
>
> Nope, it just hasn't had time yet. There are still way too many
> people out there that aren't familiar with FRS. Once they start
> fiddling with it, some of them will start ruining it, and it will be
> all downhill from there.

It's been around for quite a long time(1996?) - pretty much EVERYONE has one
of these little radios now - there aren't folks with amplifiers abusing
these frequencies. If it hasn't happened by now - it NEVER is gonna happen.

4234. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:53:27 UTC
From: horseshoe7 <horseshoe7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <XUDH8.43746$db7.1554321@news2.west.cox.net>
Source record: 43504
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Rood" <FRS@myrigs.com> wrote in message news:acn0prljq0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
> news:8D9B12C89638CC30.69FBAE998BAAE243.A6D6DF330576D1BC@lp.airnews.net...
> > On 24 May 2002 10:58:34 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
> > >
> > > >This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
> > > >will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
> > > >become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
> > > >wrong.
> > >
> > > Nope, it just hasn't had time yet. There are still way too many
> > > people out there that aren't familiar with FRS. Once they start
> > > fiddling with it, some of them will start ruining it, and it will be
> > > all downhill from there.
> > >
> > >
> > > Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> > > kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
> > > http://www.kd5nrh.net
>
> The FRS freqs in our area are not overly busy, but what is heard on them
is
> a precursor of what is to come. Cussing, arguing, name-calling, et al are
> already happening. It will only grow worse and MURS will soon follow suit.
> To believe otherwise is foolish and myopic.

The argument was that people would use AMPLIFIERS on FRS and MURS - this is
absolutely wrong... you KNOW IT, and are trying to CHANGE THE SUBJECT.

Amplifiers are not being used on FRS, GMRS or MURS.

Stewart - N0MHS

4235. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:53:48 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CEF0ABA.48795E59@icok.net>
Source record: 43505
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

> P.S. You can already do repeaters on GMRS, and I suspect that MURS
> will eventually be expanded to allow low-level repeaters on certain
> new frequencies... I'm been pushing the idea of a crossband VHF/UHF
> repeater capability, so Joe Average homeowner can set up a repeater
> site inexpensively.

Tell me why 'Joe Average' would even think about setting up
a repeater, or cross banding VHF/UHF. Seems like a very silly
idea to me. Would that repeater system be private, or public
for a fee perhaps?
MURS could fill a need, but please don't tout it as a viable
replacement for amateur radio, it isn't and will never be such.
'Doc

PS - Posting to multiple groups is as moronic as the other idea.

4236. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 03:58:26 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CEF0BD0.189FA4D5@icok.net>
Source record: 43506
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart,
2 meters is dormant, unused? What part of the
country do you live in? 'Dormant' and 'unused' are
not exactly how I would describe 2 meters in this
area. Stew, ol'buddy, I think you'd better have your
receiver checked...
'Doc

4237. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 04:13:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEF0F73.7F1588B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43507

N2EY wrote:
> An interesting hypothesis, Cecil, but it has no basis in fact.

Of course it does, Jim. I am relating personal experience. Are
you implying that I am lying? Everyone in the world is NOT
just like you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4238. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 04:27:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEF12BD.E4E57CA4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43508

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> Get it right- the extra class exam was not a minimum requirements ham radio
> exam, it was a rather comprehensive test.

BS, Dick. The extra class exam is a minimum requirements exam for obtaining an extra class license. Why is that concept so hard for you to understand? All ham exams are minimum requirements exams. Anyone who meets those minimum requirements gets the appropriate license. Assuming that they both pass the exam, under-qualified individuals receive exactly the same license as over-qualified individuals. It's like a GED. Anyone who scores at least a 450 average gets a GED. That includes people who score an average of 650 or higher.

> I'm sorry you're so dense you fail to understand anything about the subject.
> Particularly that it wasn't the passing of a test that was NOT a minimum
> requirements test, rather the most extensive test available.

Just because it is the most extensive amateur radio exam doesn't save it from being a minimum requirements exam for the extra class license. You are just going to have to find a better way to prop up your sagging self esteem. It's what you have done and are doing *after* you get the license that may be worthy of respect. Simply barely passing a minimum requirements extra exam is hardly any accomplishment at all.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4239. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 04:31:31 UTC
From: BobC <123@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <uettke31foteec@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 43479
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"horseshoe7" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:H7CH8.43701$db7.1534480@news2.west.cox.net...
>
> "Randy A. Hefner" <randy_NO_SPAM_PLEASE_@frs-usa.com> wrote in message
>
> > You're right on the money! I said this long ago. The MURS will be
> > adopted by the truckers and you can bet your bottom dollar that all 5
> > MURS frequencies will sound like CB Ch. 19.
>
> Yes, Randy, you keep saying it but it has NEVER HAPPENED.
>
> > Randy

Does anybody know first hand if truckers are presently or going to use MURS
or FRS?

Are you CB/Hamster dealers persuing this avenue and presenting it to
truckers?

If there's more than just a handfull of same company truckers using it, I
would also use it.

Personally, I've always liked the idea of a few fm channels in the VHF/UHF
regions just for truckers.

If there's a migration to MURS by truckers in general, it will be to escape
the present CH19 blatherings of hi power idiots and base stations whose sole
function in life is to cause interference just for the sake of it. I agree
that if it becomes more than a fad, the MURS ch.'s will most likely end up
sounding like the present CB 19 but it should be a long while before that
happens.

4240. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 04:35:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEF14A3.E0121B30@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43509

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >Get it right- the extra class exam was not a minimum requirements ham radio
> >exam, it was a rather comprehensive test.
>
> If hams were expected to continue accomplishing things after they passed the
> exam, it was a minimum requirement test.

Dick doesn't seem to understand the concept of minimum requirements. A certain minimum score must be attained. Everyone who attains that minimum score obtains credit for passing the exam. Any score above the minimum passing score is irrelevant in obtaining credit for the exam. The person who barely passes gets the same credit as the person who aces the exam. That's what minimum requirements are all about.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4241. Re: An out-of-this-world opportunity to PROMOTE ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 04:38:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CEF153F.D69B242B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43510

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> At last you get *something* about me right! Yes, I am an
> AMATEUR radio operator. As in a non-professional. Never
> made a dime in electronics, except when I was the Asst.
> Mangler of a Radio Shack store.

You probably got canned there for knowing too much electronics.
I heard RS corporate policy is that all employees there are to
not know anything about electronic theory. Even a Novice
licensee would be overqualified..... :-)

4242. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 04:45:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEF16DD.5AD82EA2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43511

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Did you really need someone to explain that to you? If so, things must be
> > getting pretty bad for you and I hope you feel better soon.
>
> You are plainly stating that what happens today won't matter tomorrow, ...

Please pay attention, Dick. Ed is saying that what happens today won't much matter if nothing else happens in the future. One cannot rest on one's laurels and coast through the rest of one's life without falling behind. The exception might be, "once famous, always famous", but I don't recall you being famous.

How long do you think Ed's job at the ARRL would last if he shared your attitude of, "I have arrived and now I can rest on my laurels"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4243. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 04:46:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEF1735.3FCA483A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43512

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Would you care to quote any such expectations in Part 97? They're not there,
> nor any requirement whatever beyond requirements for each level of license.

Note that those are *minimum* requirements, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4244. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 04:53:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEF18C8.FF75A948@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43513

Dan Finn wrote:
> If all people know is that a person needed to do to
> become an extra is to pass a laughable 5 wpm code test, (why even
> bother?) then right off the bat he/she is not a coded ham, therefore
> he/she must be something less than a coded ham who had to meet a much
> higher standard. This, Brian, is a matter of public knowledge. Deal with it.

How many people in the world give a rat's patootie how fast you can
read code? *Nobody* cares how fast I can read code, not even I.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4245. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 05:24:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CEF1FCB.FF218E9B@att.net>
Source record: 43514

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > Get it right- the extra class exam was not a minimum requirements ham radio
> > exam, it was a rather comprehensive test.
>
> BS, Dick.

Yes, Cecil, you're certainly full of that...

> The extra class exam is a minimum requirements exam for obtaining
> an extra class license.

Yep, the Extra test you took is a real no-brainer, and that would help explain why you waited so long to take one. You can't know that it was not at all the same in earlier years, of course. Nothing we can do about that now except to correct your misapprehensions and false statements.

4246. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 05:38:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwnaqlw.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43515
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sat, 25 May 2002 02:05:26 GMT, Sparky wrote:

>> Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
>> with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
>> does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
>> turn chicken and leave you alone.
>
>I think it depends on which lobbyist carries the most cash. A harsh
>accusation to be sure, but many of the Commission's decisions in the
>past few years are inconsistent with any other method of management.

A clear result of not having anyone high enough in management with
enough brass to bang on the table to tell The Congress what we ...
err, they... needed and what would happen if it didn;t come
through, rather than to say, a la Oliver Twist, "yes, sir, thank
you, sir...."

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4247. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 05:38:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwnb8vx.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43516

On 25 May 2002 02:51:37 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>What's up with this "foss" thang in all the FCC's URL's?

The "-foss" are all different servers, each named for a specific
iceberg ~("foss" in Norwegian, IIRC). This got started as an
exercise in weirdness by one of the IT folks there (in my dealings
with them before I retired I determined that they were all weird)
and it just stuck.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4248. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 06:26:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525022618.29915.00000578@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 43517

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/24/02 13:03 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205240903.bf1c8fb@posting.google.com>

>Anyway, the fact is, these radios have far better receiver specs than
>do most amateur radios.

A break from my usual reticence on profantiy follows:

" BULLSHIT."

And now we resume our usual broadcasting.

Putz.

Steve

4249. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 06:30:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525023010.29915.00000579@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 43518

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: "horseshoe7" horseshoe7@yahoo.com
>Date: 05/24/02 22:07 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <BlCH8.43703$db7.1536780@news2.west.cox.net>

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020524184549.22762.00000390@mb-cv.aol.com...
>> From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>>
>> >Anyway, the fact is, these radios have far better receiver specs than
>> >do most amateur radios.
>>
>> Can you cite the specs for a few of the receivers here so we can compare
>them
>> to those of Amateur equipment?
>
>Here is the current web page for the Motorola GM300:
>
>http://www.motorola.com/cgiss/LA/products/conventional/english/mobile/gm300/
>specs.html
>
>I use model MOGMCOSIC2 A
>1-10W, 146-174Mhz

Then you are NOT using "FRS" radios, nor are they approved for MURS if
theya re over 2 watts.

The radio you cite is NOT an FRS nor MURS radio.

Putz.

4250. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 06:32:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525023226.29915.00000580@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 43519

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/24/02 12:58 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205240858.46173c47@posting.google.com>

>The capabilities of a well built MURS station can now compete with
>those of a Technician Class station. Furthermore, MURS users have
>certain privileges that Amateurs don't... for example, MURS users can
>do business, or download short e-mails of any type of content to their
>Mobile PDAs from Internet gateways.

Bwwwahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha ! ! !
! ! !

YEAH! RIGHT! Maybe in Podunk, MO they can get away with that...for a
few weeks...MAYBE a few months...

WHAT AN IDIOT!

4251. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 06:34:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525023435.29915.00000581@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 43520

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: "Kï¿½HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>Date: 05/24/02 13:38 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>I could go on and on, but I'm sure you're getting the picture!

I doubt it this time, Hans. He wouldn't see the picture if it were
painted on his bathroom wall.

SR

4252. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 06:42:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525024212.29915.00000582@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 43521

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: "horseshoe7" horseshoe7@yahoo.com
>Date: 05/24/02 23:06 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <LcDH8.43727$db7.1547208@news2.west.cox.net>

>I agree with a lot of what you are saying. I just don't think the amplifier
>issue can be extended to MURS/FRS/GMRS - the fact is, we just aren't seeing
>it happening.

YOU don't see it happening...Cuz your dimwit MURS radio has a range of
about a mile or two.

I already know of abuses occuring in the Atlanta area. Big ones. And I
am hearing truckers on 151.820 and .880 from my home in Winchester, TN...they
are on Interstate 24. I'll let you take a look at a topo map and tell me WHY I
know those guys are running more than 2 watts.

To be (more) specific, my home is about 510 meters west of the Winchester
(BGF) airport. Now look at the closest approach to I-24.

Are you going to try an convicne me that those guys are running "legal"
MURS radios...?!?!

4253. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 06:48:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525024828.29915.00000583@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 43522

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/24/02 18:40 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205241440.35a2d57a@posting.google.com>

>> Big deal, there are cell phones for business and internet for
>> e-mails.
>
>... and they cost $$$$ MURS is free.

Sure...You come on to Chattanooga or Atlanta with your "MURS" system and I will fire up the PDA via cellphone and we'll see who connects first.

4254. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 06:49:17 UTC
From: lucifer@eternal-flames.gov
Message-ID: <3cef2689.2385911@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 43523
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 24 May 2002 18:23:06 -0500, "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH"
<kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote:

>Aren't you forgetting the "All above 300GHz," which technically means
>that Techs have an infinite amount of bandwidth? (Though building
>those 300nm yagis can be a pain in the ass)

Only given to us because nobody else wants it - at the moment.

As soon as somebody comes up with a way to make money out of some or
all of those frequencies, we'll lose them.

Profit first and above all else. Guys..... Remember?

Nick.

4255. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 08:23:20 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205250821010.13401-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43524
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 24 May 2002, stewart wrote:
>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> wrote in message news:<3CEE61F5.B65AA908@mailcity.net>...
>> stewart wrote:
>> >
>> > The capabilities of a well built MURS station can now compete with
>> > those of a Technician Class station.
>>
>> That is an over statement if I ever saw one. MURS can no way
>> compete with any part of ham radio, even Tech class stations.
>
>I disagree, for the average Tech with a 2m handheld, a 2.1m hanheld
>will compete quite nicely.

I believe that the U.S. Military, the user of the 142MHz slice (2.1 meters),
would disagree with you.

>> > Furthermore, MURS ...

[Doesn't deserve quoting!]

4256. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 08:36:17 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205250834060.13401-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 43525
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
On Sat, 25 May 2002, 'Doc wrote:
>stewart,
> 2 meters is dormant, unused? What part of the
>country do you live in? 'Dormant' and 'unused' are
>not exactly how I would describe 2 meters in this
>area. Stew, ol'buddy, I think you'd better have your
>receiver checked...

All his 2m receivers tuned to amateur frequencies are fully desensed from all
his MURS activity.....
```

4257. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 10:59:13 UTC
From: Rood <FRS@myrigs.com>
Message-ID: <acnqquhns0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43526
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

No matter what you post, no matter your arguments, the simple unalterable fact remains that the low life
CBers will soon ruin the MURS frequencies. Common sense and reality will , despite the claims of the self-professed intelligentia, eventually rule.
I tend to scoff at those who claim to hold themselves aloof from us commoners. These self-proclaimed phonies most usually live in a fantasy world bordered by fantasy and Harry Potter books.
You Muggles are all the same.

4258. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 12:03:24 UTC
From: Real Man <realman@dontknow.jack>
Message-ID: <3CEF7D8C.4779EB9@dontknow.jack>
Source record: 43527
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoe7 wrote:
> The point is - Amps are more useful on HF because of beyond LOS
> propagation - therefore they exist... it really does no good to use amps on
> VHF - their are of course a number of ways to increase LOS comm range,
> increasing Tx power is one of the least efficient(and ineffective after a
> certain point). I've written a web page about the whole deal:
>
> http://www.geocities.com/horseshoe7/repeat.html

You got your headline and your body text sizes bassackwards.

4259. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 12:45:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525084517.14004.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 43528

>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:

>There are modes that can be copied some
> 30 dB BELOW the noise level.

To my knowledge, there are no modes that can be copied 30 dB below their necessary bandwidth.

> Actually, it should be possible to cut throught that 70,000 watt
> am signal with 100 watts (properly done, of course).

At a very slow data rate.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4260. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 12:47:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525084738.14004.00000626@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 43529

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com :

>Do you have some kind of point?

I think he made his point quite well. Your question seems to me to be a very roundabout way of trying to cast doubt on it.

I suppose it is all you can do if you can't honestly say that anything he said is incorrect.

> I suppose not... and it seems that is the underlying problem
>these days with Amateur Radio - it is basically pointless.

A pretty pathetic counter to the good points he made.

Why do you have a need to create doom and gloom where none need exist?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4261. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 12:53:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525085340.14004.00000627@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 43530

>From: "horseshoe7" horseshoe7@yahoo.com:

>So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using amps on
>VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS.

Amplifiers on VHF and up would be an excellent way of ensuring that your
station is the one that gets through congestion.

More than a few watts is generally necessary to extend that radio-horizon LOS
to hundreds of miles using various scatter modes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4262. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 12:55:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525085558.14004.00000628@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 43532

From: "horseshoe7" horseshoe7@yahoo.com:

>If I see this kind of nonsense on MURS, I'll DF the fool, and turn 'em in.

Let us know what the Commission does with it. It took them over two years to go after a few companies selling illegal long-range cordless phones that were interfering with aeronautical communications.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4263. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 12:57:29 UTC
From: Eduardo Hernandez <BigEd@MexicoEduarocom.org>
Message-ID: <aco1l1vlc0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43531
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.flame

AB8MQ@OVIS.NET wrote in message news:acm5bgelj0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Ed-dildo, doesn't it just gall you that you have to work that pizza
delivery
> job, knowing how unskilled and unemployable a product of two drug addicts
> like you are?
>
> Besides, the last mobile antenna you "acquired" was from you stealing it
off
> another ham's car.
>
> Perhaps if you had some balls, and posted under your real name, you might
> have some credibility. Does your fat hog wife still work a the cosmetics
> counter, she does look like Fat "Mimi" from the "Drew Carey Show."

Roger, you have been told before. You have me cofused with someone
in your past. Of course, this will not stop your psycho-babbling. Your
posts are psychological projection and wishful thinking. I am sorry you
live such a miserable life, but your random attacks on successful people
will do nothing to help you with your mental problems.

I actually did work at a pizza delivery job when I was in graduate
school, and the company paid a portion of my tuition. I am not married
Roger. I have a lady friend who is employed as an actress by one of the
major film industries in Hollywood. I am sorry this angers you, but your
rage is misplaced. At 50 years old, you really need to take a look at
your life Roger. You are the laughing stock of Usenet and ham radio, and
I bet in your community too.

Ed "Beans" Hernandez

>
>

4264. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 13:33:42 UTC
From: K HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <WoMH8.450$J04.196@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43533
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

> But, in any event, I'm basically comparing MURS to Amateur Technician

Not even close to being comparable. Amateur Technician has incredible
advantages over MURS. (By the way, there is no Technician license limited
to just 2M, so don't try to drag out that red-herring.)

MURS -- 5 specific frequencies, less than 100 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
Tech -- Millions of frequencies 23,962,000 Kilohertz of total bandwidth.
Advantage Tech 239,620-to-1

MURS -- One band
Tech -- Seventeen bands
Advantage Tech 17-to-1

MURS -- 2W output
Tech -- 1500W output
Advantage Tech 750-to-1

MURS -- Antenna height 20'
Tech -- No antenna height restriction.
Advantage -- Tech

MURS -- FCC certificated radios only. Modifications illegal.
Tech -- Free to use any purchased, homebrewed, or modified radio without FCC
certification.
Advantage -- Tech

MURS -- Operation restricted by US borders.
Tech -- Reciprocal operating agreements with nations all around the globe.
Advantage -- Tech

I could go on and on, but I'm sure you're getting the picture!

Comparing MURS to even the lowest privileged Amateur Radio license is like
comparing a tricycle to a Lamborghini, and the comparison suffers even worse
when you compare MURS to a General or Extra class Amateur Radio license.

73, de Hans, K0HB
 SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4265. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 13:44:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <7zMH8.461$J04.199@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43534
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"horseshoe7" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

> So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using amps
on
> VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS.

I love it when you talk LOUD to try to overcome your lack of rational
persuasion.

Speaking of loud, in the case of MURS (with only 5 channels) the old notion
of 'capture effect' will ensure that I can get through all the other weak
signals on channel. 'Capture effect' is done with power.

Can you say "amplifier"?

I knew you could!

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4266. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 13:50:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <AEMH8.464$J04.13@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43535
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"horseshoe7" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> The argument was that people would use AMPLIFIERS on FRS and MURS - this
is
> absolutely wrong... you KNOW IT, and are trying to CHANGE THE SUBJECT.
>
> Amplifiers are not being used on FRS, GMRS or MURS.
>

Wait until a couple of good ol' boys get frustrated with the congestion on
those measly 5 little channels, and discover the magic of 'capture effect'
on FM.

Can you say 'afterburner'?

I knew you could!

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4267. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:21:17 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <aco8dn$q58$4@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43545
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.george-ashley,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"hoodat" <hoodat@hoodatHerbieNrOne.com> whined in message
news:acmm00$gj8$0@pita.alt.net...
> <<<<plonk>>>>

SPANK! You strill get get away from your molesting your daughter from your
first marriage and caused her suicide, Polly.

4268. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:22:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <d6NH8.2337$B63.122732675@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43536
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3CEED2C9.172E6346@mailcity.net...
>
>
> stewart wrote:
>
> >
> > For the most part, there is very little action on any VHF/UHF band
> > other than 2m.
>
> You really should get a vhf/uhf radio that actually receives and
> listen again.

I've got a whiz-bang dual bander in my car with enough memory slots to plug in -every- 2m frequency pair and simplex frequencies. And they are programmed in. Then I have a handheld scanner with the same frequencies programmed in. At home I have another scanner with the "popular" repeater and simplex frequencies programmed in.

With all that said, there is very little 2M FM activity in the central Ohio area. Compared to Omaha NE is the mid-late 80's, its dead.

4269. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:27:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <NbNH8.2338$oi3.123399190@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43537

Answer the question. What part of the country do you live in? Is it the
same part that Stewart lives in?

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.44.0205250834060.13401-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Sat, 25 May 2002, 'Doc wrote:
> >stewart,
> > > 2 meters is dormant, unused? What part of the
> >country do you live in? 'Dormant' and 'unused' are
> >not exactly how I would describe 2 meters in this
> >area. Stew, ol'buddy, I think you'd better have your
> >receiver checked...
>
> All his 2m receivers tuned to amateur frequencies are fully desensed from
all
> his MURS activity.....
>
>
>

4270. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:28:29 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <aco8dp$q58$6@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43546
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.eduardo-hernandez,rec.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Ed-dildo Hernandez" <BigEd@MexicoEduarocom.org> whined in message
news:aco1l1vlc0@pita.alt.net...
>
> AB8MQ@OVIS.NET wrote in message news:acm5bgelj0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > Ed-dildo, doesn't it just gall you that you have to work that pizza
> delivery
> > job, knowing how unskilled and unemployable a product of two drug
addicts
> > like you are?
> >
> > Besides, the last mobile antenna you "acquired" was from you stealing it
> off
> > another ham's car.
> >
> > Perhaps if you had some balls, and posted under your real name, you
might
> > have some credibility. Does your fat hog wife still work a the cosmetics
> > counter, she does look like Fat "Mimi" from the "Drew Carey Show."
>
> Roger, [whines and backpedals]

You in graduate school? BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

4271. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:29:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <VcNH8.2339$Hi3.123417622@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43539

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020524183506.17546.00000626@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "K&#65533;HB" KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET
>
> >I could go on and on, but I'm sure you're getting the picture!
>
> I can't speak for Stewart, but the "ham radio is doomed" brigade will not
get
> the picture; they will move onto something else that lets them preach the
> gloom. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Agreed. Or they could actively move us toward doomsday by proposing that we get rid of our VHF+ frequencies.

4272. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:30:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <heNH8.2340$0j3.123439119@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43540

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020524225137.28084.00000200@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <yUuH8.883$3L6.518@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K&#65533;HB"
> <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> writes:
>
> >Comparing MURS to even the lowest privileged Amateur Radio license is
like
> >comparing a tricycle to a Lamborghini, and the comparison suffers even
worse
> >when you compare MURS to a General or Extra class Amateur Radio license.
>
> Hansl:
>
> You forgot the "-lite" at the end of the above-mentioned license classes
> for those licensed after 4/15/00.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Kinda like your suffix.

4273. mike wirings

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:34:27 UTC
From: red_devil_69 <red_devil_69@ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <NaNH8.2006$td4.89942@newsfep1-win.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 43538

Anybody got any mike wiring in how to wire up a yeasu md1 desk mike up to a kenwood ts440s...thanks

_____ Lucy Lastic ICQ#: 72022606 Current ICQ status: + More ways to contact me i See more about me:

_____

4274. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:40:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525104002.26868.00000330@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 43541

In article <lSDH8.43744$db7.1553896@news2.west.cox.net>, "horseshoe7"
<horseshoe7@yahoo.com> writes:

>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
>news:8D9B12C89638CC30.69FBAE998BAAE243.A6D6DF330576D1BC@lp.airnews.net...
>> On 24 May 2002 10:58:34 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>>
>> >This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
>> >will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
>> >become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
>> >wrong.
>>
>> Nope, it just hasn't had time yet. There are still way too many
>> people out there that aren't familiar with FRS. Once they start
>> fiddling with it, some of them will start ruining it, and it will be
>> all downhill from there.
>
>It's been around for quite a long time(1996?)

That's not a long time at all.

>- pretty much EVERYONE has one
>of these little radios now

Not true. Most of the people I know have no idea GMRS, MURS or
FRS even exist. The only people I know who have any of them are
a childcare center that uses FRS handhelds as a wireless intercom
and a married couple that used FRS handhelds for car caravaning
until they got better cellphone plans.

>- there aren't folks with amplifiers abusing
>these frequencies.

Not yet. cb was well behaved the first couple of years, too.

There may not be any abusers in the area your radios can reach, but
can you speak for the entire country? I think not.

> If it hasn't happened by now - it NEVER is gonna happen.

That's utter nonsense. cb was well behaved the first couple of years, too.
Then people began to discover that they could break the rules and get
away with it. Before long, breaking the rules became the norm. And this was
in a licensed radio service, with callsigns and everything.

Perhaps FRS, MURS and GMRS will stay well behaved in the long term.
Perhaps they won't.

Building or converting amplifiers for MURS is duck soup. There are plenty of amateur and commercial service amplifiers out there that will do the job. Existing designs can be easily copied, too.

Hams should be concerned because MURS and GMRS abuse can result in unreasonably restrictive rules on amateurs, just the way CB abuse resulted in unreasonably restrictive rules on amateurs on HF. Did those 1978 rules end illegal cb amplifiers? Nope.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4275. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:40:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dnNH8.2342$hl3.123570360@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43542

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEF0678.3060508@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >
> >
> >>They can insist until the end that they are equal to the
Pre-Restructuring
> >>hams, but it will never be the case, and they will always occupy a low
> >>place on the pecking order among their superiors. Sad, but true.
> >>
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >
> > Larry, do you axeually believe this crap?
>
>
> How can it be any different? It is for the same reason that a Harvard or
> MIT graduate will be more sought after and receive a much higher
> starting salary than, say, a graduate from Milton university in northern
> Wisconsin, which typically accepts the lower 25% of a high school
> graduating class, just for the money. Now, the 5 wpm Extra may be a
> great ham and all that but first impressions are based upon what you
> know about a person. If all people know is that a person needed to do to
> become an extra is to pass a laughable 5 wpm code test, (why even
> bother?) then right off the bat he/she is not a coded ham, therefore
> he/she must be something less than a coded ham who had to meet a much
> higher standard. This, Brian, is a matter of public knowledge. Deal with
it.
>
> de KR4AJ

Did you learn your code at Harvard, MIT, or Milton?

4276. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:43:41 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEFA31D.6000800@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43543

CAM wrote:

>
> How many people in the world give a rat's patootie how fast you can
> read code? *Nobody* cares how fast I can read code, not even I.
>

There must be a lot of people in the world who care how fast certain people can read code. Otherwise there would be no code tests. When you obtained your license, didn't the FCC care how fast you as an applicant could read code? Whether or not you care how fast you now can read code is not relevant to the discussion although one could easily assume that you do not care how fast you now can read code, even if you hadn't stated it, correct? If so, then there is no need to re-state it.

73 de KR4AJ

4277. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:47:50 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEFA416.4070109@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43544

Brian P Burke wrote:

> Did you learn your code at Harvard, MIT, or Milton?

Axeually, I never respond to one-liners, even if they are axeually clever.

de KR4AJ

4278. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 14:53:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QzNH8.2347$Jp3.123821352@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43547

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEF098C.7050404@bellsouth.net...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > Yes, Dick; I will gladly tell you that ARRL believes that it must
continue to
> > accomplish things on ham radio, every day, and not stop because it has
done
> > good things in the past.
> >
> > Does that help?
> >
> > Did you really need someone to explain that to you? If so, things must
be
> > getting pretty bad for you and I hope you feel better soon.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed, when will the ARRL start insisting on excellence rather than the
current
>
> dumbing down of the test structure?

The ARRL was the last hold out for you're beloved multiple code exams and excessive license classes. The ARRL has instituted courses that can earn continueing education credits. Milton might even accept them.

Sorry for the direct question but I do not
>
> want to beat around the bush. ARRL may have done some good but they have
> done irreparable damage to the culture of ham radio.

Only by dragging their feet on eliminating the code requirement, and by not having a vision for the future of amateur radio. I think the ARRL more as an Amateur Radio Historical Society.

For every one
> good operator they have attracted, mostly on VHF, they have attracted 10
> qwarmers

"Qwarmers?" What's dat?

> on HF that are dragging HF to the ground...but then again, ARRL
> seems to prefer the VHF/UHF + frequencies anyway.

Huh? Go look at all the frequencies that the ARRL/W1AW broadcasts your beloved code practice sessions on. Report back the ratio of HF to VHF+ freqs.

4279. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:02:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525110210.25235.00000953@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 43548

>Agreed. Or they could actively move us toward doomsday by proposing that we
>get rid of our VHF+ frequencies.
>
>

Sounds like a good Idea

4280. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:03:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEFA7C1.C9CB9832@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43549

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The extra class exam is a minimum requirements exam for obtaining
> > an extra class license.
>
> Yep, the Extra test you took is a real no-brainer, and that would help explain why
> you waited so long to take one.

I took my first ham exam in 1951. Ham exams have always been of the set of minimum requirement exams. A spelling bee exam is an example of a maximum requirement exam where there is one and only one winner. You obviously don't comprehend the meaning of a "minimum requirements" exam. The difficulty of the exams may have changed over time but at the time they were offered, they have always been minimum requirement exams. Everyone who barely squeaked by with a minimum grade got the same amount of credit for the exam that you and I did.

Did you get extra credit for knowing more than was on your exams? If not, all you can say is that you met the minimum requirements for the exam just like all the rest of us. You are really going to have to find a better way of obtaining your self esteem than dwelling on some minimum requirements exam that you passed decades ago. That's certainly not worthy of more than a minuscule amount of respect from others.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4281. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:06:10 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <2B054AFDBC80D522.972398C525B14EF0.02F0116AEA1912AB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43550
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 24 May 2002 15:40:43 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>Anything over 5W is overkill for anything other than bizarre
>applications like EME... 2W is plenty with a couple of good antennas
>at each end of the link.

If both users don't mind wandering around with 11 element yagis
nailed to their hats, and *if* they don't mind having to keep them
continuously pointed at each other while moving, then they might be
able to match the performace of a good 2m mobile rig.

Some of us like to talk more than a few miles away.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4282. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:12:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ARNH8.2357$hv3.124137585@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43551

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020525024212.29915.00000582@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
> >From: "horseshoe7" horseshoe7@yahoo.com
> >Date: 05/24/02 23:06 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <LcDH8.43727$db7.1547208@news2.west.cox.net>
>
> >I agree with a lot of what you are saying. I just don't think the
amplifier
> >issue can be extended to MURS/FRS/GMRS - the fact is, we just aren't
seeing
> >it happening.
>
> YOU don't see it happening...Cuz your dimwit MURS radio has a range of
> about a mile or two.
>
> I already know of abuses occuring in the Atlanta area. Big ones.
And I
> am hearing truckers on 151.820 and .880 from my home in Winchester,
TN...they
> are on Interstate 24. I'll let you take a look at a topo map and tell me
WHY I
> know those guys are running more than 2 watts.

Steve, you tell us how far you are from an airport, but your point should have been how far you are from I-24. Unless the airport is closed and they're using it for a truck driver school and testing center like the old Chanute AFB.

When I get back to work I'll bring up the DRG for your location. Since I don't have "image analyst" I won't be able to do a visibility function on the vector from your location to I-24, but I'm skilled enough at reading the height contours to. Oh yeh, what is the height of your antenna? What is the gain at the back of the radio.

I assume that you are claiming that intervening terrain would block a 150mhz signal at 5 watts over a distance of 1/3 mile? If not, please clarify.

4283. Re: mike wirings

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:22:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CEFAC18.961FDD31@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43552

I can tell you the pinout of the mic connector on the TS440S:
Front view:
center pin is the ground for the stby,
Now going clockwise from 12 'o clock:
at 1:30 position, ground for the mic,
at 3 'o clock: no connection,
at 4:30, 8V at 10ma,
6 'o clock, "UP"
7:30, "DOWN"
9 'o clock, "STBY"
10:30, mic.

red_devil_69 wrote:

> Anybody got any mike wiring in how to wire up a yeasu md1 desk mike up to a
> kenwood ts440s...thanks
> _____ Lucy
> Lastic ICQ#: 72022606 Current ICQ status: + More ways to contact me i See
> more about me:
> _____

4284. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:22:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEFAC45.C434A3A7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43553

Dan Finn wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > How many people in the world give a rat's patootie how fast you can
> > read code? *Nobody* cares how fast I can read code, not even I.
>
> There must be a lot of people in the world who care how fast certain
> people can read code. Otherwise there would be no code tests. When you
> obtained your license, didn't the FCC care how fast you as an applicant
> could read code?

Yes, they cared (past tense) about my code speed back in 1952 but that was
50 years ago. My statement was in present tense and is a true statement. I
haven't been code tested in the past 50 years. Therefore: "*Nobody* cares
(present tense) how fast I can read code, not even I." My code speed is
completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4285. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:30:43 UTC
From: LSB <l.s.booth@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <D6OH8.3620$UT.274707@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43554
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Relevance???? I have a ham license, I am working on a 2.4ghz antenna, and a 160m antenna. I will look at and try if possible any new technology on one end and restore/use BA gear on the other. I love telecommunications. My ham ticket is relevant to me because I am an experimenter and an operator. I use 802.11b for home networking, just another technology. MURS is interesting. Do I see it as a threat to HR? No....Cynics who want to prophesize the demise of HR are the real threat. Do something, contribute to the science of radio, teach others.

If the AR service is irrelevant to you......quit.

stewart <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:5f4fe4c2.0205231335.52663b3e@posting.google.com...
> The latest MURS rules changes now simply limit transmitter power
> output to 2W, and remove the old 2W ERP restriction:
>
> http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-02-139A1.doc
>
> This effectively raises the ERP limit to about 10W for omni base
> stations, and about 50W with a directional beam antenna.
>
> With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>
>
> Horseshoe7, Stewart, N0MHS
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

4286. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:46:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ilOH8.2363$2L3.125089109@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43555

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020525110210.25235.00000953@mb-fp.aol.com...
> >Agreed. Or they could actively move us toward doomsday by proposing that
we
> >get rid of our VHF+ frequencies.
>
> Sounds like a good Idea

We've got Larry and Bruce on the same page. Anyone else want to eliminate
our VHF+ authorizations?

4287. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:49:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <soOH8.2366$OA3.124459251@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43556
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
news:3ceef008.4714762@news.cet.com...
> In <cuvyxnansvbet.gwmxepp.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop> wrote:
>
> >On 24 May 2002 09:58:11 -0700, stewart wrote:
> >
> >>The fact stands - MURS has been made a more capable service, and now
> >>offers capabilities and privileges on the order of those of the
> >>Amateur Technician Class license.
> >
> > The fact stands - the only reason that there is a "MURS" is that
> > folks went to the nearest CostCo or BestBuy and bought the JobComm
> > or Color-Dot radios which were intended for small business use WITH
> > A LICENSE and then started using them without benefit of same. This
> > is criminal behavior no better than the ham-band "bootlegger" or the
> > broadcast "pirate".
> >
> > The Commish'- to my deep disgust - was more interested in getting
> > more economists and phone-company=merger specialists on board -
> > folks who had no concept of what radio regulation was all about or
> > should be - than in putting more law enforcement agents on the
> > streets to clean up the mess, and the rest is history.
>
> True story.
>
> > Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
> > with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
> > does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
> > turn chicken and leave you alone.
>
> I think it depends on which lobbyist carries the most cash. A harsh
> accusation to be sure, but many of the Commission's decisions in the
> past few years are inconsistent with any other method of management.

Like Bob Dole, as he exited public life, sponsored a bill allowing 100% of
the radio/tv media in any metropolitan area to be owned by one person.

Why would he do that?

4288. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:52:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <IqOH8.2368$_M3.125198500@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43557

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEFA31D.6000800@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >
> > How many people in the world give a rat's patootie how fast you can
> > read code? *Nobody* cares how fast I can read code, not even I.
> >
>
>
> There must be a lot of people in the world who care how fast certain
> people can read code. Otherwise there would be no code tests.

2003.

4289. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 15:57:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <DvOH8.2371$xP3.125348021@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43558

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEFA416.4070109@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>
> > Did you learn your code at Harvard, MIT, or Milton?
>
> Axeually, I never respond to one-liners, even if they are axeually clever.
>
>
> de KR4AJ

I'm just trying to determine how much more (or less) valuable your code is over my code. I mean, if there's a pecking order and all, and it hinges around code. Because the written exams are harder now than ever before and I've passed them, so I've got rank on you there.

4290. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 16:54:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <_kPH8.693$J04.253@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43559
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Horseshoe, you're going to have to help us here.

We need you to explain the difference between useful ERP and "virtually useless' ERP.

On one hand you say higher ERP is VIRTUALLY USELESS ---

> So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using amps on
> VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS.

But on another hand you applaud the lifting of ERP limits ---

> This effectively raises the ERP limit to about 10W for omni base
> stations, and about 50W with a directional beam antenna.

Which kind of ERP is useful?

I can imagine ol' Billy Bob buying hisself a 14dB gain antenna, string some lowloss coax, and exclaiming "Sheeeett, ah'm putting me an ERP of 50W over toward ol' Ellie Mae's house!."

Then I can imagine Ellie Mae hollerin' back "Yeah, but I called 1-800-HAM-AMPS and got me one of them thar Mirage B-320G bricks, and ah'm puttin' me an ERP of 200W in every durn direction! That be making me about 6dB louder'n ya'll in every direction!"

Well, ol' Billy Bob's mammy din't raise no idjits. He slaps hisself on the forehaid and esclaims "Ah'll jess get me one of them thar bricks too -- lessee, my antenna done gave me 14dB, and that thar brick of Ellie Mae's is givin' 20dB -- that be 'bout 34dB -- holy sheeeeeeeitt, my ERP done be 'bout 5,000W -- hell's bell's -- I ***OWN*** them thar MURS channels fer a hunnert miles around old Mount Baldy!"

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4291. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 16:57:17 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEFC26D.6030102@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43560

Brian P Burke wrote:

> I'm just trying to determine how much more (or less) valuable your code is
> over my code. I mean, if there's a pecking order and all, and it hinges
> around code. Because the written exams are harder now than ever before and
> I've passed them, so I've got rank on you there.

With all due respect, do not ask me how much more valuable my code is over your code. Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is over a high school diploma. For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves, bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order. KR4AJ has nothing to do with it. It is simply a fact that one must accept. If you obtain a certification as a dog catcher under a reduced set of standards compared to that of another dog catcher's certification, you will not be held under the same degree of esteem as the dog catcher certified under the higher standard. Who cares? Perhaps the person who hires the dog catcher cares. Perhaps the National Dog Catcher Society cares. Perhaps fellow dog catchers think the one certified to the higher standard cares more about dog catching and will always strive to catch more dogs, more efficiently. I don't know Brian, that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger. It's something you cannot change. Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams complained to the hilt and took that option away.

Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a higher standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being unfair to the less talented?

As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that. Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio test was the code test. But you know that already.

73 de KR4AJ

4292. Who is the real Wayne Green?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 17:01:46 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0205250901.4589a9df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43561

From the reviews in eham.net, I have had the impression there are two different people named Wayne Green in charge of _73_ magazine. Some say he is a kook while others say he is an iconoclast with fresh new ideas.

I have had the opportunity to read a few of Wayne Green's columns in his _73_ magazine. I was right. There are two different Wayne Greens running the magazine. The cutting-edge Wayne Green (the side I like) has complained about the fact that the ARRL hasn't done enough to bring ham radio into the mainstream and out of obscurity. (I can relate to this. For most of my life, I was unaware of ham radio.) This is the same side of Wayne Green who has complained about the bureaucratic nature of the educational system and the students who endure it. (I can relate to this, too. I'm still trying to recover.)

The kooky Wayne Green, however, thinks that the government faked the moon landing and is hiding aliens. This is the same kook who sells advertisements to psychics and "miracle" medical quacks.

I want to see the good Wayne Green who attacks the issues. I want the kooky conspiracy theorist to be abducted by aliens.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet@@@jasonhsu.com
http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html

4293. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 17:05:31 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525130531.14328.00000550@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 43562

>The fact stands - the only reason that there is a "MURS" is that
> folks went to the nearest CostCo or BestBuy and bought the JobComm
> or Color-Dot radios which were intended for small business use WITH
> A LICENSE and then started using them without benefit of same. This
> is criminal behavior no better than the ham-band "bootlegger" or the
> broadcast "pirate".
>
> The Commish'- to my deep disgust - was more interested in getting
> more economists and phone-company=merger specialists on board -
> folks who had no concept of what radio regulation was all about or
> should be - than in putting more law enforcement agents on the
> streets to clean up the mess, and the rest is history.

Interesting, Phil. I thought the general consensus was that the FCC does NOT "reward" illegal behavior by legalizing it.

>Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
> with a Petition for Rulemaking,

You mean kind of like RM-9807? Then the above statement no longer applies.

>or just go ahead and do what the law
> does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
> turn chicken and leave you alone.

"CQ, CQ, CQ 11 meters."

>The second method makes me sick.

The first method's been tried...and proven unreliable.

><Enough ranting>

Agreed. Take care and 73.

Mark

4294. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 17:17:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEFC740.F0C6A0CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43563

Dan Finn wrote:
> As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that.
> Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is
> not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
> test was the code test. But you know that already.

I got my mail-order Conditional in 1952 after rote memorizing the ARRL
License Manual. I obtained all amateur frequency/power privileges at
that time. I regained all amateur frequency/power privileges in 2000
when I passed the Extra exam. In my life, there was no effective
difference between the Conditional class license and the Extra class
license. There was nothing I wanted to do with a Conditional license
in the 50's that I couldn't do. Virtually all of the value of a ham
license is in the privileges granted. That you view amateur radio exams
as some sort of "King-of-the-Mountain" game is of no consequence to anyone
except you and the small minority of hams like you who don't realize that
your's is actually a "King-of-the-Molehill" delusionary diversion from
the real world of amateur radio. It is the, "When I was young, I had to
walk to school in snowstorms", mentality at work. My Dad rode a mule
to school. So what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4295. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 17:19:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <OIPH8.2406$%j4.127255770@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43564

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEFC26D.6030102@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>
> > I'm just trying to determine how much more (or less) valuable your code
is
> > over my code. I mean, if there's a pecking order and all, and it hinges
> > around code. Because the written exams are harder now than ever before
and
> > I've passed them, so I've got rank on you there.
>
>
> With all due respect, do not ask me how much more valuable my code is
> over your code.

Why not?

Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is
> over a high school diploma.

Depends on the H.S., depends on the college.

For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
> bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.

Survival of the fittest?

> KR4AJ has nothing to do with it.

Dan can accept it, embrace it, or reject it. Dare he change it?

> It is simply a fact that one must accept.

Accept oppression?

> If you obtain a certification as a dog catcher under a reduced
> set of standards compared to that of another dog catcher's
> certification, you will not be held under the same degree of esteem as
> the dog catcher certified under the higher standard.

By whom?

>Who cares?

Dick, Larry, and Bruce. And you, it would appear.

Perhaps
> the person who hires the dog catcher cares. Perhaps the National Dog
> Catcher Society cares. Perhaps fellow dog catchers think the one
> certified to the higher standard cares more about dog catching and will
> always strive to catch more dogs, more efficiently.

> I don't know Brian,
> that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger.

Messenger? You guys aren't the messengers. You're trying to be the
enforcers of a false system of values.

> It's something you cannot change.

I think I've already been part of making the change. The actuarial tables
will have to take care of the rest.

> Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
> hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
> complained to the hilt and took that option away.

You measure a ham by the exam he took. A better system would be to measure
a ham by what he does. But why measure at all?

> Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a higher
> standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
> unfair to the less talented?

Ah, finally a question. The exam needs to test what is necessary to equip
and operate a station within the confines of the authorization, and to do so
safely. Anything else is irrelevant and superflous.

> As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that.
> Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is
> not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
> test was the code test. But you know that already.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined,
in your opinion.

4296. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 17:25:58 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEFC926.1050107@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43565

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:3CEF098C.7050404@bellsouth.net...

> The ARRL was the last hold out for you're beloved multiple code exams and
> excessive license classes. The ARRL has instituted courses that can earn
> continueing education credits. Milton might even accept them.

I wouldn't know about that but to pass today's written exams does not
even require an education of the same quality as one might obtain from
answering an advertisement on a matchbook, much less Milton.

>
> Sorry for the direct question but I do not
>
>>want to beat around the bush. ARRL may have done some good but they have
>> done irreparable damage to the culture of ham radio.
>>
>
> Only by dragging their feet on eliminating the code requirement, and by not
> having a vision for the future of amateur radio. I think the ARRL more as
> an Amateur Radio Historical Society.

What is *your* vision of the future of amateur radio, Brian?

>
> For every one
>
>>good operator they have attracted, mostly on VHF, they have attracted 10
>>qwarmers
>>
>
> "Qwarmers?" What's dat?

A type of radio pest whose species has multiplied many times over since
the introduction of the 5 wpm General amateur license. This QRMing
creature has no known natural enemies because it refuses to use a call
sign to identify himself. They are known to frequent the voice portions
of HF frequencies, particularly in the 20m and 75 meter bands. They are
indistinguishable from problem 11 meter operators. They are usually not
found on the code portions of the bands possibly because they are not
capable of receiving 13 wpm code transmissions.

>
>>on HF that are dragging HF to the ground...but then again, ARRL
>>seems to prefer the VHF/UHF + frequencies anyway.

>>
>
> Huh? Go look at all the frequencies that the ARRL/W1AW broadcasts your
> beloved code practice sessions on. Report back the ratio of HF to VHF+
> freqs.

I don't need to. The ratio is probably close to zero. Would you expect ARRL

to have a presence in all major cities so that they could "broadcast" code practice

via

line-of sight communication?

Come on Brian, when you studied for your license, surely you memorized
the part about skywave propagation?

de KR4AJ

4297. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 17:51:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CEFB26B.F05EFD31@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43566
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.flame

Eduardo Hernandez wrote:
> At 50 years old, you really need to take a look at
> your life Roger.

He would but he has no life.

> You are the laughing stock of Usenet and ham radio, and I bet in your > community too.

The local ham club kicked him out and won't let him join any more,
and he thinks everyone who posts is named Polly.

4298. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 17:59:20 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEFD0F8.1090007@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43567

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:3CEFC26D.6030102@bellsouth.net...
>
>>
>>Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>I'm just trying to determine how much more (or less) valuable your code
>>>
> is
>
>>>over my code. I mean, if there's a pecking order and all, and it hinges
>>>around code. Because the written exams are harder now than ever before
>>>
> and
>
>>>I've passed them, so I've got rank on you there.
>>>
>>
>>With all due respect, do not ask me how much more valuable my code is
>>over your code.
>>
>
> Why not?

Because there is no quantitative measure of value for effort and commitment.

>
> Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is
>
>>over a high school diploma.
>>
>
> Depends on the H.S., depends on the college.

I agree. And code proficence depends upon the code speed.

>
> For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
>
>>bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.
>>
>

> Survival of the fittest?

Yes. Do not blame KR4AJ for this one either.

>
>>KR4AJ has nothing to do with it.
>>
>
> Dan can accept it, embrace it, or reject it. Dare he change it?

Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.

>
>
>>It is simply a fact that one must accept.
>>
>
> Accept oppression?

That's Life in the big city, Bud.

>
>
>>If you obtain a certification as a dog catcher under a reduced
>>set of standards compared to that of another dog catcher's
>>certification, you will not be held under the same degree of esteem as
>>the dog catcher certified under the higher standard.
>>
>
> By whom?
>
>
>>Who cares?
>>
>
> Dick, Larry, and Bruce. And you, it would appear.

Whether we care or not onviously does not not matter to you. The fact
that it matters to many pther people who know nothing else about what a
great ham you are, Brian, may or may not matter to you. But all I'm
saying is that certification to a higher standard matters to people in
general. That is Life.

>
> Perhaps
>
>>the person who hires the dog catcher cares. Perhaps the National Dog
>>Catcher Society cares. Perhaps fellow dog catchers think the one
>>certified to the higher standard cares more about dog catching and will
>>always strive to catch more dogs, more efficiently.
>>
>
>>I don't know Brian,

>>that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger.
>>
>
> Messenger? You guys aren't the messengers. You're trying to be the
> enforcers of a false system of values.

I object to that statement. My role in Life is not to enforce any system of values. I merely observe, and I am reporting to you what I observe. You may disagree that what I observe is really true but that is another discussion. But what do you observe, Brian? That people never observe a pecking order or that survival of the fittest is not a characteristic of humanity? Go ahead, take a shot at it, explain to us your New Wave approach to interpreting Humanity in general.

>
>
>>It's something you cannot change.
>>
>
> I think I've already been part of making the change. The actuarial tables
> will have to take care of the rest.

Brian, the part about the actuarial tables is not a very nice thing to say. The Amateur operator is supposed to be friendly and not darken the face of Amateur radio. Part 97 doesn't say that..but you know it is true. I am ashamed to be associated with a ham who writes like this.

>
>
>>Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
>>hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
>>complained to the hilt and took that option away.
>>
>
> You measure a ham by the exam he took. A better system would be to measure
> a ham by what he does.

And you measure a ham by his statistical probability on an actuarial table. Nice guy.

>But why measure at all?

What? You want no test at all? Just give everybody a ham license?

>
>
>>Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a higher
>>standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
>>unfair to the less talented?
>>
>
> Ah, finally a question. The exam needs to test what is necessary to equip
> and operate a station within the confines of the authorization, and to do so

> safely. Anything else is irrelevant and superflous.

Aha, so you do want to measure something! At least that is a start.

>
>
>>As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that.
>>Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is
>>not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
>>test was the code test. But you know that already.
>>
>>73 de KR4AJ
>>
>
> So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined,
> in your opinion.

...putting words in my mouth...No, but it is probably more valuable than
the written test at filtering out effort and commitment to amateur radio.

Now a question for you:

Do you value a person's probability statistic on an actuarial table to
be more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined?

de KR4AJ

4299. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 18:03:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525140342.25367.00000516@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 43568

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: "LSB" l.s.booth@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 05/25/02 11:30 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <D6OH8.3620$UT.274707@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>

>If the AR service is irrelevant to you......quit

It appears he already has.

73
Steve, K4YZ

4300. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 18:05:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEFD255.64DB542E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43569

Dan Finn wrote:
> I wouldn't know about that but to pass today's written exams does not
> even require an education of the same quality as one might obtain from
> answering an advertisement on a matchbook, much less Milton.

Judging from the poor English used by some of the older Extras,
amateur radio *never* required a very good education.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4301. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 18:09:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEFD372.DED25A9B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43570

Dan Finn wrote:
> Because there is no quantitative measure of value for effort and commitment.

Effort and commitment are not Part 97 requirements.

Say Dan, I see you have the same problem with Netscape 6.2 that caused me
to go back to Netscape 4.6 Got any idea why it puts in all those extra
lines?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4302. Re: Who is the real Wayne Green?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 18:10:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525141054.25367.00000522@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 43571

>Subject: Who is the real Wayne Green?
>From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu)
>Date: 05/25/02 13:01 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f7d9a152.0205250901.4589a9df@posting.google.com>

>I want to see the good Wayne Green who attacks the issues. I want the
>kooky conspiracy theorist to be abducted by aliens.

If they (aliens) do take him, you'd lose both. Wayne DID have some good ideas...back around 1978.

He could talk up a storm, but then do absolutely nothing about it. He ran the life out of "73" magazine until it was bought out and some new money (and editorial responsibility) was infused.

Along the way he managed to some little personal credit, to get back into the sadle with his tirades and meandering "editorials". he now uses "73" as his personal footstool for meaningless rants. Wayne's "Never Say Die" editorials were the "rrap" of his day.

His big thing is to suggest "someone" could do all these great things for Ham Radio, perhaps even supplanting the ARRL. HE might have done it at one time, but never did.

Wayne Green is Amateur radio's infamous "also ran".

73

Steve, K4YZ

4303. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 18:27:45 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CEFD7A1.7090106@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43572

CAM wrote:

> Dan Finn wrote:
>
>>Because there is no quantitative measure of value for effort and commitment.
>>
>
> Effort and commitment are not Part 97 requirements.

I agree; certainly very few if any Federal codes deal with effort and commitment but the topic Brian introduced was about intrinsic value, not Part 97.

>
> Say Dan, I see you have the same problem with Netscape 6.2 that caused me
> to go back to Netscape 4.6 Got any idea why it puts in all those extra
> lines?

Actually, believe it or not, I actually put the extra lines there for clarity due to the number of imbedded articles. If that is a problem for people not running the window maximized, I can eliminate the extra spaces.

73 de KR4AJ

4304. Re: Who is the real Wayne Green?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 18:52:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <acomgmlpd1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43573

Wayne Green died during the abortive attempt to take over the ARRL back in 1963. His "Institute of Amateur Radio" was actually a front organization for the American CBer in drag club... Now defunct due to lack of interest.

The shell that runs around Dayton talking to K1MAN is really a bio-robot. He designed it in his heyday of Byte commando.

Dan/W4NTI
"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0205250901.4589a9df@posting.google.com...
> From the reviews in eham.net, I have had the impression there are two
> different people named Wayne Green in charge of _73_ magazine. Some
> say he is a kook while others say he is an iconoclast with fresh new
> ideas.
>
> I have had the opportunity to read a few of Wayne Green's columns in
> his _73_ magazine. I was right. There are two different Wayne Greens
> running the magazine. The cutting-edge Wayne Green (the side I like)
> has complained about the fact that the ARRL hasn't done enough to
> bring ham radio into the mainstream and out of obscurity. (I can
> relate to this. For most of my life, I was unaware of ham radio.)
> This is the same side of Wayne Green who has complained about the
> bureaucratic nature of the educational system and the students who
> endure it. (I can relate to this, too. I'm still trying to recover.)
>
> The kooky Wayne Green, however, thinks that the government faked the
> moon landing and is hiding aliens. This is the same kook who sells
> advertisements to psychics and "miracle" medical quacks.
>
> I want to see the good Wayne Green who attacks the issues. I want the
> kooky conspiracy theorist to be abducted by aliens.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> usenet@@@jasonhsu.com
> http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio-technical.html

4305. Re: Who is the real Wayne Green?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 18:54:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <acomka$8mh$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43574

Yep Yep.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020525141054.25367.00000522@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >Subject: Who is the real Wayne Green?
> >From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu)>

Wayne Green is Amateur radio's infamous "also ran".
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

4306. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 19:03:41 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <f0cc2d6c6081d4edb6f2fcb3499ca8ab.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43575

Of course, Ed. I found it interesting that amateurs could actually do
moonbounce on 24 GHz with the water vapor loss running only 85 watts.
Obviously, slow data rates are necessary, but that beats no data at all!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020525084517.14004.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com

> >"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
> >There are modes that can be copied some
> > 30 dB BELOW the noise level.
>
> To my knowledge, there are no modes that can be copied 30 dB below their
> necessary bandwidth.
>
> > Actually, it should be possible to cut throught that 70,000 watt
> > am signal with 100 watts (properly done, of course).
>
> At a very slow data rate.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4307. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 19:11:29 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <a91e8a9784c35af8e5606c9d18c6c65d.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43576
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Stewart, you seem to think there isn't a point. The point is about learning. This served the United States very well back in 1968 (I believe it was 1968 - within a year). The Coast Guard lost a big tower on Saipan (did I get this right this time, Hans?). The Navy was having a big problem copying the hams they sent over to get communications back up (the disaster was caused by a typhoon). I was in the shack at KG6AAY on NavCommSta Guam and heard the goings on. I called the signs 'sparkplug, sparkplug1, this is KG6AAY standing by'. The net result was that the AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS restored communications. For a number of days, we were the ONLY communications to that island. Hans was one of the guys that went over to Saipan. This has happened countless times, you simply may not have heard about it. One does not learn simply by talking on the radio. The hobby is much richer than you can ever imagine (and far bigger than I know about as well). It is a valuable resource to this country whether you or I believe it or not.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205241456.69dce605@posting.google.com

> Absolutely. What is wrong with that? Again, do you have some kind of
> point? I suppose not... and it seems that is the underlying problem
> these days with Amateur Radio - it is basically pointless.
>
> Stewart - N0MHS

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4308. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 19:24:12 UTC
From: vhfradiobuff@aol.com
Message-ID: <5e5fccab.0205251124.159d9aa1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43577
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0205231335.52663b3e@posting.google.com>...
> With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> Radio just keeps getting less relevant.

In that case, please email me and I will provide the shipping address
where you can send all of your ham equipment. Thank you!

4309. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 19:47:07 UTC
From: sparky@cet.com
Message-ID: <3cefe8f0.2837590@news.cet.com>
Source record: 43578
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In <GrDH8.40919$9z5.2632569@typhoon.austin.rr.com>, "Randy"
<rchapman8@houston.rr.com> wrote:

>
>"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
>news:3ceee73b.2461793@news.cet.com...
>> In <26zH8.130793$Q42.6570780@typhoon.austin.rr.com>, "Randy"
>> <rchapman8@houston.rr.com> wrote:
>>
>> <snip>
>> >So Sparky, got any suggestions on building a dual band amp for FRS and
>MURS?
>> >Oh wait, nevermind, Mirage already makes those. TeeHee!
>>
>> What do you call that -- flaming spam?
>>
>> BTW Randy, it's been so long since you ducked the issue, I can't
>> remember if you said one-way skip causes -more- or -less- interference
>> than two-way skip. So which is it?
>>
>
>You said that, I did not.

Let me refresh your memory. The discussion was about noise caused from
skip, to which you responded:

"...not all DX is reciprocal inkind or magnitude."

Now what does that mean if not saying that the -reciprocity- of skip
is a factor in band noise? I'm sure most will agree that skip causes
noise, but how does one-way skip affect the noise level differently
than two-way skip? That's what you said, Randy, like it or not. Now
quit avoiding the question and answer it.

4310. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 19:52:57 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <acoq13$2jq$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43579
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:aco8dn$q58$4@pita.alt.net...
>
> "hoodat" <hoodat@hoodatHerbieNrOne.com> whined in message
> news:acmm00$gj8$0@pita.alt.net...
> > <<<<plonk>>>>
>
> SPANK! You strill get get away from your molesting your daughter from your
> first marriage and caused her suicide, Polly.

OK. What the heck is "strill get get away"?
Must be some sort of West Virginia speak.
And he claims to have attended college.

4311. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 19:57:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CEFECB4.91A22673@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43580

Dan Finn wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Say Dan, I see you have the same problem with Netscape 6.2 that caused me
> > to go back to Netscape 4.6 Got any idea why it puts in all those extra
> > lines?
>
> Actually, believe it or not, I actually put the extra lines there for
> clarity due to the number of imbedded articles. If that is a problem for
> people not running the window maximized, I can eliminate the extra spaces.

I would be interested in knowing if you can get rid of those extra
lines while continuing to use Netscape 6.2. The extra lines don't
appear in this reply. I wonder why?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4312. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 20:10:41 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <acor2b$6lj$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43581
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:7zMH8.461$J04.199@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "horseshoe7" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using amps
> on
> > VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS.
>
> I love it when you talk LOUD to try to overcome your lack of rational
> persuasion.
>
> Speaking of loud, in the case of MURS (with only 5 channels) the old
notion
> of 'capture effect' will ensure that I can get through all the other weak
> signals on channel. 'Capture effect' is done with power.
>
> Can you say "amplifier"?
>
> I knew you could!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> ��� SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
>

Well done! Kudos!!!
Now, is anybody listening?

4313. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 20:24:14 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <acorro$8ir$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43582
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K&#65533;HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:_kPH8.693$J04.253@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Horseshoe, you're going to have to help us here.
>
> We need you to explain the difference between useful ERP and "virtually
> useless' ERP.
>
> On one hand you say higher ERP is VIRTUALLY USELESS ---
>
> > So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using amps
> on
> > VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS.
>
> But on another hand you applaud the lifting of ERP limits ---
>
> > This effectively raises the ERP limit to about 10W for omni base
> > stations, and about 50W with a directional beam antenna.
>
> Which kind of ERP is useful?
>
> I can imagine ol' Billy Bob buying hisself a 14dB gain antenna, string
some
> lowloss coax, and exclaiming "Sheeeett, ah'm putting me an ERP of 50W over
> toward ol' Ellie Mae's house!."
>
> Then I can imagine Ellie Mae hollerin' back "Yeah, but I called
> 1-800-HAM-AMPS and got me one of them thar Mirage B-320G bricks, and ah'm
> puttin' me an ERP of 200W in every durn direction! That be making me
about
> 6dB louder'n ya'll in every
> direction!"
>
> Well, ol' Billy Bob's mammy din't raise no idjits. He slaps hisself on
the
> forehaid and esclaims "Ah'll jess get me one of them thar bricks too --
> lessee, my antenna done gave me 14dB, and that thar brick of Ellie Mae's
is
> givin' 20dB -- that be 'bout 34dB -- holy sheeeeeeeitt, my ERP done be
'bout
> 5,000W -- hell's bell's -- I ***OWN*** them thar MURS channels fer a
hunnert
> miles around old Mount Baldy!"

>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> ��� SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

Well done again! I gots ter git me wunna dem dere radidios so's I kin git
out, too.
How much duz wunna them there kickers cost? I heard dat I did. Ten four?

4314. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 20:42:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CEFDA92.1065C80E@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43583
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Sparky wrote:

>
> Now what does that mean if not saying that the -reciprocity- of skip
> is a factor in band noise? I'm sure most will agree that skip causes
> noise, but how does one-way skip affect the noise level differently
> than two-way skip? That's what you said, Randy, like it or not. Now
> quit avoiding the question and answer it.

I guess he thinks one-way skip creates only half as much noise as
two-way skip.

4315. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 21:21:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF00018.12F9265D@att.net>
Source record: 43584

Dan Finn wrote:

> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > I'm just trying to determine how much more (or less) valuable your code is
> > over my code. I mean, if there's a pecking order and all, and it hinges
> > around code. Because the written exams are harder now than ever before and
> > I've passed them, so I've got rank on you there.
>
> With all due respect, do not ask me how much more valuable my code is
> over your code. Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is
> over a high school diploma. For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
> bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.
> KR4AJ has nothing to do with it. It is simply a fact that one must
> accept. If you obtain a certification as a dog catcher under a reduced
> set of standards compared to that of another dog catcher's
> certification, you will not be held under the same degree of esteem as
> the dog catcher certified under the higher standard. Who cares? Perhaps
> the person who hires the dog catcher cares. Perhaps the National Dog
> Catcher Society cares. Perhaps fellow dog catchers think the one
> certified to the higher standard cares more about dog catching and will
> always strive to catch more dogs, more efficiently. I don't know Brian,
> that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger. It's something you
> cannot change. Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
> hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
> complained to the hilt and took that option away.
>
> Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a higher
> standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
> unfair to the less talented?
>
> As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that.
> Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is
> not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
> test was the code test. But you know that already.

Dang, Dan, where ya been for so long? I've been trying to put in such clear yet precise terms for years, and here you come and just lay it out in terms that even Brian can understand! Good job!

4316. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 22:02:24 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.com>
Message-ID: <QRTH8.136721$Q42.6725934@typhoon.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 43585
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
news:3cefe8f0.2837590@news.cet.com...
> In <GrDH8.40919$9z5.2632569@typhoon.austin.rr.com>, "Randy"
> <rchapman8@houston.rr.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Sparky" <sparky@cet.com> wrote in message
> >news:3ceee73b.2461793@news.cet.com...
> >> In <26zH8.130793$Q42.6570780@typhoon.austin.rr.com>, "Randy"
> >> <rchapman8@houston.rr.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> <snip>
> >> >So Sparky, got any suggestions on building a dual band amp for FRS and
> >MURS?
> >> >Oh wait, nevermind, Mirage already makes those. TeeHee!
> >>
> >> What do you call that -- flaming spam?
> >>
> >> BTW Randy, it's been so long since you ducked the issue, I can't
> >> remember if you said one-way skip causes -more- or -less- interference
> >> than two-way skip. So which is it?
> >>
> >
> >You said that, I did not.
>
> Let me refresh your memory. The discussion was about noise caused from
> skip, to which you responded:
>
> "...not all DX is reciprocal inkind or magnitude."
>
> Now what does that mean if not saying that the -reciprocity- of skip
> is a factor in band noise? I'm sure most will agree that skip causes
> noise, but how does one-way skip affect the noise level differently
> than two-way skip? That's what you said, Randy, like it or not. Now
> quit avoiding the question and answer it.
>

It means what it says Aaron/Sparky. How fucking dense are you? It has
nothing to do with causing more or less interference with regard to
reciprocity.

4317. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 22:50:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CF01562.56F8F204@adelphia.net>
Source record: 43586

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> >> If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing done today does
> >either.
>
> >I think this one gets posted on my office wall, Dick!! Do you want
> >quote attributes? 8^)
>
> Would that be like laying on the operating table just before brain surgery and
> seeing the surgeon wearing a button that says "It doesn't have to be perfect to
> be good?"

No, I don't even know how you picked that out of this.

> I do have a suggestion; if you put it up in your office, put it where your boss
> won't see it. :-)

I'm kind of surprised, Ed! I put great stock in what has gone before. We
can't stay there, but what happened before provides the foundation for
where we are going.

But Dick is right. If all there is is now, and if what has passed is
not worth anything, then the march of time makes all useless. Why even
watch the news.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4318. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 23:42:37 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3CF0216D.E5EAD00@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 43587
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.flame

JJ wrote:
>
> Eduardo Hernandez wrote:
> > At 50 years old, you really need to take a look at
> > your life Roger.
>
> He would but he has no life.
>
> > You are the laughing stock of Usenet and ham radio, and I bet in your > community too.
>
> The local ham club kicked him out and won't let him join any more,
> and he thinks everyone who posts is named Polly.

The local ham club kicked him out? Why, he's been insisting that in RL
he's a very different person.

Guess he's been lying about that too.

4319. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-25 23:43:44 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF02198.3E39C44B@icok.net>
Source record: 43588
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Rood,
What's a 'muggles'?
'Doc

4320. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:03:25 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@TinyTennaBARF.org>
Message-ID: <acp8m5khq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43589
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.flame

AB8MQ@OVIS.NET wrote in message:
>
> SPANK! You strill get get away from your molesting your daughter from your
^^^^^^^^^^^^
> first marriage and caused her suicide, Polly.
>
>
And Roger expects us to believe he is a "college graduate"?

HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

4321. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:07:58 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@TinyTennaBARF.org>
Message-ID: <acp8ul$la8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43590
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message
news:acoq13$2jq$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:aco8dn$q58$4@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "hoodat" <hoodat@hoodatHerbieNrOne.com> whined in message
> > news:acmm00$gj8$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > <<<<plonk>>>>
> >
> > SPANK! You strill get get away from your molesting your daughter from
your
> > first marriage and caused her suicide, Polly.
>
> OK. What the heck is "strill get get away"?
> Must be some sort of West Virginia speak.
> And he claims to have attended college.
>

Roger attend college? He doesn't even have a job, let alone
a life! HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH

4322. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:08:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qIVH8.1918$VG.81880170@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43591

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEFD0F8.1090007@bellsouth.net...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CEFC26D.6030102@bellsouth.net...
> >>
> >>Brian P Burke wrote:
> >>>I'm just trying to determine how much more (or less) valuable your code
is
> >>>over my code. I mean, if there's a pecking order and all, and it
hinges
> >>>around code. Because the written exams are harder now than ever before
> >>>and I've passed them, so I've got rank on you there.
> >>
> >>With all due respect, do not ask me how much more valuable my code is
> >>over your code.
> >
> > Why not?
>
> Because there is no quantitative measure of value for effort and
commitment.

So people who were radio and electronics careerists should be denied an
amateur radio license because it comes to them with no effort?

> > Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is over a high
school diploma.
> >
> > Depends on the H.S., depends on the college.
>
> I agree. And code proficence depends upon the code speed.

Nope, I could copy 9wpm error free. I could not copy 13wpm at 70%. I was
proficient at one speed, a failure at another.

> > For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
>> bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.
> >
> > Survival of the fittest?
>
> Yes. Do not blame KR4AJ for this one either.

Who are we trying to oust? Where is this competitiveness AGAINST your
fellow ham come from?

> >>KR4AJ has nothing to do with it.
> >
> > Dan can accept it, embrace it, or reject it. Dare he change it?
>
> Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.

It is your construct, not a mountain.

> >>It is simply a fact that one must accept.
> >
> > Accept oppression?
>
> That's Life in the big city, Bud.

There are idiots in the big city, and you're one of them.

> Whether we care or not onviously does not not matter to you. The fact
> that it matters to many pther people who know nothing else about what a
> great ham you are, Brian, may or may not matter to you. But all I'm
> saying is that certification to a higher standard matters to people in
> general. That is Life.

You've said that the highest license (not certification) is meaningless.

> >>I don't know Brian,
> >>that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger.
> >>
> > Messenger? You guys aren't the messengers. You're trying to be the
> > enforcers of a false system of values.
>
> I object to that statement. My role in Life is not to enforce any system
> of values.

Then cease and desist.

> I merely observe, and I am reporting to you what I observe.
> You may disagree that what I observe is really true but that is another
> discussion. But what do you observe, Brian? That people never observe a
> pecking order or that survival of the fittest is not a characteristic of
> humanity? Go ahead, take a shot at it, explain to us your New Wave
> approach to interpreting Humanity in general.

Kill all the no code Techs? I don't think so.

> >>It's something you cannot change.
> >
> > I think I've already been part of making the change. The actuarial
tables
> > will have to take care of the rest.
>
> Brian, the part about the actuarial tables is not a very nice thing to
> say. The Amateur operator is supposed to be friendly and not darken the
> face of Amateur radio. Part 97 doesn't say that..but you know it is
> true. I am ashamed to be associated with a ham who writes like this.

Yes Dan, try being friendly. Say friendly things othere than "I only observe...Don't shoot the messenger..."

> >>Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
> >>hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
> >>complained to the hilt and took that option away.
> >>
> >
> > You measure a ham by the exam he took. A better system would be to measure
> > a ham by what he does.

> And you measure a ham by his statistical probability on an actuarial
> table. Nice guy.

I am a nice guy. But I have my faults. One of them is to accept newcomers to the service without judging them by the code exam they took, or what university they took it at.

> >But why measure at all?
>
> What? You want no test at all? Just give everybody a ham license?

You have such a limited mind. Try one exam, one license.

> >>Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a higher
> >>standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
> >>unfair to the less talented?
> >
> > Ah, finally a question. The exam needs to test what is necessary to equip
> > and operate a station within the confines of the authorization, and to do so
> > safely. Anything else is irrelevant and superflous.
>
> Aha, so you do want to measure something! At least that is a start.

Yes, do they know the rules? Can they operate an amateur station safely?

> >>As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that.
> >>Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is
> >>not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
> >>test was the code test. But you know that already.
> >>
> >>73 de KR4AJ
> >>
> >
> > So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined,
> > in your opinion.
>
> ...putting words in my mouth...No, but it is probably more valuable than
> the written test at filtering out effort and commitment to amateur radio.

Part 97 doesn't ask for effort nor commitment. You don't even have to raise your right hand and swear allegiance to America in order to have a license.

> Now a question for you:
>
> Do you value a person's probability statistic on an actuarial table to
> be more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined?

It will eventually get rid of people like me and you who remember that there used to be layers of useless licensing requirements. Only then will we consider the measure of a good ham by what de does and how he does it (rather than by how fast he beeps).

4323. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:08:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525200855.18803.00000517@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43592

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>You are plainly stating that what happens today won't matter tomorrow, and
>you can't understand that's what your saying.

You are being ridiculous, Dick. I guess I had assumed that any idiot would know that the actions of the past have consequences in the future. I just didn't assume that anyone could possibly have felt I was saying otherwise.

If that is your interpretation, you are either an idiot or are being very deliberate in your misunderstanding.

>If Newington runs on that kind of juice no wonder they stumble around so much
>up there.

Well, you are using my "juice" as an example. Do you think that my work for ARRL HQ in the areas of RFI, RF safety and spectrum issues has been stumbling?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4324. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:10:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <LJVH8.1919$ZG.81884323@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43594

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEFD7A1.7090106@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dan Finn wrote:
> >
> >>Because there is no quantitative measure of value for effort and
commitment.
> >>
> >
> > Effort and commitment are not Part 97 requirements.
>
> I agree; certainly very few if any Federal codes deal with effort and
> commitment but the topic Brian introduced was about intrinsic value, not
> Part 97.

Intrinsic value is measured by a federal exam? Try again.

4325. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:10:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525201025.18803.00000518@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43593

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>How long do you think Ed's job at the ARRL would last if he shared your
>attitude
>of, "I have arrived and now I can rest on my laurels"?

By his intentional misinterpretation of my words, he did imply that if I did
that, I wouldn't stumble around in my work.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4326. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:11:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525201145.18803.00000519@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43596

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>> If hams were expected to continue accomplishing things after they passed
>the
>> exam, it was a minimum requirement test.

>Would you care to quote any such expectations in Part 97? They're not there,
>nor any requirement whatever beyond requirements for each level of license.

So now Dick is saying that hams should not do anything with their licenses.

Well there you have it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4327. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:12:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <lLVH8.1920$JH.81924251@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43595

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF00018.12F9265D@att.net...
> Dan Finn wrote:
>
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > I'm just trying to determine how much more (or less) valuable your
code is
> > > over my code. I mean, if there's a pecking order and all, and it
hinges
> > > around code. Because the written exams are harder now than ever
before and
> > > I've passed them, so I've got rank on you there.
> >
> > With all due respect, do not ask me how much more valuable my code is
> > over your code. Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is
> > over a high school diploma. For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
> > bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.
> > KR4AJ has nothing to do with it. It is simply a fact that one must
> > accept. If you obtain a certification as a dog catcher under a reduced
> > set of standards compared to that of another dog catcher's
> > certification, you will not be held under the same degree of esteem as
> > the dog catcher certified under the higher standard. Who cares? Perhaps
> > the person who hires the dog catcher cares. Perhaps the National Dog
> > Catcher Society cares. Perhaps fellow dog catchers think the one
> > certified to the higher standard cares more about dog catching and will
> > always strive to catch more dogs, more efficiently. I don't know Brian,
> > that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger. It's something you
> > cannot change. Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
> > hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
> > complained to the hilt and took that option away.
> >
> > Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a higher
> > standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
> > unfair to the less talented?
> >
> > As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that.
> > Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is
> > not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
> > test was the code test. But you know that already.
>
> Dang, Dan, where ya been for so long? I've been trying to put in such
clear yet
> precise terms for years, and here you come and just lay it out in terms

that even
> Brian can understand! Good job!

Yes, I understand the analogy is incorrect. Dan won't answer what
university taught him morse code.

4328. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:18:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CRVH8.1921$9G.81831966@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43597

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEFC926.1050107@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CEF098C.7050404@bellsouth.net...
> >
> >
> > > The ARRL was the last hold out for you're beloved multiple code exams
and
> > > excessive license classes. The ARRL has instituted courses that can
earn
> > > continueing education credits. Milton might even accept them.
> >
> >
> > I wouldn't know about that but to pass today's written exams does not
> > even require an education of the same quality as one might obtain from
> > answering an advertisement on a matchbook, much less Milton.

Milton must a dump. When did you matriculate?

> > Sorry for the direct question but I do not
> > >
> > >>want to beat around the bush. ARRL may have done some good but they have
> > >> done irreparable damage to the culture of ham radio.
> > >>
> > >
> > > Only by dragging their feet on eliminating the code requirement, and by
not
> > > having a vision for the future of amateur radio. I think the ARRL more
as
> > > an Amateur Radio Historical Society.
> >
> >
> > What is *your* vision of the future of amateur radio, Brian?

People using the priveleges to communicate, experiment, learn, provide
emergency communications, have fun.

> > For every one
> > >
> > >>good operator they have attracted, mostly on VHF, they have attracted 10
> > >>qwarmers

> >>
> >
> > "Qwarmers?" What's dat?
>
>
> A type of radio pest whose species has multiplied many times over since
> the introduction of the 5 wpm General amateur license. This QRMing
> creature has no known natural enemies because it refuses to use a call
> sign to identify himself. They are known to frequent the voice portions
> of HF frequencies, particularly in the 20m and 75 meter bands. They are
> indistinguishable from problem 11 meter operators. They are usually not
> found on the code portions of the bands possibly because they are not
> capable of receiving 13 wpm code transmissions.

Those are disgruntled Extras and they've been there for years.

> >>on HF that are dragging HF to the ground...but then again, ARRL
> >>seems to prefer the VHF/UHF + frequencies anyway.
> >>
> >
> > Huh? Go look at all the frequencies that the ARRL/W1AW broadcasts your
> > beloved code practice sessions on. Report back the ratio of HF to VHF+
> > freqs.
>
> I don't need to. The ratio is probably close to zero. Would you expect
ARRL
> to have a presence in all major cities so that they could "broadcast" code
practice
> via
> line-of sight communication?

With an i-Link they could broadcast on 145.00 MHz in Moscow. Sheesh. Let's
use our brain a little.

> Come on Brian, when you studied for your license, surely you memorized
> the part about skywave propagation?
>
> de KR4AJ

Nope, I dropped some acid and actually became part of the ionosphere - for a
moment. I did memorize the existing band edgedes at the time. Today I use
a cheat sheet. Can't wait to add 5MHz to it.

4329. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:19:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bSVH8.1923$UJ.82066743@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43598

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CEFD255.64DB542E@IEEE.org...
> Dan Finn wrote:
> > I wouldn't know about that but to pass today's written exams does not
> > even require an education of the same quality as one might obtain from
> > answering an advertisement on a matchbook, much less Milton.
>
> Judging from the poor English used by some of the older Extras,
> amateur radio *never* required a very good education.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Not only that, but have you tried to read the code they send?

4330. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:21:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <TTVH8.1924$9K.82084080@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43599

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020525201145.18803.00000519@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >Would you care to quote any such expectations in Part 97? They're not
there,
> >nor any requirement whatever beyond requirements for each level of
license.
>
> So now Dick is saying that hams should not do anything with their
licenses.
>
> Well there you have it.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

We should all be like Dick?

4331. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:22:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525202223.18803.00000520@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43600

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>Then you are NOT using "FRS" radios, nor are they approved for MURS if
>theya re over 2 watts.

Do you mean that the very fellow who got on here and swore on a stack that no one using MURS would ever break a rule is breaking a rule? Who woulda' figured.

Now, I went looking for a newsgroup for this service that he alleged is "better than amateur" and couldn't find one.

It must not be very popular.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4332. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:23:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <SVVH8.1926$6F.81763484@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43651

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:f0cc2d6c6081d4edb6f2fcb3499ca8ab.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Of course, Ed. I found it interesting that amateurs could actually do
> moonbounce on 24 GHz with the water vapor loss running only 85 watts.
> Obviously, slow data rates are necessary, but that beats no data at all!
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Dan Finn says that slow means a person isn't proficient.

4333. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:25:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525202520.18803.00000521@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43652

From: 'Doc w5lz@icok.net

> 2 meters is dormant, unused? What part of the
>country do you live in?

I don't think 2 meters is dormant in his part of the country at all. He wants to say that it is because he thinks that he can trick all the hams into operating on MURS.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4334. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:27:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525202737.18803.00000522@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43653

From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net

>Of course, Ed. I found it interesting that amateurs could actually do
>moonbounce on 24 GHz with the water vapor loss running only 85 watts.
>Obviously, slow data rates are necessary, but that beats no data at all!

I agree wholeheartedly, btw; I find QRSS and long-term intergration techniques to be very interesting. I expect to have a DSP-10 up and running fairly soon and will transvert it to HF. I want to see what can be done with QRP that would make a QRPer tremble! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4335. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:28:19 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <D_VH8.21347$%y.2033048@bin4.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 43654
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message news:ackekk$dq5$0@pita.alt.net...
> Not so! The Ham freqs. WILL continue to be relevant. Look for the CB'ers to
> get into these five freqs and ruin them. Two watts? Bah! Since when has a
> CB'er ever played by the rules?

Good point, there are enough examples of that right here on this news group.

> Look for them to buy Ham two meter rigs,
> modify the TX, buy an amplifier with five watts in, 100 out and modify it,
> too. They will ruin the MURS frequencies within five years. Mark my words.
> Remember when CB was licensed and limited to 4 watts? Good concept, but it
> was doomed for failure from the outset. The MURS frequencies will meet the
> same fate.

Maybe or maybe not. The Ham Fox hunters will have a field day tracking down the bozos, on VHF it is much harder to hide one's activities and location. The real concern is not the running of power, but the fact that the idiots who do the above will find it almost irresistible to dial their modified 2m rigs down to the Ham 2m band to take advantage of the nation wide system of repeaters, some linked in to multistate coverage systems, for a quick QSO with other like minded pirate operators. The reason they would even consider dropping down to the 2m Ham band is due to the fact that many businesses still use the now unlicensed MURS frequencies, and likely will continue to do so. This could make the current problem with intruders on 10m and 12m look small.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

4336. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:29:55 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acpfg1dju0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43663
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"'Doc" <w5lz@icok.net> wrote in message news:3CF02198.3E39C44B@icok.net...
>
>
> Rood,
> What's a 'muggles'?
> 'Doc

It's what Rood calls those gerbils he inserts rectally.

4337. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:39:04 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acpfg4dju1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43664
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.stagger-lee,rec.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.flame

Woman beater with a criminal record of spousal abuse "Stagger Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> whined in message
news:3CF0216D.E5EAD00@houston-hunks.com...
> Jizzswallowing Perry whined:
> >
> > Ed-dildo Hernandez slobbered:
> > > At 50 years old

First off, jackass, I'm not 50 years old, or can you illegal beaners from
Mexico even count?
Here's some help for you, pedo:

2002 - 1955 = ?

See if you can figure it out, you perverted pedo. And quit selling those
controlled drugs, or Eckerd's is going to be minus 1 pill-pusher.

>> >you really need to take a look at

You really need to quit molesting your own daughter.

> > He would but he has no life.

Says the virgin who follows a 47 year old man around and slurps his ass in
the newsgroup.

> > The local ham club kicked him out

Which ham club would that be?

>
> The \ /
Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit "Stagger Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically
admits he has no credibility by his own definition in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

I heard the Houston area hamclubs don't want you after you stole some of
their funds, Faggot Lee. Guess your reputation of cheating other hams at
hamfests got around.
--
Faggot Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com> confirms his SPANKARD status with the
following whine (but the BITCH still follows up like a good puppy dog to
every post) in <a9c75dgon0@dosa.alt.net >:

"Basically, Wiseman bores me now, and I won't waste time on his replies
[blah blah blah]"

4338. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:43:54 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <edWH8.19431$%o.2010648@bin3.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 43655
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205240958.50295699@posting.google.com...
> With no skip, there is no incentive to go with
> exceedingly higher power in the first place, because it serves
> virtually no useful purpose on VHF/UHF.

Tell that to Mirage amps, RF Concepts, Beko Elektronik,etc. They do a tidy amount of business selling V/UHF amps, and they DO make a difference on those bands with or without skip conditions. You'll be hard pressed to find a serious V/UHF operator that does not own an amplifier. I own and use several myself.

http://www.mirageamp.com/mirageamp/index.php
http://www.alpha-amps.com/rfconcepts/index.html
http://www.beko.cc/amateurfunk_english.htm

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

4339. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:44:32 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acpfg7dju2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43665
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.lloyd-davies,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

LLLLLLARDASSSSSSS "Lloyd" <Lloyd@TinyTennaBARF.org> slobbered in message
news:acp8ul$la8$0@pita.alt.net...

"Tiny" doesn't even cover what the women say your dick is, Lllardasssssss.

> "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberalz.com> slobbered in message
> news:acoq13$2jq$0@pita.alt.net...

> > OK. What the heck

Monkey boy "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@BetterThanRonaldReagan.com>
gleefully gibbered incoherently when dog penises are presented to him to
suck
in <9fpehvlih0@dosa.alt.net>:

"Whoo hoo hoo hoo!!!"

>
> Roger attend college?

Poor baby, like Steve Turdeater, who couldn't hack freshman year at college
and had to drop out, LllllArdasssssss Lllllloyd's GPA only allowed him to
complete that worthless certificate.

> He doesn't even have a job,

Says the Piuzza delivery boy who shills those stolen obsolete computer parts
at a flea market in his crack-house, ghetto neighborhood

> let alone a life!

In article <95qrtt$p1r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Lloyd/N0VFP <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote:
"It's a lot more complicated than that. I need friends, sure. But, you
dont know how lonely I am in this life."
--
Lllllllllllaaaaaaardasssssssss Lllllllllllllllloyd
"Friends of Hal Turner" <we.will@get.by.com> confessed his fatassed status
in message news:3c388ad7$1_3@news.teranews.com...
"SO WHAT IF I'M A LARDASS??<...> DOESNT IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?
SO WHAT IF I WEAR A SIZE 38-40 PANTS AND SIZE 18 DRESS SHIRTS?
IS THAT A CRIME? I WORK WITH PEOPLE WHO ARE ALOT BIGGER THAN ME....."

4340. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:46:31 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acpfnmemp0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43666
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.lloyd-davies,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.flame

LLLLLLLARDASSSSSSSSSSSSSS"Lloyd" <Lloyd@TinyTennaBARF.org> wrote in message
news:acp8m5khq0@pita.alt.net...
>
> AB8MQ@alt.net wrote in message:
> >
> > SPANK! You still can't get away from your molesting your daughter from
your
> > first marriage and caused her suicide, Polly.
> >
> >
> And Roger []

Lloyd Asswipe Davies<N0VFP@AOL.COMNOSPAM proves is as ignorant of history
and
politics as he is in everything else when he "wrote" in message
<19990823214439.01713.00000283@ng-cd1.aol.com>...
"There are those call Liberty People "Nazis" What does supposed to mean?
I thought a Nazi was a communist."

"People like AF2Y dont listen to reason! He's just a Jew!"
-Lloyd Davies, neo-nazi comic sex clown, keeping
that Old Auschwitz spirit alive, in <iDbA4.9105$_P5.1472043@news2.mia>
----
n0vfp@aol.comWWCR (Brother Lloyd Davies) drooled in
<20010318230639.03162.00003271@ng-md1.aol.com>
"Never Met a Jew I liked"

Antisemetic Lllllllloyd Davies, N0VFP slobbered in
<3AAEDE2C@MailAndNews.com>:
"No, Jew lover, I have a Ten-Tec RX-320, controlled by my new IBM
Thinkpad laptop."

In article <95qrtt$p1r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Lloyd/N0VFP <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote:
"It's a lot more complicated than that. I need friends, sure. But, you
dont know how lonely I am in this life."

Racist "Lloyd Davies" <n0vfp@bellsouth.net> drooled in message
news:OYs16.135$Gc5.10799@news1.atl...
"Hey nigger breath, you and your "brothers" will all pay for all the
trouble you given us for many, many years...It's CHRISTMAS, you jungle
bunny.

Here's to hoping you will get the lynching you so deserve.
Hoping someone will lynch you......."

Lllllllllllardassss Llllllloyd the degenerate homosexual racist fuck
slobbered in
<20020121163251.04829.00002231@mb-cm.aol.com>:

"You sound just like a nigger lover. Down here in Athens, Alabama. We
celabreat
robert. e. lees birthday."

And LLLLLARDASSSSSSSSS LLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLOYD expects us to believe he
graduated from high school?
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!
--
"Lloyd Davies" <r74bfrr@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020104131356.23129.00001216@mb-fp.aol.com...
"To many people are saying hatful things about me.
My computer busines is picking up, so i'll be leaveing for good this time."

Ill-educated Llllardasss Llllloyd enlightens us with:
"Do you think they send out retest letters for good amatuer pratice?"
in <9tc95n$4u$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>.

Llllllardasssssss Lllllllloyd,who has Hitler's lone testicle in his mouth,
slobbered in
<3c75c041_7@news.teranews.com>:
"Listen old zionist pig, I do not have a "ghost writer""

Llllllardasssssss Lllllllloyd fucks up as usual in
<012857CA.1269072F@taranews.net>:
" HAHAHAHAHAHA! roger is going to be a famious guy!!!!!"

Lllllllllllardass Lllllllllllllllllloyd, N0VFP, English illiterate,
ironically slobbers more of his
Xtian academy schooling in <3c813e49_8@news.1usenet.com>:
"Woger feels he does not have to post proof. He never engagages in
intelligent posts."

4341. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:46:58 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF03082.8030003@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43656

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:3CEFD7A1.7090106@bellsouth.net...
>
>>
>>CAM wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Dan Finn wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Because there is no quantitative measure of value for effort and
>>>>
> commitment.
>
>>>Effort and commitment are not Part 97 requirements.
>>>
>>I agree; certainly very few if any Federal codes deal with effort and
>>commitment but the topic Brian introduced was about intrinsic value, not
>>Part 97.
>>
>
> Intrinsic value is measured by a federal exam? Try again.

OK, here goes:

"I agree; certainly very few if any Federal codes deal with effort and
commitment but the topic Brian introduced was about intrinsic value, not
Part 97."

de KR4AJ

4342. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:52:41 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <tlWH8.18513$Kp.2073600@bin7.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 43657
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.com> wrote in message
news:26zH8.130793$Q42.6570780@typhoon.austin.rr.com...
> So Sparky, got any suggestions on building a dual band amp for FRS and MURS?
> Oh wait, nevermind, Mirage already makes those. TeeHee!

No they don't Randy. They do make dual band 2m, 70cm FM only amps, and only two models at that. The BD-35, which I use for my dual band HT, and the higher power version the BD-38-G. Both amps are for FM use only, and the output drops off real fast outside of the Ham Bands they are tuned to operate on.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

4343. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:55:40 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF0328C.8080603@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43658

CAM wrote:

>
> I would be interested in knowing if you can get rid of those extra
> lines while continuing to use Netscape 6.2.

Yes, you can take them out,

> The extra lines don't appear in this reply.

Or not put them in,

>I wonder why?

Is why!
de KR4AJ

4344. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 00:55:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <poWH8.1934$sT.82654371@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43659

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF03082.8030003@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CEFD7A1.7090106@bellsouth.net...
> > >
> > >>
> > >>CAM wrote:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>Dan Finn wrote:
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>>Because there is no quantitative measure of value for effort and
> > >>>>
> > > commitment.
> > >
> > >>>Effort and commitment are not Part 97 requirements.
> > >>>
> > >>I agree; certainly very few if any Federal codes deal with effort and
> > >>commitment but the topic Brian introduced was about intrinsic value, not
> > >>Part 97.
> > >>
> > >
> > > Intrinsic value is measured by a federal exam? Try again.
> >
> >
> > OK, here goes:
> >
> > "I agree; certainly very few if any Federal codes deal with effort and
> > commitment but the topic Brian introduced was about intrinsic value, not
> > Part 97."
> >
> > de KR4AJ

You wanted to measure an amateur. I'm saying the license class isn't a good
measure - you should look for other indicators.

Yet I hear you say that the only way YOU can know if the ham has given the
proper effort and commitment is by the level and date of his license.

4345. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 01:07:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525210716.13422.00000232@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 43660

In article <3CF02198.3E39C44B@icok.net>, 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net> writes:

>Rood,
> What's a 'muggles'?
> 'Doc

It's from the Harry Potter books. Means ordinary humans, having no
special powers. Mildly patronizing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4346. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 01:07:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020525210716.13422.00000231@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 43661

In article <a91e8a9784c35af8e5606c9d18c6c65d.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Stewart, you seem to think there isn't a point. The point is about
>learning. This served the United States very well back in 1968 (I
>believe it was 1968 - within a year). The Coast Guard lost a big tower
>on Saipan (did I get this right this time, Hans?). The Navy was having
>a big problem copying the hams they sent over to get communications
>back up (the disaster was caused by a typhoon). I was in the shack at
>KG6AAY on NavCommSta Guam and heard the goings on. I called the
>signs 'sparkplug, sparkplug1, this is KG6AAY standing by'. The net
>result was that the AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS restored communications.
>For a number of days, we were the ONLY communications to that island.
>Hans was one of the guys that went over to Saipan. This has happened
>countless times, you simply may not have heard about it. One does not
>learn simply by talking on the radio. The hobby is much richer than you
>can ever imagine (and far bigger than I know about as well). It is a
>valuable resource to this country whether you or I believe it or not.

Exactly right, Jim. That sort of thing is still going on. Consider the following,
which happened 10 days ago:

(from ARRL website)>

"New Mexico amateurs called in to help following air crash: John Strain, K0HGW, and his brother Larry, N7DF, of La Luz, New Mexico, were called in May 15 by the Burro Flats Volunteer Fire Department to assist in search and recovery efforts after a German Air Force Tornado fighter plane crashed in the mountains near Alamogordo. They used a DeLorme topographic computer map to chart the GPS coordinates of the search and rescue crews and coordinated Air Force, county sheriff and news media personnel. US Forest Service crews who were called in to fight the forest fire that developed were monitored on multiple scanners. Communications were relayed through the sheriff's dispatch office, since many on-site units could not reach their repeater stations from the canyon floor. Early on the morning of May 16, the welcome news was relayed that one crew member had been located and was being transported out with relatively minor injuries. Firefighters reaching the wreckage at daybreak discovered that the other crewman had failed to eject in time, however. During the following day, N7DF remained at the US Air Force Incident Command Post and helped pinpoint the major crash features with his portable computer and GPS. Maps were printed out and provided to the US and German Air Force for documenting the incident. Meanwhile K0HGW manned the Burro Flats Firehouse and provided support for the Forest Service firefighters. John Strain continued providing support into the weekend until the final crash recovery operations were assumed by the US Air

Force."

Note that the local fire company, the US Forest service, and both the US and German Air Forces worked with amateurs to effect the search and rescue.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4347. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 01:54:00 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF04038.6040804@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43662

Brian P Burke wrote:

> So people who were radio and electronics careerists should be denied an
> amateur radio license because it comes to them with no effort?

If they are careerists, that would be professional. Should professionals
be granted amateur radio licenses with no effort?

>
>>>Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is over a high
>>>
> school diploma.
>
>>>Depends on the H.S., depends on the college.
>>>
>>I agree. And code proficence depends upon the code speed.
>>
>
> Nope, I could copy 9wpm error free. I could not copy 13wpm at 70%. I was
> proficient at one speed, a failure at another.

So in this case a neutral observer may conclude that your certification
to operate on the code portions of the band is based on a faulty
standard because it allow you to operate where you are incapable of
communicating. Perhaps it would be better for you to only operate in the
voice or the old novice code portions. Certainly, you should not be
given privileges in any sub-bands where you cannot understand anyone,
correct? What if there is an emergency?

>
>
>>>For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
>>>bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.
>>>
>>>Survival of the fittest?
>>>
>>Yes. Do not blame KR4AJ for this one either.
>>
>
> Who are we trying to oust? Where is this competitiveness AGAINST your
> fellow ham come from?

What competitiveness? You keep losing sight of the fact that KR4AJ is
merely trying to state a fact. Is stating a fact competitive?

>
>
>>>>KR4AJ has nothing to do with it.
>>>>
>>>Dan can accept it, embrace it, or reject it. Dare he change it?
>>>
>>Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.
>>
>
> It is your construct, not a mountain.

I believe that survival of the fittest was Darwin's construct but it
could be about as difficult to change as moving a mountain.

>
>
>>>>It is simply a fact that one must accept.
>>>>
>>>Accept oppression?
>>>
>>That's Life in the big city, Bud.
>>
>
> There are idiots in the big city, and you're one of them.

Ouch!!!

Brian, you just come out nowhere and *slam*. You got me on that one!
>
>
>
>>Whether we care or not onviously does not not matter to you. The fact
>>that it matters to many pther people who know nothing else about what a
>>great ham you are, Brian, may or may not matter to you. But all I'm
>>saying is that certification to a higher standard matters to people in
>>general. That is Life.
>>
>
> You've said that the highest license (not certification) is meaningless.
>
>
>>>>I don't know Brian,
>>>>that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Messenger? You guys aren't the messengers. You're trying to be the
>>>enforcers of a false system of values.
>>>
>>I object to that statement. My role in Life is not to enforce any system
>>of values.
>>
>

> Then cease and desist.

huh?

>
>
>>I merely observe, and I am reporting to you what I observe.
>>You may disagree that what I observe is really true but that is another
>>discussion. But what do you observe, Brian? That people never observe a
>>pecking order or that survival of the fittest is not a characteristic of
>>humanity? Go ahead, take a shot at it, explain to us your New Wave
>>approach to interpreting Humanity in general.
>>
>
> Kill all the no code Techs?

oUCH AGAIn! Where did that one come from???

>I don't think so.

I don't either but we can make no-code-tech-jokes all day long, such
'How many no code techs does it take to replace a 3-500Z?'

>
>
>>>>It's something you cannot change.
>>>>
>>>I think I've already been part of making the change. The actuarial
>>>
> tables
>
>>>will have to take care of the rest.
>>>
>>Brian, the part about the actuarial tables is not a very nice thing to
>>say. The Amateur operator is supposed to be friendly and not darken the
>>face of Amateur radio. Part 97 doesn't say that..but you know it is
>>true. I am ashamed to be associated with a ham who writes like this.
>>
>
> Yes Dan, try being friendly. Say friendly things othere than "I only
> observe...Don't shoot the messenger..."

By all means, *yes*, do *not* shoot the messenger. KR4AJ is only trying
to help you by providing you with information that is extremely relevant
for living Life in general and the Life of a ham in particular but you
know that already as this is all a matter of public knowledge. What I
see has the impeccable credentials of Conventional Wisdom, you know,
"CW". Readers Digest is my infallible source. And one time Readers
Digest had an article about Morse Code saving a ham's life during a
snowstorm in Montana. That ham could have been N0IMD!

>
>

>>>>Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
>>>>hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
>>>>complained to the hilt and took that option away.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>You measure a ham by the exam he took. A better system would be to
>>>
> measure
>
>>>a ham by what he does.
>>>
>
>>And you measure a ham by his statistical probability on an actuarial
>>table. Nice guy.
>>
>
> I am a nice guy. But I have my faults.

I wasn't aware of that (i.e. that you were a nice guy) heh heh...

One of them is to accept newcomers
> to the service without judging them by the code exam they took, or what
> university they took it at.

What did they call this in high school, a mixed metaphor I believe.

>
>
>>>But why measure at all?
>>>
>>What? You want no test at all? Just give everybody a ham license?
>>
>
> You have such a limited mind. Try one exam, one license.

I tried it...one exam, one license. Conclusion: Too limited.

>
>
>>>>Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a higher
>>>>standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
>>>>unfair to the less talented?
>>>>
>>>Ah, finally a question. The exam needs to test what is necessary to
>>>
> equip
>
>>>and operate a station within the confines of the authorization, and to
>>>
> do so
>
>>>safely. Anything else is irrelevant and superflous.

>>>
>>Aha, so you do want to measure something! At least that is a start.
>>
>
> Yes, do they know the rules? Can they operate an amateur station safely?

Don't stop now, you're making real progress.
>
>
>>>>As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that.
>>>>Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is
>>>>not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
>>>>test was the code test. But you know that already.
>>>>
>>>>73 de KR4AJ
>>>>
>>>>
>>>So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio
>>>
> combined,
>
>>>in your opinion.
>>>
>>...putting words in my mouth...No, but it is probably more valuable than
>>the written test at filtering out effort and commitment to amateur radio.
>>
>
> Part 97 doesn't ask for effort nor commitment.

Nor does an aviator's or a surgeon's license. Just because something
isn't legally mandated does not mean we should not insist on excellence
using the only tools we have available, i.e the CFR's (Codes of Federal
Regulation). Is it against the Constitution to emphasize effort and
commitment by structuring minimum standards as such? Prove it. Take it
to court.

You don't even have to raise
> your right hand and swear allegiance to America in order to have a license.

Is this supposed to be logically connected to something else you have
written? Forgive me but I am getting into my statistically disadvantaged
years, you know, according to that Actuarial chart you mentioned, so
please enlighten me if you will how this comment is relevant to anything
in this thread. But noe that you bring it upI will note that Part 97
does require US citizenship, and Naturalized US citizenship does require
the Oath that you mentioned, so, it might be said that swearing
allegiance actually is a prerequisite to a ham license, at least for
some people.

>
>
>>Now a question for you:

>>
>>Do you value a person's probability statistic on an actuarial table to
>>be more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined?
>>
>
> It will eventually get rid of people like me and you who remember that there
> used to be layers of useless licensing requirements. Only then will we
> consider the measure of a good ham by what de does and how he does it
> (rather than by how fast he beeps).
Ouch again!!! Speak for yourself! Truly a grave topic. Let's talk about

something else like Eastern Carolina Barbecue or something on that general

plane.

de KR4AJ

4348. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 02:04:11 UTC
From: randy_NO_SPAM_PLEASE_@frs-usa.com
Message-ID: <b03b87e2.0205251804.40f675be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43667
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message > Moonbounce? Have you completely lost all touch with reality? The
> fact that is basically all Amateur Radio seems to have to offer on
> VHF/UHF for a Technician operator PROOVES how irrelevant ham radio is
> becoming
>
> Repeaters, maybe... but moonbounce? Give me a break.
>
> Stewart - N0MHS
>

Stew...Do you not know that hams have been doing moonbounce with
2-meter rigs for a long time!

4349. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 02:33:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF04947.DB266BDF@att.net>
Source record: 43668

Mike Coslo wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >
> > >> If yestedays accomplishments stand for nothing, nothing done today does
> > >either.
> >
> > >I think this one gets posted on my office wall, Dick!! Do you want
> > >quote attributes? 8^)
> >
> > Would that be like laying on the operating table just before brain surgery and
> > seeing the surgeon wearing a button that says "It doesn't have to be perfect to
> > be good?"
>
> No, I don't even know how you picked that out of this.
>

What Ed has said is that he couldn't care less about the background of his brain surgeon, if he even has one! Maybe Ed is his very first case, and Ed isn't concerned! Fantastic!

4350. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 02:36:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF049ED.CAF392AA@att.net>
Source record: 43669

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:3CEFD0F8.1090007@bellsouth.net...
> >
> > Do you value a person's probability statistic on an actuarial table to
> > be more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined?
>
> It will eventually get rid of people like me and you who remember that there
> used to be layers of useless licensing requirements. Only then will we
> consider the measure of a good ham by what de does and how he does it
> (rather than by how fast he beeps).

I know good hams who don't beep at all. You ain't one of them.

4351. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 02:36:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CF04A1D.D223FBF6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43670

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>
> >Of course, Ed. I found it interesting that amateurs could actually do
> >moonbounce on 24 GHz with the water vapor loss running only 85 watts.
> >Obviously, slow data rates are necessary, but that beats no data at all!
>
> I agree wholeheartedly, btw; I find QRSS and long-term intergration techniques
> to be very interesting. I expect to have a DSP-10 up and running fairly soon
> and will transvert it to HF. I want to see what can be done with QRP that
> would make a QRPer tremble! :-)
>

And then there's the LF work in IIRC New Zealand and Europe.

4352. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 02:38:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF04A8B.A5FC5114@att.net>
Source record: 43671

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >> If hams were expected to continue accomplishing things after they passed
> >the
> >> exam, it was a minimum requirement test.
>
> >Would you care to quote any such expectations in Part 97? They're not there,
> >nor any requirement whatever beyond requirements for each level of license.
>
> So now Dick is saying that hams should not do anything with their licenses.
>
> Well there you have it.

Yeah, there you have it, again. Ed rewrites my entire post to suit himself as to what he wanted me to say.

4353. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 02:43:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CF04BBC.857FF2D5@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43672

> It is a
> >valuable resource to this country whether you or I believe it or not.
>
> Exactly right, Jim. That sort of thing is still going on. Consider the
> following,
> which happened 10 days ago:
>
> (from ARRL website)>
>
> "New Mexico amateurs called in to help following air crash: John Strain, K0HGW,
> and his brother Larry, N7DF, of La Luz, New Mexico, were called in May 15 by
> the Burro Flats Volunteer Fire Department to assist

About 10 years ago a hurricane "Hugo" IIRC trashed the Virgin Islands.
Law and order broke down there. Phones were out. A few hams with
emergency power and HF stations told hams on the mainland USA
of the trouble. The national guard IIRC arrived by plane and restored
order and did the other things one needs to do to clean up hurricane
damage. So emergency traffic via HF does happen.

4354. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 02:45:37 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CF02FB3.8B2B1D6A@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

2test and well known cber AB8ManyQueers wrote:

>
> Says the Piuzza delivery boy who shills those stolen obsolete computer > parts
> at a flea market in his crack-house, ghetto neighborhood
>
> > let alone a life!

What is "piuzza"? Learn to spell 2test.

4355. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 03:07:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF05142.F0DA638C@att.net>
Source record: 43674

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The extra class exam is a minimum requirements exam for obtaining
> > > an extra class license.
> >
> > Yep, the Extra test you took is a real no-brainer, and that would help explain why
> > you waited so long to take one.
>
> I took my first ham exam in 1951.

Yep. A true minimal exam, the novice. Of course you memorized everything and learned not a thing, too.

> Ham exams have always been of the set of minimum
> requirement exams.

Funny why there were so many different levels of "minimum" though, isn't it?

> A spelling bee exam is an example of a maximum requirement
> exam where there is one and only one winner.

So you think the winner can spell any word then? Don't think so.

> You obviously don't comprehend the
> meaning of a "minimum requirements" exam.

You need to be worrying about your miscomprehensions, not mine. I know what I'm dealing with.

> The difficulty of the exams may have
> changed over time but at the time they were offered, they have always been minimum
> requirement exams. Everyone who barely squeaked by with a minimum grade got the
> same amount of credit for the exam that you and I did.
>

But we took drastically different tests. You'll never be able to claim that you passed the same test I did, even though you have an extra lite to show.

>
> Did you get extra credit for knowing more than was on your exams? If not,
> all you can say is that you met the minimum requirements for the exam
> just like all the rest of us. You are really going to have to find a
> better way of obtaining your self esteem than dwelling on some minimum
> requirements exam that you passed decades ago. That's certainly not worthy
> of more than a minuscule amount of respect from others.

Why are you so hung up on who respects what or who? No one here is worried about it but you and The Gadfly. My concern is for the crumbling of the ARS that has gone on for so long. I know, you were too busy with the "one hit $shit" and Scotch to notice. Brian was too busy bitching about the requirements.

4356. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 03:08:44 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205251908.38d59985@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43675
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"LSB" <l.s.booth@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<D6OH8.3620$UT.274707@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> Relevance???? I have a ham license, I am working on a 2.4ghz antenna, and a
> 160m antenna. I will look at and try if possible any new technology on one
> end and restore/use BA gear on the other. I love telecommunications. My ham
> ticket is relevant to me because I am an experimenter and an operator. I
> use 802.11b for home networking, just another technology. MURS is
> interesting. Do I see it as a threat to HR? No....Cynics who want to
> prophesize the demise of HR are the real threat. Do something, contribute
> to the science of radio, teach others.
>
> If the AR service is irrelevant to you......quit.

YOU are the one saying it is irrelevant, and seem to think you need to
argue that it isn't. I just said it has become LESS relevant... and
that's a FACT.

Stewart - N0MHS

4357. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 03:21:00 UTC
From: hoodat <hoodat@polly14313.com>
Message-ID: <acpk6l$u7v$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43676
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

AB8MQ@OVIS.NET wrote in message:
>
> Says the Piuzza delivery boy who shills those stolen obsolete computer
parts
^^^^^^^^
> at a flea market in his crack-house, ghetto neighborhood
>
> let alone a life!

What is a "Piuzza" oh curtains boy who tells us he has a
college degree? A 50 year old man who lives with his mother,
has no job and no life, other than the Lavender Lads of Glendale.

ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

4358. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 03:26:36 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205251926.3db86efb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43677
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

vhfradiobuff@aol.com (vhfradiobuff) wrote in message
news:<5e5fccab.0205251124.159d9aa1@posting.google.com>...
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0205231335.52663b3e@posting.google.com>...
> > With licenseless services like MURS beginning to flourish, Amateur
> > Radio just keeps getting less relevant.
>
> In that case, please email me and I will provide the shipping address
> where you can send all of your ham equipment. Thank you!

I'll ship you all the boat anchors you want - at YOUR EXPENSE... just
make a deposit via Paypal for everything you want :)

Let's start with a couple of old, and very large, MOCOM-70s that I
converted to run digital on 50.14 in the early 90's, OK? The relays
are still good on the beasts. However, you should be aware that they
DO have a propensity to set car alarms off when they are in need of a
tuneup. I'll throw in the service manual if you buy both. Shipping
and Handling charge for each radio - $50.

Stewart - N0MHS

P.S. I hope you have a good Service Monitor - you are going to need
it.

4359. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 03:46:53 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205251946.3d0cf87b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43678

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20020525023010.29915.00000579@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
> >From: "horseshoe7" horseshoe7@yahoo.com
> >Date: 05/24/02 22:07 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <BlCH8.43703$db7.1536780@news2.west.cox.net>
>
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020524184549.22762.00000390@mb-cv.aol.com...
> >> From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
> >>
> >> >Anyway, the fact is, these radios have far better receiver specs than
> >> >do most amateur radios.
> >>
> >> Can you cite the specs for a few of the receivers here so we can compare
> them
> >> to those of Amateur equipment?
> >
> >Here is the current web page for the Motorola GM300:
> >
> >http://www.motorola.com/cgiss/LA/products/conventional/english/mobile/gm300/
> >specs.html
> >
> >I use model MOGMCOSIC2 A
> >1-10W, 146-174Mhz
>
> Then you are NOT using "FRS" radios, nor are they approved for MURS if
> theya re over 2 watts.
>
> The radio you cite is NOT an FRS nor MURS radio.

Part 90 approved, baby... programmed to run at less than 2W out - so THERE.

> Putz.

Putz you.

Stewart - N0MHS

4360. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 04:08:36 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF05FC4.2090605@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43679

CAM wrote:

> Dan Finn wrote:
>
>>As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that.
>>Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is
>>not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
>>test was the code test. But you know that already.
>>
>
> I got my mail-order Conditional in 1952 after rote memorizing the ARRL
> License Manual. I obtained all amateur frequency/power privileges at
> that time. I regained all amateur frequency/power privileges in 2000
> when I passed the Extra exam. In my life, there was no effective
> difference between the Conditional class license and the Extra class
> license. There was nothing I wanted to do with a Conditional license
> in the 50's that I couldn't do. Virtually all of the value of a ham
> license is in the privileges granted.

That is true. The measureable value would be in terms of privileges granted.

That you view amateur radio exams
> as some sort of "King-of-the-Mountain" game is of no consequence to anyone
> except you and the small minority of hams like you who don't realize that
> your's is actually a "King-of-the-Molehill" delusionary diversion from
> the real world of amateur radio.

But by your own words, those with more privileges have a certification with more value. This plays quite well into your king of the mountain analogy, does it not? Those with more privileges are the "kings" and those with the least privileges are the serfs. Whether the kingdom is on a mountain or a molehill depends upon the value that one assigns to privileges. If one grossly overstates the value of the privileges, then one is delusionary. I will note that you happen to be talking to me and how I personally ascertain this value and you are quite wrong. In fact, it is you, not I, who have gone all the way to Extra. I am quite happy with Advanced. If anyone is delusionary, which I do not believe i really true, would it not be you, who was driven to become Extra, while I am quite happy with my smaller mountain, or molehill, whatever you may call it depending on one's perception of Amateur radio's value?

It is the, "When I was young, I had to
> walk to school in snowstorms", mentality at work.

It's more like, 'when I was young I had to know how to design a transistor circuit that did not work only in the saturation region'.

Believe it or not, transistors still do work in analog circuits not operating in the saturation region. My dad never rode a mule but did some work with tubes. So what? HF Ham radio is full of analog circuits and tubes. Physics hasn't changed much from the time I was young until today. Analog design and tubes are still very relevant to amateur radio today and so is Morse code. You cannot say the Morse code is not being used heavily today, can you?

And that very usage must be a signicant indicator that it still has value.

My Dad rode a mule
> to school. So what?

I agree, so what. Mules probably are not very relevant to today's modes of transportation.

73 de KR4AJ

4361. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 04:19:42 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205252019.6f2a54fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43680
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20020523204441.01608.00000313@mb-dh.aol.com>...

> Why not, Ham Radio has turned into Cb, might as well make MURS the same way.
> Besides I have a few Delta S at over 100 Watts that will easily go there, so I
> might as well put them there. I would probably be able to sell them to some of
> ther new Murs CB ers for a good price.

Where do you come up with such NONSENSE - don't you have any concept
of reality?

Unless used in conjunction with towers, 100W amps are virtually
useless to Joe Average on VHF... and don't start with the tropo
ducting, Sporadic-E, and EME crap... try to use your BRAIN, man.

This is why amps are not going to be used on VHF MURS and have never
been used on UHF GMRS/FRS - when are you folks going to tune into
reality, and quit trying to extrapolate your HATE and knowledge of 11m
CB to VHF/UHF services - it is PLAIN IGNORANCE I tell you.

Steewart - N0MHS

4362. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 04:37:05 UTC
From: Jimick <jimick1nospam@nohotmail.com>
Message-ID: <RDZH8.5363$jv5.1197657@typhoon.ne.ipsvc.net>
Source record: 43681

Ah Larry,

Do you mean those annoying teleautowriters that would buzz and beep after each weather observation was posted from the weather facility? I was a control tower operator for the Air Force. I thought those memories were dead...that's going back three decades for me. Damn man! Anyway we used to turn the buzzer over so we wouldn't have to keep hitting the silencer. Then it became an Article 15 offense to do so. I hated those things. And Article 15's too...never received one mind you in the 20 years I was in.

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20020515230328.29123.00002017@mb-mu.aol.com...
> In article <3CE2BF7D.415B5C28@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> > >
> > >Sure there are, Brian. Morse has been sent and received by humans since
> > >the inception of radio. I'll wager you've never even SEEN an
> > >electro-writer.
> > >
> > >Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave:
> >
> > Well, I won't be asking for a piece of *that* action! I do believe Brian
> > used to be a Weather specialist in the Air Force, and if so, considering
> > the time span of his career, I'm sure he's quite familiar with electro-
> > writers, indeed!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT

4363. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 04:53:31 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <44da9d49d3dccaa147cb64ea92af10b5.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43682
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Stewart, let's cut the nonsense and I'll ask a serious question - why do you seem to believe that amateur radio stopped with spark gap in the early 1900's? I've got news for you - the latest and greatest in cb could be cut to ribbons with amateur technology in the 60s - I know, I was there. What is it that you do not understand? My 440 MHz handheld runs only 6 aa alkaline batteries, yet is capable of using (not just opening, USING) repeaters 100 miles away. I've talked with guys on handhelds up in Watertown, NY - a good long ways from here - on the handheld. And this is old technology! You'd best brush up on PSK-31 and other modes before you continue to insert your foot in your mouth. Boat anchors exist everywhere. Get back on subject. Just exactly where do you think that anything without a license (including CB) has more to offer than something with a license? Please be specific.

Thanks & 73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

ps - I talked with Norm, VK2NP, in Brisbane, Australia, many many times using RTTY. Yep, old technology. Did it in the 60s. Go ahead and tell me how fantastic the internet is. I used to type 90 wpm on a 100 wpm machine in the navy and could keep the old 60 wpm machine in the shack going without interruption. Ok, you can cut and paste 3,000 wpm with the internet. How fast can you get information out on your own without simply copying someone else's information?

pps - the amateur scene is considerably faster than you may suspect.

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205251926.3db86efb@posting.google.com

>
> I'll ship you all the boat anchors you want - at YOUR EXPENSE... just
> make a deposit via Paypal for everything you want :)
>
> Let's start with a couple of old, and very large, MOCOM-70s that I
> converted to run digital on 50.14 in the early 90's, OK? The relays
> are still good on the beasts. However, you should be aware that they
> DO have a propensity to set car alarms off when they are in need of a
> tuneup. I'll throw in the service manual if you buy both. Shipping
> and Handling charge for each radio - $50.
>
> Stewart - N0MHS
>
> P.S. I hope you have a good Service Monitor - you are going to need
> it.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4364. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 05:24:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526012452.27654.00000859@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 43683

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/25/02 23:08 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205251908.38d59985@posting.google.com>

>YOU are the one saying it is irrelevant, and seem to think you need to
>argue that it isn't. I just said it has become LESS relevant... and
>that's a FACT

No, Stewart, that's an OPINION. One that's not very well considered or
accurate.

Now, I have a LARGE tube of KY jelly we can loan you to help you get your
head back out into the daylight, if you'd like.....

4365. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 05:26:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526012620.27654.00000860@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 43684

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/25/02 23:46 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205251946.3d0cf87b@posting.google.com>

>
>Part 90 approved, baby... programmed to run at less than 2W out - so THERE

Only IF it's set at 2 watts, and considering the nature of your rants and ravings, I seriously doubt your word.

Now...do you want that KY or not?

4366. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 05:42:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526014214.18051.00000811@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 43686

>Where do you come up with such NONSENSE - don't you have any concept
>of reality?

Oh but I do, by the way, I have already received 8 E-Mails from MURS users
asking how much I want for the Deltas>

Unless used in conjunction with towers, 100W amps are virtually
>useless to Joe Average on VHF..

Its apparent you have no Idea what you are talking about.

4367. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 05:42:17 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205252142.50f55e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43685
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<7zMH8.461$J04.199@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "horseshoe7" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using amps
> on
> > VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS.
>
> I love it when you talk LOUD to try to overcome your lack of rational
> persuasion.
>
> Speaking of loud, in the case of MURS (with only 5 channels) the old notion
> of 'capture effect' will ensure that I can get through all the other weak
> signals on channel. 'Capture effect' is done with power.
>
> Can you say "amplifier"?
>
> I knew you could!

Nobody is using illegal amplifiers on GMRS/FRS - why? Because it
makes no pratical sense. If the MURS/FRS/GMRS channels get so crowded
that people need to resort to amplifiers for the reason you cited -
then it is simply time for the FCC to add more channels to these
services... didn't think about that one, did you?

You see, you are still trapped in trying to equate 11m CB with
FRS/GMRS/MURS - and it just doesn't work. 11m CB might be "frequency
constrained" - but, with channel narrowization, there are PLENTY OF
UNUSED FREQUENCIES on VHF/UHF for small footprint public services...
besides, if these folks are putting it to such good use, then the hams
shouldn't mind giving up a few VHF/UHF frequencies too, right? Try
scanning them sometime - they are VIRTUALLY UNUSED.

Stewart - N0MHS

4368. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 06:35:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526023507.03263.00000795@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 43687

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/26/02 01:42 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205252142.50f55e0@posting.google.com>

>Nobody is using illegal amplifiers on GMRS/FRS...(snip)

You are either lying or are ignorant of the facts. I am still leaning towards ignorant, but at this point it's a coin-toss.

Also, you also have yet to respond to my other comments vis-a-vis MURS frequency abuses already being noted. You insist it's not happening.

It's already being done. I know of truckers using Amateur 2M gear on MURS frequencies. I am willing to bet I will hear similar violations if I listened to FRS or GMRS.

>- why? Because it makes no pratical sense.

Who are you talking about, Dimwit Stew? You are not talking about people who have any "practical" knowledge of VHF practice or technique, and they bring with them the "If 5 Watts Is Good, 500 Watts Is Great" philosophies.

> If the MURS/FRS/GMRS channels get so crowded
>that people need to resort to amplifiers for the reason you cited -
>then it is simply time for the FCC to add more channels to these
>services... didn't think about that one, did you?

You ARE a complete idiot! Let them ruin the functionality of the channels assigned, then assign MORE for them to likewise ruin...?!?!

STUPID! Just freaking STUPID!

>You see, you are still trapped in trying to equate 11m CB with
>FRS/GMRS/MURS - and it just doesn't work. 11m CB might be "frequency
>constrained" - but, with channel narrowization, there are PLENTY OF
>UNUSED FREQUENCIES on VHF/UHF for small footprint public services

There's nothing "small footprint" about the infestation you are suggesting, Stewart.

CB bootleggers already infest HF from 25 to 30mHz and numerous other bands in the HF spectrum. Both ends of 40 meters have numerous bootleggers. There's NOTHING 'constrained" about the problem.

They improperly use marine band radios for truckers and have been heard on MURS channels already. I am hearing truckers on Interstate 24 from my house in Franklin County, TN.

You really want me to believe these guys are running 2 watts?

>Try scanning them sometime - they are VIRTUALLY UNUSED.

I concur with Hans...You turn up the volume to mask your stupid comments.

4369. Off Topic...help Find?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 06:37:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526023705.03263.00000796@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 43688

Can anyone suggest a good source for quality plastic scale models,
especially of light civil aircraft?

73

Steve, K4YZ

4370. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 07:31:11 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205252331.57173de3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43689

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020525202223.18803.00000520@mb-dd.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> >Then you are NOT using "FRS" radios, nor are they approved for MURS if
> >theya re over 2 watts.
>
> Do you mean that the very fellow who got on here and swore on a stack that no
> one using MURS would ever break a rule is breaking a rule? Who woulda'
> figured.

Who is breaking a rule? Your statement is slanderous. The radio in
question is Part 90 approved, and meets all parts of the MURS
regulations.

Better get your facts straight, before you go accusing people of
breaking rules. THAT is illegal, by the way.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Stewart - N0MHS

4371. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 07:36:25 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205252336.6605c84a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43690

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020525202223.18803.00000520@mb-dd.aol.com>...
>
> Now, I went looking for a newsgroup for this service that he alleged is "better
> than amateur" and couldn't find one.

"better than amatuer"? What the hell are you talking about? I've
simply said that amateur radio has become a little less relevant with
the recent rules changes. THAT is a fact. Where do you come up with
all this other crap?

4372. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 08:01:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526040107.18807.00000590@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 43691

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/26/02 03:31 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205252331.57173de3@posting.google.com>

>Who is breaking a rule? Your statement is slanderous. The radio in
>question is Part 90 approved, and meets all parts of the MURS
>regulations.
>
>Better get your facts straight, before you go accusing people of
>breaking rules. THAT is illegal, by the way.

I have facts, Stewart, which seems to be YOUR weakness.

Is it just me, or are ALL of the ill-informed and foolish in SoCal these days? Certainly they are all west of the Mississippi.

Stewie ought to run on up to SinCity and see His Putziness and maybe they can come up with a mutually agreeable "schedule" on MURS so they can bad mouth Amateur Radio on license-free channels.

4373. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 08:05:30 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205260005.53b9e812@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43692

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020525202520.18803.00000521@mb-dd.aol.com>...
> From: 'Doc w5lz@icok.net
>
> > 2 meters is dormant, unused? What part of the
> >country do you live in?
>
> I don't think 2 meters is dormant in his part of the country at all. He wants
> to say that it is because he thinks that he can trick all the hams into
> operating on MURS.

Ed, has anyone told you that you have a propensity for bending the
truth?

Read what I've said, and use the WHOLE CONTEXT. I'll repeat my
thoughts... Other than a couple of high-level repeaters, 2m activity
is virtually non-existant(or dormant) in San Diego County... and 2m is
the most active ham VHF/UHF band. You stupid shits extract one word
out of the statement, and use it out of context... you are no better
than that stupid cunt Hillary for using a tabloid headline "Bush
knew".

Do you folks really have such a LOW READING COMPREHENSION level, that
you can't understand a simple sentence? Or, have you simply lost the
ability to reason, or except change?

I'll tell you what, when I get my VX-5, I'll run some scans on the
various bands and post the statistics. I don't think you are going to
like what you see.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Stewart - N0MHS

4374. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 08:28:01 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205260028.11111ce6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<a91e8a9784c35af8e5606c9d18c6c65d.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> Stewart, you seem to think there isn't a point. The point is about
> learning. This served the United States very well back in 1968 (I
> believe it was 1968 - within a year). The Coast Guard lost a big tower
> on Saipan (did I get this right this time, Hans?). The Navy was having
> a big problem copying the hams they sent over to get communications
> back up (the disaster was caused by a typhoon). I was in the shack at
> KG6AAY on NavCommSta Guam and heard the goings on. I called the
> signs 'sparkplug, sparkplug1, this is KG6AAY standing by'. The net
> result was that the AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS restored communications.
> For a number of days, we were the ONLY communications to that island.
> Hans was one of the guys that went over to Saipan. This has happened
> countless times, you simply may not have heard about it. One does not
> learn simply by talking on the radio. The hobby is much richer than you
> can ever imagine (and far bigger than I know about as well). It is a
> valuable resource to this country whether you or I believe it or not.

For crying out loud - this was 35 years ago.

The world has totally changed - everyone has cell phones now(except
me). The govt. is far more prepared to handle emergency comms these
days. I'm sorry to say, but I think you are living in the past.

But - if you must know, I don't believe ham radio is completely
pointless yet... but it is heading in that direction.

You know what - I'm starting to think that's why the FCC goes ahead
and simply allows all these CBers to have illegal amps - it is a
valuable National Resource :^) Could come in quite useful in an
emergency.

> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Stewart - N0MHS

4375. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 11:51:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1%3I8.2118$zI4.91577555@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43694

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF04038.6040804@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>
> > So people who were radio and electronics careerists should be denied an
> > amateur radio license because it comes to them with no effort?
>
> If they are careerists, that would be professional. Should professionals
> be granted amateur radio licenses with no effort?

Yes, that is the question. You demand effort, but there is no effort for
the radio careerists. Should they be kept out because there is not
sufficient effort?

> >>>Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is over a high
> >>>
> > school diploma.
> >
> >>>Depends on the H.S., depends on the college.
> >>>
> >>I agree. And code proficence depends upon the code speed.
> >>
> >
> > Nope, I could copy 9wpm error free. I could not copy 13wpm at 70%. I
was
> > proficient at one speed, a failure at another.
>
>
> So in this case a neutral observer may conclude that your certification
> to operate on the code portions of the band is based on a faulty
> standard because it allow you to operate where you are incapable of
> communicating.

Slow is not incapable. I thought you were Milton educated?

Perhaps it would be better for you to only operate in the
> voice or the old novice code portions. Certainly, you should not be
> given privileges in any sub-bands where you cannot understand anyone,
> correct?

I did that for a while when the Novice Enhancement came along. It was a
form of self-punishment for not advancing with the code. It was also
stupid.

>What if there is an emergency?

Jim says "IF" is for children.

> >>>For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
> >>>bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.
> >>>
> >>>Survival of the fittest?
> >>>
> >>Yes. Do not blame KR4AJ for this one either.
> >>
> >
> > Who are we trying to oust? Where is this competitiveness AGAINST your
> > fellow ham come from?
>
> What competitiveness? You keep losing sight of the fact that KR4AJ is
> merely trying to state a fact. Is stating a fact competitive?

You cannot answer why you engage in competition with your fellow hams?

> >>>>KR4AJ has nothing to do with it.
> >>>>
> >>>Dan can accept it, embrace it, or reject it. Dare he change it?
> >>>
> >>Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.
> >>
> >
> > It is your construct, not a mountain.
>
> I believe that survival of the fittest was Darwin's construct but it
> could be about as difficult to change as moving a mountain.

I recall someone parting the sea.

> >>>>It is simply a fact that one must accept.
> >>>>
> >>>Accept oppression?
> >>>
> >>That's Life in the big city, Bud.
> >>
> >
> > There are idiots in the big city, and you're one of them.
>
> Ouch!!!
>
>
> Brian, you just come out nowhere and *slam*. You got me on that one!

Its Brian or N0iMD. Leave "Bud" in your fridge or your closet.

> >>Whether we care or not onviously does not not matter to you. The fact
> >>that it matters to many pther people who know nothing else about what a
> >>great ham you are, Brian, may or may not matter to you. But all I'm
> >>saying is that certification to a higher standard matters to people in

> >>general. That is Life.
> >>
> >
> > You've said that the highest license (not certification) is meaningless.
> >
> >
> >>>>I don't know Brian,
> >>>>that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>Messenger? You guys aren't the messengers. You're trying to be the
> >>>enforcers of a false system of values.
> >>>
> >>I object to that statement. My role in Life is not to enforce any system
> >>of values.
> >>
> >
> > Then cease and desist.
>
> huh?

You perpetuate the myth that old exams are better than the new exams.

> >>I merely observe, and I am reporting to you what I observe.
> >>You may disagree that what I observe is really true but that is another
> >>discussion. But what do you observe, Brian? That people never observe a
> >>pecking order or that survival of the fittest is not a characteristic of
> >>humanity? Go ahead, take a shot at it, explain to us your New Wave
> >>approach to interpreting Humanity in general.
> >
> > Kill all the no code Techs?
>
> oUCH AGAIn! Where did that one come from???

OK. Just harass them?

> >I don't think so.
>
> I don't either but we can make no-code-tech-jokes all day long, such
> 'How many no code techs does it take to replace a 3-500Z?'

Cute.

> >>>>It's something you cannot change.
> >>>>
> >>>I think I've already been part of making the change. The actuarial
> >>>
> > tables
> >
> >>>will have to take care of the rest.
> >>>
> >>Brian, the part about the actuarial tables is not a very nice thing to

> >>say. The Amateur operator is supposed to be friendly and not darken the
> >>face of Amateur radio. Part 97 doesn't say that..but you know it is
> >>true. I am ashamed to be associated with a ham who writes like this.
> >>
> >
> > Yes Dan, try being friendly. Say friendly things othere than "I only
> > observe...Don't shoot the messenger..."
>
>
> By all means, *yes*, do *not* shoot the messenger. KR4AJ is only trying
> to help you by providing you with information that is extremely relevant
> for living Life in general and the Life of a ham in particular but you
> know that already as this is all a matter of public knowledge. What I
> see has the impeccable credentials of Conventional Wisdom, you know,
> "CW". Readers Digest is my infallible source. And one time Readers
> Digest had an article about Morse Code saving a ham's life during a
> snowstorm in Montana. That ham could have been N0IMD!

I would have survived it without Morse Code.
Why do you speak of yourself in the 3rd person? Larry did that when he told
us that "his friend" used to send QFU on CW.

> >>>>Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
> >>>>hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
> >>>>complained to the hilt and took that option away.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>You measure a ham by the exam he took. A better system would be to
> >>>
> > measure
> >
> >>>a ham by what he does.
> >>>
> >
> >>And you measure a ham by his statistical probability on an actuarial
> >>table. Nice guy.
> >>
> >
> > I am a nice guy. But I have my faults.
>
> I wasn't aware of that (i.e. that you were a nice guy) heh heh...

Well, I am. I'm one of the few that will apologize for my mistakes on here.

> One of them is to accept newcomers
> > to the service without judging them by the code exam they took, or what
> > university they took it at.
>
> What did they call this in high school, a mixed metaphor I believe.

Ahh. Milton is showing through again.

> >>>But why measure at all?
> >>>
> >>What? You want no test at all? Just give everybody a ham license?
> >>
> >
> > You have such a limited mind. Try one exam, one license.
>
> I tried it...one exam, one license. Conclusion: Too limited.

Why? No visible pecking order?

OK, one full license, one limited license.

> >>>>Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a
higher
> >>>>standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
> >>>>unfair to the less talented?
> >>>>
> >>>Ah, finally a question. The exam needs to test what is necessary to
> >>>
> > equip
> >
> >>>and operate a station within the confines of the authorization, and to
> >>>
> > do so
> >
> >>>safely. Anything else is irrelevant and superflous.
> >>>
> >>Aha, so you do want to measure something! At least that is a start.
> >>
> >
> > Yes, do they know the rules? Can they operate an amateur station
safely?
>
> Don't stop now, you're making real progress.

That's all a regulatory agency can ask for. This isn't Milton, you know.
Yhe BMV didn't stamp your license "cum Loud?"

> >>>>As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with
that.
> >>>>Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance
is
> >>>>not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
> >>>>test was the code test. But you know that already.
> >>>>
> >>>>73 de KR4AJ
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio
> >>>
> > combined,
> >

> >>>in your opinion.
> >>>
> >>...putting words in my mouth...No, but it is probably more valuable than
> >>the written test at filtering out effort and commitment to amateur
radio.
> >>
> >
> > Part 97 doesn't ask for effort nor commitment.
>
> Nor does an aviator's or a surgeon's license. Just because something
> isn't legally mandated does not mean we should not insist on excellence
> using the only tools we have available, i.e the CFR's (Codes of Federal
> Regulation). Is it against the Constitution to emphasize effort and
> commitment by structuring minimum standards as such? Prove it. Take it
> to court.

Minimum standards to operate at 7100khz are valid at 7099khz, yet the
government denies access to 7099. The electrical principals are the same,
the rf principles are the same, the propagation principles are the same, the
safety principles are the same...

> You don't even have to raise
> > your right hand and swear allegiance to America in order to have a
license.
>
> Is this supposed to be logically connected to something else you have
> written? Forgive me but I am getting into my statistically disadvantaged
> years, you know, according to that Actuarial chart you mentioned, so
> please enlighten me if you will how this comment is relevant to anything
> in this thread. But noe that you bring it upI will note that Part 97
> does require US citizenship, and Naturalized US citizenship does require
> the Oath that you mentioned, so, it might be said that swearing
> allegiance actually is a prerequisite to a ham license, at least for
> some people.

You are getting old. You mentioned effort and "commitment." Swearing an
oath is a commitment. Taking a test is not. And I would guess that most
Americans have never sworn an oath.

> >>Now a question for you:
> >>
> >>Do you value a person's probability statistic on an actuarial table to
> >>be more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined?
> >>
> >
> > It will eventually get rid of people like me and you who remember that
there
> > used to be layers of useless licensing requirements. Only then will we
> > consider the measure of a good ham by what de does and how he does it
> > (rather than by how fast he beeps).
>

> Ouch again!!! Speak for yourself! Truly a grave topic. Let's talk about
>
> something else like Eastern Carolina Barbecue or something on that general
>
> plane.
>
> de KR4AJ

OK, family cookout at Slate Run Metro Park today. Kids can fish, hike
trails, or play on the huge playground. Fantastic!

(no alcohol)

Brian/N0iMD

4376. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 11:52:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <B%3I8.2119$II4.91586576@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43695

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF049ED.CAF392AA@att.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CEFD0F8.1090007@bellsouth.net...
> > >
> > > Do you value a person's probability statistic on an actuarial table to
> > > be more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined?
> > >
> > It will eventually get rid of people like me and you who remember that
there
> > used to be layers of useless licensing requirements. Only then will we
> > consider the measure of a good ham by what de does and how he does it
> > (rather than by how fast he beeps).
>
> I know good hams who don't beep at all. You ain't one of them.
>
Yep, I beep at 5wpm. Sorry.

4377. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 11:53:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <214I8.2121$QG4.91478114@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43696

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF04A8B.A5FC5114@att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
> >
> > >> If hams were expected to continue accomplishing things after they
passed
> > >the
> > >> exam, it was a minimum requirement test.
> >
> > >Would you care to quote any such expectations in Part 97? They're not
there,
> > >nor any requirement whatever beyond requirements for each level of
license.
> >
> > So now Dick is saying that hams should not do anything with their
licenses.
> >
> > Well there you have it.
>
> Yeah, there you have it, again. Ed rewrites my entire post to suit
himself as to
> what he wanted me to say.
>
What's wrong with that? At least he did it honest, and didn't petition his
government to make other people do things to suit himself.

4378. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 11:56:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526075606.18807.00000504@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43697

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>Yeah, there you have it, again. Ed rewrites my entire post to suit himself as
>to
>what he wanted me to say.

Which is exactly what you did to me.

I am always amazed at how outraged you get if someone does to you the very
things you do to others here.

Is this another one of your "do as I say, not as I do" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4379. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 11:57:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <U44I8.2123$yJ4.91632762@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43698

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF05142.F0DA638C@att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
>
> > > Ham exams have always been of the set of minimum
> > > requirement exams.
>
> Funny why there were so many different levels of "minimum" though, isn't
it?

Anything above that minimum requirement, i.e., General, is superflous. The
General once granted all priveleges, in a day when you had to beep fast,
take exams without question pools, and face down that mean old FCC Examiner.
The Novice was meant to be a limited license. The General was not.

4380. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 11:57:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526075750.18807.00000505@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43699

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>You wanted to measure an amateur. I'm saying the license class isn't a good
>measure - you should look for other indicators.

License class is the only way the FCC measures an amateur.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4381. Re: Open Letter to Mr. B. P. Burke on the Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 12:01:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <o84I8.2124$xC4.91218157@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43700

"Jimick" <jimick1nospam@nohotmail.com> wrote in message
news:RDZH8.5363$jv5.1197657@typhoon.ne.ipsvc.net...
> Ah Larry,
>
> Do you mean those annoying teleautowriters that would buzz and beep after
> each weather observation was posted from the weather facility? I was a
> control tower operator for the Air Force. I thought those memories were
> dead...that's going back three decades for me. Damn man! Anyway we used
> to turn the buzzer over so we wouldn't have to keep hitting the silencer.
> Then it became an Article 15 offense to do so. I hated those things. And
> Article 15's too...never received one mind you in the 20 years I was in.

Jim, that's the one. I've transmitted thousands of weather observations,
and weather watches and warnings with those damned things.

Dave won't tell me how much he's going to give me. (he has a bet that I've
never seen one)

4382. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 12:04:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526080419.18807.00000506@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43601

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

> Ed, when will the ARRL start insisting on excellence rather than the current
> dumbing down of the test structure? Sorry for the direct question but I do
>not want to beat around the bush.

When the current test structure was being proposed by the FCC, ARRL asked for 4 classes of license, a maximum 12 wpm code speed and asked the Commission to increase the level of the written exam to balance the reduction in code speed.

ARRL is a member of the Question Pool Committee, and I know enough of the nature of ARRL's input to know that they routinely bring technical matters to the table with the Committee.

ARRL is also conducting on-line classes, publishes technical books and takes a number of other steps to help amateurs be better amateurs, techncial and otherwise.

I won't beat around the bush either, Dan. Your believe that ARRL does not want excellence in ham radio is not very well thought out and does not stand up to even a cursory examination of the things that ARRL does.

>ARRL seems to prefer the VHF/UHF + frequencies anyway.

What is your reason for believing this? I can't count the number of times a person with a different agenda than yours has argued with me here that all ARRL cares about is HF. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4383. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 12:05:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526080559.18807.00000507@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43602

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>I wouldn't know about that but to pass today's written exams does not
>even require an education of the same quality as one might obtain from
>answering an advertisement on a matchbook, much less Milton.

Your exaggeration is ridiculous. I didn't require an education to pass my
General in 1963 to obtain all Amateur priveleges; I was a 14 year old kid who
wasn't doing so well in the 8th grade.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4384. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 12:08:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526080815.18807.00000508@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43603

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>What Ed has said is that he couldn't care less about the background of his
>brain
>surgeon, if he even has one! Maybe Ed is his very first case, and Ed isn't
>concerned!
>Fantastic!

And what Dick is saying is that he cares only about the background of the brain surgeon and would let him operate even if he had gone blind in the meantime.

Fantastic indeed!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4385. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 12:12:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526081218.18807.00000509@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43604

From: "horseshoe7" horseshoe7@yahoo.com

>http://www.motorola.com/cgiss/LA/products/conventional/english/mobile/gm300/
>specs.html

The radio doesn't look all that impressive. Its sensitivity is a bit less than most modern ham rigs, though perfectly useable.

Its selectivity compares with modern ham rigs and it doesn't even mention dynamic range.

If that is your basis for why ham radio is "obsolete" and MURS is the future, you should rethink your position -- or at least rethink your justification.

Is there a MURS newsgroup or reflector? Perhaps I should go there and see if I can correct some of the misinformation you are passing about. The things you say there might be believed by those who don't know Amateur Radio, but when you say them here, you are not apt to gain any converts from hams who know better.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4386. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 12:14:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526081432.18807.00000513@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43605

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>You stupid shits

Talking with a juvenile like you wastes everyone's time, Stew. If this is how you preach your message of the future, I am not at all worried about the damage you might to; most people do not respond positively to such immature words.

It worked for you in grammar school, I am sure.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4387. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 12:20:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526082033.18807.00000514@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43606

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>Where do you come up with such NONSENSE - don't you have any concept
>of reality?

>Unless used in conjunction with towers, 100W amps are virtually
>useless to Joe Average on VHF... and don't start with the tropo
>ducting, Sporadic-E, and EME crap... try to use your BRAIN, man.

I have personally done tropo communications from a rooming house, using an IC-202 and its whip antenna. Propagation modes do not care whether a ham has a tower or not; in fact, an amplifier would be one way to overcome ground-clutter attenuation and ensure that the signal is lauched toward the propagation medium.

What you said to him was slanderous. Why do you get outraged when people do to you the same things you do to others?

>it is PLAIN IGNORANCE I tell you.

There certainly is some ignorance at work in this discussion.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4388. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 12:23:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526082357.18807.00000515@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 43607

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>If the MURS/FRS/GMRS channels get so crowded
>that people need to resort to amplifiers for the reason you cited -
>then it is simply time for the FCC to add more channels to these
>services...

Are you saying that the MURS channels are not popular enough to be overcrowded now? What are the reasons for its unpopularity?

The FCC might add more channels; after about 15 years of overcrowing on 11 meters, they almost doubled the number of channels. If they do the same for MURS, that would give them, say... 9 channels?

Do you think that those 9 channels will never fill up enough for some users to experience capture effect?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4389. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 12:58:08 UTC
From: John Kimball <johnkimb@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <jtm1fugsjoukinrendtq88pjvf80l21s8g@4ax.com>
Source record: 43608
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.george-ashley,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.flamenet

On Sat, 25 May 2002 10:21:17 -0400, "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> Blew their
wad in Message id: <aco8dn$q58$4@pita.alt.net>:

>
>"hoodat" <hoodat@hoodatHerbieNrOne.com> whined in message
>news:acmm00$gj8$0@pita.alt.net...
>> <<<<plonk>>>>
>
>SPANK! You strill get get away from your molesting your daughter from your
>first marriage and caused her suicide, Polly.

Nice sentence, Wiseman.

--
"Dr. Seuess is above your reading level."
^^^^^^
Roger Wiseman, Rhodes scholar, blows his cover
in Message-ID: <9u0smepoe0@dosa.alt.net>

4390. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 13:32:46 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acqr3lsff1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43614
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.george-ashley,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Polly who drove his daughter to suicide because of sexual molestation,
"hoodat" <hoodat@polly14313.com> whined in message
news:acpk6l$u7v$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> AB8MQ@alt.net wrote in message:
> >
> > Says the Pizza delivery boy who shills those stolen obsolete computer
> > parts at a flea market in his crack-house, ghetto neighborhood
> >
> > let alone a life!
>
> What is a (Typo lame, followed by a fag lame)

Hey Polly, did you really not finish high schol? And by the way you keep
briinging up the gopher-faced Turdeater's sister organization, or do you
want to be a Pink Lady too? And speaking of ol' gopher face Nadless Ate
Womanish Gay Males, you know he uses the same "techniques" as you do on
here? And they're about as effective. Zero. Now there's a over 50 ham who's
never been married in Thevie boy. Something wrong there. You think ol'
Thevie's a Lavender Lad himself?
I've heard, since he and you seem to be most familiar with it, are you both
like DAvid Tolassi and members of Lamda?
But I see you still haven't gotten one tooth Ruth do calculate 2002 - 1955
yet. What's the matter, is Ruthie tricking again? I know you couldn't
calculate it Polly, since you weren't cheating Sears customers with hidden
charges.

4391. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 14:00:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526100021.08525.00000850@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 43609

>The FCC might add more channels; after about 15 years of overcrowing on 11
>meters, they almost doubled the number of channels. If they do the same for
>MURS, that would give them, say... 9 channels?

And then they came out with restructuring and added all the Ham Freqs to CB.

4392. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 14:01:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF0EAC3.787A28D6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43610

Dan Finn wrote:
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > So people who were radio and electronics careerists should be denied an
> > amateur radio license because it comes to them with no effort?
>
> If they are careerists, that would be professional. Should professionals
> be granted amateur radio licenses with no effort?

Some amateurs are granted amateur radio licenses with virtually no effort
involved. Why should professionals be denied the same right?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4393. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 14:03:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF0EB30.A7036471@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43611

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Well there you have it.
>
> Yeah, there you have it, again. Ed rewrites my entire post to suit himself as to
> what he wanted me to say.

That was to show you what your favorite technique feels like.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4394. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 14:10:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526101004.08525.00000851@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 43612

>ARRL is also conducting on-line classes, publishes technical books and takes
>a
>number of other steps to help amateurs be better amateurs, techncial and
>otherwise

Interesting, we take a Test to get a License, then after we get the License,
the ARRL gives Classes, and provides info about Technical Stuff we should have
none before taking the Test.
Again I ask, so what is the purpose of Testing, since it appears we are
Testing people on Info that they have no knowledge of.

4395. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 14:17:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF0EE5C.7F0FF133@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43613

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Ham exams have always been of the set of minimum
> > requirement exams.
>
> Funny why there were so many different levels of "minimum" though, isn't it?

Not funny at all. Each class of license has a different set of *minimum*
requirements and thus has a different minimim requirements exam.

> > A spelling bee exam is an example of a maximum requirement
> > exam where there is one and only one winner.
>
> So you think the winner can spell any word then? Don't think so.

I didn't say it was an infinite requirements exam. Please pay attention.
The New England Patriots are not the best NFL team ever but they are
wearing the Super Bowl rings.

> You need to be worrying about your miscomprehensions, not mine. I know what I'm dealing
> with.

We all know what you are dealing with, Dick - a very short deck.

> But we took drastically different tests. You'll never be able to claim that you passed
> the same test I did, even though you have an extra lite to show.

I never claimed to have passed the same test you did but we both a passed minimum
requirements exam at different times and earned the same privileges. It's the
privileges earned that matter, not the test one took.

> Why are you so hung up on who respects what or who?

Because you are so desperate for respect that you demand respect for a minimum
requirements exam that you took decades ago. That act, by itself, is not worthy
of respect. It's what you did with your earned privileges that matters.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4396. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 14:26:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Zf6I8.3691$IX4.105342145@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43615

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526075750.18807.00000505@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >You wanted to measure an amateur. I'm saying the license class isn't a
good
> >measure - you should look for other indicators.
>
> License class is the only way the FCC measures an amateur.

So, like Larry and now Dan, the FCC says the old licenses are the good ones,
and the new people just don't measure up?

4397. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 14:26:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF0F082.D3D4F9B6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43617

Dan Finn wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Virtually all of the value of a ham license is in the privileges granted.
>
> That is true. The measureable value would be in terms of privileges granted.

Not in terms of how fast one can copy code. Maybe I misunderstood you.

> But by your own words, those with more privileges have a certification
> with more value.

No matter how fast they can copy code. Maybe I misunderstood you.

> If anyone is delusionary, which I do not believe i really
> true, would it not be you, who was driven to become Extra, while I am
> quite happy with my smaller mountain, or molehill, whatever you may call
> it depending on one's perception of Amateur radio's value?

Someone suggested that the FCC may someday give the Advanced licensees the
choice of being busted back to General or passing the Extra exam. Since I'm
not getting any younger, I decided to alleviate that future potential problem
in a near effortless manner.

> And that very usage must be a signicant indicator that (CW) still has value.

Of course it has value as a communications mode. It doesn't have any value
anymore in playing that silly King-of-the-Mountain game.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4398. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 14:26:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Ng6I8.3692$YQ4.104947742@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43616

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CF0EAC3.787A28D6@IEEE.org...
> Dan Finn wrote:
> >
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > So people who were radio and electronics careerists should be denied
an
> > > amateur radio license because it comes to them with no effort?
> >
> > If they are careerists, that would be professional. Should professionals
> > be granted amateur radio licenses with no effort?
>
> Some amateurs are granted amateur radio licenses with virtually no effort
> involved. Why should professionals be denied the same right?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Dan demands effort and commitment. I don't have a problem with
professionals getting a license.

4399. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 14:32:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF0F208.CD280EF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43618

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> >What if there is an emergency?
>
> Jim says "IF" is for children.

Actually, it was Roger Whittaker singing, "I Don't Believe in If Anymore", in the context of statements like: If pigs had wings, they could fly. I'm sure Roger wasn't singing about valid conditional logical statements.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4400. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 15:15:07 UTC
From: Jesus Slut Fucker <pparis7@NOFUCKINGSPAM!cox.net>
Message-ID: <%Z6I8.80260$eD2.2595220@news2.east.cox.net>
Source record: 43619
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.flamenet

John Kimball wrote:

> On Sat, 25 May 2002 10:21:17 -0400, "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> Blew their
> wad in Message id: <aco8dn$q58$4@pita.alt.net>:
>
>
>>"hoodat" <hoodat@hoodatHerbieNrOne.com> whined in message
>>news:acmm00$gj8$0@pita.alt.net...
>>
>>> <<<<plonk>>>>
>>>
>>SPANK! You strill get get away from your molesting your daughter from your
>>first marriage and caused her suicide, Polly.
>>
>
> Nice sentence, Wiseman.
>
> --
> "Dr. Seuess is above your reading level."
> ^^^^^^
> Roger Wiseman, Rhodes scholar, blows his cover
> in Message-ID: <9u0smepoe0@dosa.alt.net>
>

I really think we need to start a fund to pay for his GED schooling.

-Jesus

--
Jesus Slut Fucker: Son of Gawd, Mary's Pimp
I was born, long ago. I am the chosen one.
Asshole of the Year 1987, 1989, 1999 (contested)
God Emperor: AssholeNet
Has Been of the Year 1995, 1997, 1999
Voted Flamer one would least like to share a prison cell with: 2000
Fuck up of the Year 2000
Fuck up of the Century for 20th Century
crm 1x3,
mhm 1x1,

Do as thousands of Gay men have already done and view Woger's
home page, Woger's page contains contact numbers, you can sign
his guest book, send him e-mail or just look at his loser ass:

Woger Wiseman's Profile:
http://profiles.gay.com/scripts/viewprofile?for=rogerwiseman

Woger Wiseman Gallery of Shame:

"Don't bring a knife to a gun fights you illarate fuck!"
Woger explains his battle plan in ^^^^^^^
9ujg6hpa@dosa.alt.net

"Dr. Seuss is above your reading level you. You fucker illerate"
kc8jbo@alt.net Woger demonstrates his superior sentence ^^^^^^
structure and spelling ability.

"...I never went to high school..."
Woger laments his lack of education in (a129t$i578@pita.alt.net)

Mehehe... Well, "grammer" sic boy, you definately have no room
to talk... (9viq9f$2@dosa.alt.net) ^^^^^^^

WOGER SPELLING DICTIONARY

"Basios"...word Woger uses when he gets neeeerrrrvous.
"Behing"...a cross between being and behind?
"Feamle"...I think he meant female.
"Losser"...only loser Roger can do it better.
"Ignroant"...typical, considering the source.
"Sluprs"...only Rogie knows what this means.
"Travelled"...a Rogerism, replete with ignorance.
"Postss"...pssst...Roger..that should be Posts.
"Defgenerate"...well, it's Roger's word...
"Faity"...he meant to say Fairy, but you know Roger.
"Distribiution"...Roger likes using phonics.
"Biotch"...he meant Bitch, but his phonics took over again.
"Methjadone"...a West Virginia substitute for Heroin.
"Anoinymous"...a cross between anonymous and annoying?
"Sumbliminal"...one of Roger's favorites.
"Recepticle"...either of Roger's moist cavaties.
"Cociane"...a West Virginia drug of choice?
"Tiome"...Roger meant to say Time...but his fingers were numb.
"Beraking"...no definition. Could mean 'beraking' the leaves,
"Amny"...he meant 'any',
"Nlay"...a town in Maylaysia? Vermont?
"Al;ong"...only Wussman knows what this means.
"Becasu"...well, becasu Roger is not the brightest bulb on the tree.
"Seperation". Why? Because Roger cannot "seperate" from his mommie!

Woger Wiseman Newsgroups:

news://news.epita.fr/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache0.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache3.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache1.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://ftp.tomica.ru/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

news://newscache2.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

4401. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 15:15:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF0FBEC.91CB9F6E@att.net>
Source record: 43620

CAM wrote:

> Some amateurs are granted amateur radio licenses with virtually no effort
> involved. Why should professionals be denied the same right?

Why should it matter where you learned radio as long as you learned it? Many hams including me got commercial radio licenses before we got the Extra class ham license. The point is it was learned. Today that isn't a requirement.

4402. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 15:19:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF0FCC4.F4781CF7@att.net>
Source record: 43622

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Ham exams have always been of the set of minimum
> > > requirement exams.
> >
> > Funny why there were so many different levels of "minimum" though, isn't it?
>
> Not funny at all. Each class of license has a different set of

<Megasnippage>

BLAH, BLAH, BLAH..... with you the bullshit is neverending.

You ignored it all till the grate dumbdown then leaped on the bandwagon with both feet. That
says it all.

4403. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 15:35:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020526113506.14911.00000786@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 43623

In article <OIPH8.2406$%j4.127255770@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined,
>in your opinion.

Brian:

The PCTA has never argued that, it's only your own twisted construct. The value of the Pre-Restructuring code tests was to give radio amateurs the ability to effectively exploit ham radio's most basic mode of electronic communication. Nothing more, nothing less. It's just that we PCTA's who have learned to employ the Morse/CW mode understand it's value, and the NCTA's don't -- so they whine about having to learn it. The dumbing-down of the written tests was supported by the ARRL because they saw their membership numbers tanking, and felt this was the way to stop the hemmorage.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4404. Re: Off Topic...help Find?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 15:37:00 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uf1v5bgajj9a2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 43621

Steve Robeson wrote:

>Can anyone suggest a good source for quality
>plastic scale models, especially of light civil aircraft?

Don't you know ANYTHING about UseNet! This is the
WRONG newgroup for plastic models.

Try: sci.physics.research!

Get WITH it, guy!

Val Germann
KC0MUB

4405. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 15:52:48 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF104D0.2070605@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43624

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:3CF03082.8030003@bellsouth.net...
>
>>
>>Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>>>news:3CEFD7A1.7090106@bellsouth.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>CAM wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Dan Finn wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Because there is no quantitative measure of value for effort and
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>commitment.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Effort and commitment are not Part 97 requirements.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>I agree; certainly very few if any Federal codes deal with effort and
>>>>commitment but the topic Brian introduced was about intrinsic value, not
>>>>Part 97.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Intrinsic value is measured by a federal exam? Try again.
>>>
>>
>>OK, here goes:
>>
>>"I agree; certainly very few if any Federal codes deal with effort and
>>commitment but the topic Brian introduced was about intrinsic value, not
>>Part 97."
>>

>>de KR4AJ
>>
>
> You wanted to measure an amateur.

No, I wanted to measure value.

I'm saying the license class isn't a good
> measure - you should look for other indicators.

Such as???

>
> Yet I hear you say that the only way YOU can know if the ham has given the
> proper effort and commitment is by the level and date of his license.

But I provided the qualification that nothing else would be known about
said amateur. Also, the evaluator would come from the mainstream of
humanity, not necessarily a 5wpm general lite in rrap.

4406. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 16:32:43 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acr2pr$ia5$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43625
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.george-ashley,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Polly who drove his daughter to suicide because of sexual molestation,
> "hoodat" <hoodat@polly14313.com> whined in message
> news:acpk6l$u7v$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > AB8MQ@alt.net wrote in message:
> > >
> > > Says the Pizza delivery boy who shills those stolen obsolete computer
> > > parts at a flea market in his crack-house, ghetto neighborhood
> > >
> > > let alone a life!
> >
> > What is a (Typo lame, followed by a fag lame)

[Space for typo lames]

> Hey Polly, did you really not finish high school? And by the way you keep
> bringing up the gopher-faced Turdeater's sister organization, or do you
> want to be a Pink Lady too? And speaking of ol' gopher face Nadless Ate
> Womanish Gay Males, you know he uses the same "techniques" as you do on
> here? And they're about as effective. Zero. Now there's a over 50 ham
who's
> never been married in Thevie boy. Something wrong there. You think ol'
> Thevie's a Lavender Lad himself?
> I've heard, since he and you seem to be most familiar with it, are you
both
> like David Tolassi and members of Lamda?
> But I see you still haven't gotten one tooth Ruth do calculate 2002 -
1955
> yet. What's the matter, is Ruthie tricking again? I know you couldn't
> calculate it Polly, since you weren't cheating Sears customers with hidden
> charges.

[space for typo lames]

Dance polly,dance.

4407. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 16:38:29 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF10F85.5010104@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43626

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:3CF04038.6040804@bellsouth.net...
>
>>
>>Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>So people who were radio and electronics careerists should be denied an
>>>amateur radio license because it comes to them with no effort?
>>>
>>If they are careerists, that would be professional. Should professionals
>>be granted amateur radio licenses with no effort?
>>
>
> Yes, that is the question. You demand effort, but there is no effort for
> the radio careerists. Should they be kept out because there is not
> sufficient effort?

They should not automatically be granted an amateur license as your propose.

>
>
>>>>Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is over a high
>>>>
>>>>
>>>school diploma.
>>>
>>>
>>>>Depends on the H.S., depends on the college.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I agree. And code proficence depends upon the code speed.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Nope, I could copy 9wpm error free. I could not copy 13wpm at 70%. I
>>>
> was
>
>>>proficient at one speed, a failure at another.
>>>
>>
>>So in this case a neutral observer may conclude that your certification

>>to operate on the code portions of the band is based on a faulty
>>standard because it allow you to operate where you are incapable of
>>communicating.
>>
>
> Slow is not incapable.

Oh yes it is. If someone is sending to you at 18 wpm, you are incapable
of copying that communication. I say this not to be mean. You can fix
that, you know.

> I thought you were Milton educated?

But my placement in the actuarial tables implies that I tend to forget.

>
> Perhaps it would be better for you to only operate in the
>
>>voice or the old novice code portions. Certainly, you should not be
>>given privileges in any sub-bands where you cannot understand anyone,
>>correct?
>>
>
> I did that for a while when the Novice Enhancement came along. It was a
> form of self-punishment for not advancing with the code. It was also
> stupid.
>
>
>>What if there is an emergency?
>>
>
> Jim says "IF" is for children.

Suppose there is an emergency?

>
>
>>>>>For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
>>>>>bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.
>>>>>
>>>>>Survival of the fittest?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Yes. Do not blame KR4AJ for this one either.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Who are we trying to oust? Where is this competitiveness AGAINST your
>>>fellow ham come from?
>>>
>>What competitiveness? You keep losing sight of the fact that KR4AJ is
>>merely trying to state a fact. Is stating a fact competitive?
>>

>
> You cannot answer why you engage in competition with your fellow hams?

Even if I did, what would be wrong with that. Have you ever heard of
contests, ARRL awards and so on? Don't you like competition? You are
beginning to sound like a Communist again. Everybody should be the same
and never compete. That is almost unpatriotic. Maybe you are a democrat.

>
>
>>>>>>KR4AJ has nothing to do with it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>Dan can accept it, embrace it, or reject it. Dare he change it?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>It is your construct, not a mountain.
>>>
>>I believe that survival of the fittest was Darwin's construct but it
>>could be about as difficult to change as moving a mountain.
>>
>
> I recall someone parting the sea.

If you can remember that, so much for your actuarial tables. You've got
me beat by a few years.

>
>
>>>>>>It is simply a fact that one must accept.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>Accept oppression?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>That's Life in the big city, Bud.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>There are idiots in the big city, and you're one of them.
>>>
>>Ouch!!!
>>
>>
>>Brian, you just come out nowhere and *slam*. You got me on that one!
>>
>
> Its Brian or N0iMD. Leave "Bud" in your fridge or your closet.

Or you will do...what?

>
>
>>>>Whether we care or not onviously does not not matter to you. The fact
>>>>that it matters to many pther people who know nothing else about what a
>>>>great ham you are, Brian, may or may not matter to you. But all I'm
>>>>saying is that certification to a higher standard matters to people in
>>>>general. That is Life.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>You've said that the highest license (not certification) is meaningless.

No, I said it had no measureable value. However, Cecil reminded me that
that it did have value, i.e. in terms of operating privileges granted.
That is measureable and I agree with that. However, if it were not
measureable, it could still have a qualitative value that is not
measureable by quantitative means.

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>I don't know Brian,
>>>>>that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Messenger? You guys aren't the messengers. You're trying to be the
>>>>enforcers of a false system of values.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I object to that statement. My role in Life is not to enforce any system
>>>>of values.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Then cease and desist.
>>>
>>huh?
>>
>
> You perpetuate the myth that old exams are better than the new exams.

No, I merely state how other people may tend to perceive it. There you
go again, Brian. Learn to read.

>
>
>>>>I merely observe, and I am reporting to you what I observe.
>>>>You may disagree that what I observe is really true but that is another
>>>>discussion. But what do you observe, Brian? That people never observe a
>>>>pecking order or that survival of the fittest is not a characteristic of
>>>>humanity? Go ahead, take a shot at it, explain to us your New Wave
>>>>approach to interpreting Humanity in general.
>>>>

>>>Kill all the no code Techs?
>>>
>>oUCH AGAIn! Where did that one come from???
>>
>
> OK. Just harass them?

That is difficult for me because I don't use a repeater.
>
>
>>>I don't think so.
>>>
>>I don't either but we can make no-code-tech-jokes all day long, such
>>'How many no code techs does it take to replace a 3-500Z?'
>>
>
> Cute.

ANS: Three. One NCT forget to unplug the amp, one to dial 911 for the
NCT who forgot to unplug the amp and one to receive the NAL from the FCC
for transmitting test signals outside his authorized privilege.

>
>
>>>>>It's something you cannot change.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>I think I've already been part of making the change. The actuarial
>>>>
>>>>
>>>tables
>>>
>>>
>>>>will have to take care of the rest.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Brian, the part about the actuarial tables is not a very nice thing to
>>>>say. The Amateur operator is supposed to be friendly and not darken the
>>>>face of Amateur radio. Part 97 doesn't say that..but you know it is
>>>>true. I am ashamed to be associated with a ham who writes like this.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Yes Dan, try being friendly. Say friendly things othere than "I only
>>>observe...Don't shoot the messenger..."
>>>
>>
>>By all means, *yes*, do *not* shoot the messenger. KR4AJ is only trying
>>to help you by providing you with information that is extremely relevant
>>for living Life in general and the Life of a ham in particular but you
>>know that already as this is all a matter of public knowledge. What I
>>see has the impeccable credentials of Conventional Wisdom, you know,

>>"CW". Readers Digest is my infallible source. And one time Readers
>>Digest had an article about Morse Code saving a ham's life during a
>>snowstorm in Montana. That ham could have been N0IMD!
>>
>
> I would have survived it without Morse Code.

Not according to Reader's Digest.

> Why do you speak of yourself in the 3rd person? Larry did that when he told
> us that "his friend" used to send QFU on CW.

Does KR4AJ speak of himself in the third person?

>
>
>>>>>>Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
>>>>>>hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
>>>>>>complained to the hilt and took that option away.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>You measure a ham by the exam he took. A better system would be to
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>measure
>>>
>>>
>>>>>a ham by what he does.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>And you measure a ham by his statistical probability on an actuarial
>>>>table. Nice guy.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>I am a nice guy. But I have my faults.
>>>
>>I wasn't aware of that (i.e. that you were a nice guy) heh heh...
>>
>
> Well, I am. I'm one of the few that will apologize for my mistakes on here.

Regardless of their actuarial index? You would actually bother to
apologize to a fellow ham who might kick the bucket soon anyway? That
seems inefficient.

>
>
>> One of them is to accept newcomers
>>
>>>to the service without judging them by the code exam they took, or what
>>>university they took it at.

>>>
>>What did they call this in high school, a mixed metaphor I believe.
>>
>
> Ahh. Milton is showing through again.

Well, two out of three ain't bad in the metaphor mix.

>
>
>>>>>But why measure at all?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>What? You want no test at all? Just give everybody a ham license?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>You have such a limited mind. Try one exam, one license.
>>>
>>I tried it...one exam, one license. Conclusion: Too limited.
>>
>
> Why? No visible pecking order?
>
> OK, one full license, one limited license.

Better than your communistic one-size-fits-all proposal. Gosh, I really
think you are a communist. Did you ever work the MIR space station?

>
>
>>>>>>Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a
>>>>>>
> higher
>
>>>>>>standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
>>>>>>unfair to the less talented?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>Ah, finally a question. The exam needs to test what is necessary to
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>equip
>>>
>>>
>>>>>and operate a station within the confines of the authorization, and to
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>do so
>>>
>>>
>>>>>safely. Anything else is irrelevant and superflous.

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Aha, so you do want to measure something! At least that is a start.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Yes, do they know the rules? Can they operate an amateur station
>>>
> safely?
>
>>Don't stop now, you're making real progress.
>>
>
> That's all a regulatory agency can ask for.

What about excellence?

> This isn't Milton, you know.

Those mixed metaphors are getting the best of you.

> Yhe BMV didn't stamp your license "cum Loud?"

No Comment. That is one of your dumber one's, Bud.

>
>
>>>>>>As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with
>>>>>>
> that.
>
>>>>>>Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance
>>>>>>
> is
>
>>>>>>not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
>>>>>>test was the code test. But you know that already.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>73 de KR4AJ
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>combined,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>in your opinion.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>...putting words in my mouth...No, but it is probably more valuable than
>>>>the written test at filtering out effort and commitment to amateur

>>>>
> radio.
>
>>>Part 97 doesn't ask for effort nor commitment.
>>>
>>Nor does an aviator's or a surgeon's license. Just because something
>>isn't legally mandated does not mean we should not insist on excellence
>>using the only tools we have available, i.e the CFR's (Codes of Federal
>>Regulation). Is it against the Constitution to emphasize effort and
>>commitment by structuring minimum standards as such? Prove it. Take it
>>to court.
>>
>
> Minimum standards to operate at 7100khz are valid at 7099khz, yet the
> government denies access to 7099.

Not to me!

The electrical principals are the same,
> the rf principles are the same, the propagation principles are the same, the
> safety principles are the same...

Pecking order, you know. That's life.

>
>
>> You don't even have to raise
>>
>>>your right hand and swear allegiance to America in order to have a
>>>
> license.
>
>>Is this supposed to be logically connected to something else you have
>>written? Forgive me but I am getting into my statistically disadvantaged
>>years, you know, according to that Actuarial chart you mentioned, so
>>please enlighten me if you will how this comment is relevant to anything
>>in this thread. But noe that you bring it upI will note that Part 97
>>does require US citizenship, and Naturalized US citizenship does require
>>the Oath that you mentioned, so, it might be said that swearing
>>allegiance actually is a prerequisite to a ham license, at least for
>>some people.
>>
>
> You are getting old.

Oh no, not that actuarial sermon again.

> You mentioned effort and "commitment."

Truly a cardinal sin for an NCT.

Swearing an
> oath is a commitment. Taking a test is not. And I would guess that most

> Americans have never sworn an oath.

So what? Many have.

>
>
>>>>Now a question for you:
>>>>
>>>>Do you value a person's probability statistic on an actuarial table to
>>>>be more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>It will eventually get rid of people like me and you who remember that
>>>
> there
>
>>>used to be layers of useless licensing requirements. Only then will we
>>>consider the measure of a good ham by what de does and how he does it
>>>(rather than by how fast he beeps).
>>>
>>Ouch again!!! Speak for yourself! Truly a grave topic. Let's talk about
>>
>>something else like Eastern Carolina Barbecue or something on that general
>>
>>plane.
>>
>>de KR4AJ
>>
>
> OK, family cookout at Slate Run Metro Park today. Kids can fish, hike
> trails, or play on the huge playground. Fantastic!

I gotta go too but before I do I want to leave you with three important
thoughts. You can forget everything else I have written as long as you
always remember the following:

1. Barbecue sauce NEVER includes tomato in any form.

2. Barbecue never includes anything but pig. No chicken or beef.
Barbecue is only pig and vinegar.

3. Barbecue is a noun, never a verb.

73 de KR4AJ

> (no alcohol)
>
> Brian/N0iMD
>
>
>

4408. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 17:08:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526130809.26555.00000538@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43627

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>The PCTA has never argued that, it's only your own twisted construct.

What is twisted, Larry, is your saying that "the PCTA has never argued that."
Those that believe that an Amateur exam must consist of a Morse-decoding skill
and a written test that includes all else about Amateur Radio, and that if they
fail to pass either they are not given priveleges cannot believe anything but
that Morse-decoding skill is equal in important to all else in Amateur Radio,
at least in meeting the minimum requirements to enter the avocation.

All the rest is justification.

You are not being very logical.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4409. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 17:09:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526130901.26555.00000539@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43628

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>The dumbing-down of the written tests was
>supported by the ARRL because they saw their membership
>numbers tanking, and felt this was the way to stop the hemmorage.

In the one place that matters -- before the FCC in a rulemaking procedure --
ARRL asked the FCC to make the written exams more difficult.

You are not being very logical.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4410. Re: Mobile Antenna

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 17:11:17 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CF0FA91.38AD50FD@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

2test AB8ManyQueers wrote:

>
> Hey Polly, did you really not finish high schol?

What is "schol"? Did you even finish second grade wogie? You must
not have, you can't spell.

4411. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 17:11:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526131138.26555.00000540@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43630

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> License class is the only way the FCC measures an amateur.

>So, like Larry and now Dan, the FCC says the old licenses are the good ones,
>and the new people just don't measure up?

How the heck did you get that from my post? I think I will be able to better answer your question if I can make some sense of the logic that led you to conclude that from my words.

Is this one of those "what he said; what Brian heard" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4412. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 17:14:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526131426.26555.00000541@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43631

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>Interesting, we take a Test to get a License, then after we get the License,
>the ARRL gives Classes, and provides info about Technical Stuff we should
>have
>none before taking the Test.

There were no questions on antenna modeling or DSP (an upcoming topic) on any
of the tests I took. How about you?

Are you really suggesting that hams should know the equivalent of the 6-week
antenna-modeling course that ARRL conducts before being given their licenses.?
If not, what did you mean wnen you said that ARRL's courses provide information
about the stuff you should have done before you took the test?

I am trying to take you at your word, Bruce, but your words are not making very
much sense.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4413. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 17:17:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526131705.26555.00000542@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43632

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>The point is it was learned. Today that isn't a requirement.

Very few people can study the correct answers to over 1000 questions without learning something. Learning is the easiest way to pass the tests. Why do you keep discouraging people from learning by telling them that they don't have to?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4414. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 17:19:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526131915.26555.00000543@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43633

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>And then they came out with restructuring and added all the Ham Freqs to CB.

Yeah, Bruce -- you can go ahead and use your amateur callsign at 1500 watts on channel 19. Make sure you ID every 10 minutes, though.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4415. ARNewsline 1293 - May 24 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 17:49:50 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526134950.14607.00000977@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 43634

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1293 - May 24 2002

This is a special announcement: Attention all listeners. Please be advised that our next newscast, Number 1294, will not be released until Sunday evening June 2nd. This is due to staff travel to an out of town event and will affect only next weeks newscast. ARNewsline newscast number 1295 will return to our normal Friday release on June 7th. Please adjust your release schedule accordingly. Thank you.

Also, once again this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline™ newscast is extremely audio intensive. We believe that it is impossible to really appreciate the words of those quoted without hearing them for yourself. For this reason we suggest that after reading this weeks print edition that you take your web browser to:

http://www.arnewsline.org

Click on the newscast number then download the MP3 audio file. Next sit back and experience a 20 minute "audio picture" of Hamventionr 200 for yourself.

Thank you. End special advisory.

--

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1293 with a release date of Friday, May 24th 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. 2002 turns out to be the year of surprises at Hamvention. This story is first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1293 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

DAYTON 2002 - A YEAR OF SURPRISE - PART 1

If nothing else, the 2002 Dayton Hamvention was filled with surprises. Surprises like this:

--
"I just flat do not believe that. What are the odd? The top three prizes and people without calls win them? There's a lot of guys walking out of here with their heart down in their shoe soles."
--

That's right. The top three prizes -- three top line ham radio stations and this year they were won by non hams. And before some of you channel

cops start saying that non hams cannot legally win ham gear guess again. The law is on their side. Not only did they win it. They went home with it.

Another surprise? How about business. Business as in what may be a record year for vendors. Why? Because those who came to Hamvention 2002 were armed with cash and ready to buy. Just ask Radio School's Gordon West, WB6NOA:

--
Gordon West WB6NOA: "Well at he booths I was working to show the Gordon West Radio School products the sales were very, very positive. I mean -- people came here to get equipment and to get back on the air.

Many new hams were going on the air for the first time, yet there were allot of older hams who were sort of not on the air allot trading up to new equipment.

Certainly, I think we are about where we were last year for attendance but enthusiasm in acquiring new equipment? Yes! Much more than last year.
--

As to the size of the crowd? There is still no official figure. Also, the weather was a bit unpredictable. Friday was wet. Saturday was first clear then wet. Sunday turned out to be the nicest weather of all. CQ Magazine's Rich Moseson, W2VU, was happy either way:

--
Rich Moseson W2VU: "I just love rain. On Friday it rained and everybody was inside and it was very, very busy and we had a great show.

Saturday it was nice outside and the Flea Market people were happier than they were on Friday. Overall, as always. Good show."
--

Moseson's view was echoed by Chip Margelli of Vertex Standard -- the Yaesu people:

--
Chip Margelli K7JA: "I think Hamvention this year was great. The weather was very cooperative especially on Saturday. This gave us lots of time to talk to customers and describe our products. We think that everybody was in a festive mood and a buying mood and that was good especially with all of the new products we have here. We've had a tremendous time here at Hamvention."
--

In reality, Hamvention 2002 was a buyers market. Dealers kept prices low and lots of major ticket items moved across the sales counters. In fact, it was possible to buy a Yaesu FT-817 for under $500.

As to what was new this year? Listen to what some of the company reps brought with them starting with Vertex Standard's Chip Margelli.

--
Chip Margelli K7JA: We have introduced new products in every major category. We introduced the Mark V Field high-end HF; the FT-897 second generation `man-pack' portable; the VX7R submersible handheld; the FT-8900 `quad-band' 10 meter, 6 meter, 2 meter and 70 Cm mobile radio and the Wires Internet repeater linking system. So we have had a very busy time."
--

Not to be outdone, Kenwood's Leo Famie, KJ6HI, said that those coming to his booth wanted to see a little HT called the F6:

--
Leo Famie, KJ6HI: F6, our new HT. A tri-band hand-held covering 2 meters, 220 and 440. It has a receiver from about 500 Kilohertz to 1300 MHz but blocks out cellular telephones. But the neat thing about this radio is its all mode receive in the band B. AM, FM, USB, LSB and CW."
--

Famie says that dealers sold well over 300 of these new H-T's making the F6 was a bright star for Kenwood at this years Dayton show.

And what about Icom you ask? We asked Ray Novak, KC7JPA, what was hot and what those coming to the Icom booth wanted to see:

--
Ray Novak, KC7JPA: 706 Mark 2 G by far. Also allot of interest in a new digital radio that we have that will give you bandwidth for data equivalent to a T-1 line."
--

One guy who always has something new up his sleeve is MFJ's Martin Jue, K5FLU. This year he gave Amateur Radio Newsline a peak at two new goodies. The one that really caught our eye is a high frequency beacon network receiver that is so pretty that it would be as much at home in your livingroom as in your hamshack. Not only that, it lights up a LED on a map to show you what beacon you are actually hearing: Martin gave us a simple explanation of how it works:

--
Martin Jue, K5FLU: "The beacons are precisely timed...so everything is exactly right. What we did was to duplicate that timing sequence in here. And we make sure that it is always right because we have an atomic clock receiver in here."
--

MFJ also showed its new Morse code interface box. Not only does it decode the C-W signal your receiver is hearing. It also lets you plug in a key, paddle or even a keyboard and send Morse like a pro.

But new gear and great prices were not the only surprises at Hamvention 2002 and we will have more later on in this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report. (ARNewsline™)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the N7QVK repeater serving Tucson Arizona.

(5 sec pause here)

**
RESCUE RADIO: HAM RADIO ASSISTS FOLLOWING UK RAIL ACCIDENT

RAYNET -- the United Kingdom's equivalent of ARES and RACES here in the United States was called out on Friday, May 10th. This, following a railroad crash that occurred in the city of Potters Bar less than one mile from the RSGB Headquarters.

The accident took place at about 1 P-M. G4MWO says that Hertfordshire Raynet County Controller, Trevor Groves, G4KUJ, was contacted at home at 2 P.M. and asked to assist with setting up the local Emergency Control Vehicle. Groves had it operational by 4.20 P.M. He then provided technical and administrative support to the relief administration staff who used it until office accommodations were arranged at about 8 P.M. that evening. (GB2RS)

**

RADIO LAW: COMMERCE COMMITTEE VOTES TO DELAY SPECTRUM AUCTION

Back on this side of the Atlantic the House Energy and Commerce Committee approved a measure that would delay the government's June 19th sale of spectrum now used by television broadcasters and sought for wireless services. The panel approved the action on a voice vote May 5th. As previously reported, this legislation was sought by a large segment of both the wireless and broadcast industries. The bill now goes to the House floor for consideration. (Published news reports)

**

SPECTRUM SHARING: MOVE OVER DIRECT TV - YOUR SPECTRUM IS ABOUT
TO BE
SHARED

The 12 GHz downlink spectrum used by Direct TV and Echostar is about to shared by terrestrial services. The CGC Communicator says that thanks to a creative idea and a multi-year lobbying effort by Northpoint, the 12.2 to 12.7 GHz band will soon be used for new video and broadband communications services, such as local television programming and high-speed Internet access. Technically, the new service is called "MVDDS," short for Multichannel Video Distribution and Data Service. (CGC Communicator)

**

RADIO ACCIDENT: FIRE ATOP THE KCBD-TV TOWER

The C-G-C Communicator also reports that KCBD-TV, in Lubbock, Texas, recently installed a new Andrew batwing antenna designed to accommodate both its channel 11 NTSC and channel 9 digital transmissions. After only five days of operation with just N-T-S-C power applied, there was an apparent arc-over and the
aerial was destroyed by fire. The station resumed NTSC operations using an old Alford antenna located on the same tower. Engineers are trying to determine the cause of the failure. (CGC Communicator)

**

GATHERINGS: WEAK SIGNAL BREAKFAST IN NORCAL

The Western States Weak Signal Society and Sidewinders on Two will jointly host a the semi annual "Brunch, Grip and Grin" in Northern California. The Date is Saturday June 1st. The location is Bakers Square in West Sacramento California. As usual, there will be door prizes and a good raffle of a radio. It all starts at 9:30 a-m, Pacific Savings Time. For more information contact W6OMF by e-mail to w6omf@cwnet.com. (VHF Reflector, WSWSS)

**

DAYTON 2002 - A YEAR OF SURPRISE - PART 2

Now, continuing with our coverage of Hamvention 2002, lets look at the forums. Emergency communications was this years Hamvention theme and all of the sessions -- about 50 of them -- were in some way dedicated in some way to it. And while we could not visit every one of session, we do know that for all three days the forum rooms were packed. In fact, many sessions had people lined up against the walls and sitting in the aisles. That included our own Ham Radio Town Meeting that featured Popular Communications Editor Harold Ort, N2RLL as the keynote speaker. His theme: Emergency communications means more than just ham radio:

--
Harold Ort N2RLL: "I want to say that now is the time to learn to operate with other services in concert and not just with ham radio. That's really my message. And if you are wearing the blinders: If you are wearing the ham radio blinders -- take them off. Please.

I don't have all of the answers but I would like to have folks depart from business as usual. We have allot of smart people out there with specialized know-how.

And that's the beauty of ham radio. We can bring allot of radio users into the emergency communications mix so that we can help to make America safe.

Ladies and gentlemen: If we don't get it after 911, we really never will. Thank you very much. (Applause)
--

Ort's message: Its time to break down the barriers that divide us and work together for the good of our nation and the world. Or as Harold

himself said: If we don't get it after 911, we never will.

Another session that drew a stand room only crowd was the FCC forum with Bill Cross, W3TN. That one you can hear right now on the RAIN Report. Its on the web at in streaming audio www.rainreport.com or on the phone at 847-827-7246. (ARNewsline™)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

**

DAYTON 2002 - A YEAR OF SURPRISE - PART 3

The Hamvention Grand Awards banquet was held on Saturday evening. This years recipients included Owen Garriott W5LFL and Tonly England, W0ORE who shared the Special Achievement award:

--
OwenGarriott W5LFL: "As perhaps you could tell from that brief introduction, hamming has been a part of my life for over 55 years. I started with my father and perhaps you can tell from the sequence of events in my professional career hamming was a very strong influence on the direction. I went to undergraduate school, to college and to a professional career after that.

I know that this story is not unique. In fact it wouldn't surprise me if there were some 10% to 20% of those of you in the audience who could provide a similar story about how hamming has influenced your professional career as well as your past-time in the area of ham radio.

I do want to thank all I the Amateur Radio community for the benefit it has been to me in directing and guiding all of my professional interests over the past 55 years: All of the way back to the time that my father asked me to come along to code school, to theory school and ending up in my getting my first license.

It has been a great career and I owe an awful lot of it to Amateur Radio. Thank you."
--

Tony England W0ORE: "It was probably in the 9th grade when one of the big blizzards was coming through West Fargo and they sent us home. I remember vividly: My bedroom was up on the 2nd floor. All of the now was blowing by the window and I was playing around with the radio and I was talking to this Pastor at a mission in South America. It was a jungle setting and he was describing what they were doing down there.

And you can imagine what an imagination expanding experience it was for a kid in North Dakota to be able to talk to someone living in the jungle of South America? It was that kind of experience that we were hoping to share when we talked to young peoples groups on Spacelab II through the Amateur Radio system. And it is something that I hope we pass on to other kids.

When maybe one of my granddaughters is a teenager and an Amateur Radio operator I hope that she has the chance to talk to a professional female engineer who is on a spacecraft on its way to one of the moons of Mars. So I hope that all of you keep up this good work and see that this happens. Thank you. (Applause)

--
Al Waller, K3TKJ, was next. He received this years Technical Excellence award for creating qsl.net:

--
Al Waller K3TKJ: "...With that and the insight of the Dayton Hamvention Awards Committee we have certainly legitimized another mode of communication for ham radio. The Internet is not the enemy of ham radio that I have heard professed so many times. It is just another mode of operation.

Today we have hundreds of thousands of QSL users on the Internet. It is a friendly place. The hobby is better for it and I am honestly proud to be a small part of it."
--

Then, the man that everyone was waiting to hear from. The 2002 Radio Amateur of the Year, Hap Holly, KC9RP of RAIN. His closeing remarks brought down the house:

--
Hap Holly KC9RP: "In closing, please allow me to borrow from this years Winter Olympics a familiar international theme that sums up my exhilaration at being selected to receive this award. Simply put: `the year 2002 has truly been my Gold Medal year' in the Olympics of Amateur Radio. I am indeed honored to be chosen as Radio Amateur of the Year by the Hamvention, but also to be the first person with disabilities to receive this plaque. Thank you very much. (Applause)
--

But there was another surprise. This one involved KC9RP, a radio and a company known as Alinco and our producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF:

--
Bill Pasternak WA6ITF: "Hi Hap. I'm changing my uniform tonight. I was asked by the wonderful folks at Alinco and ATOC Distributing any by Evelyn Garrison to represent them because they are at a business meeting. But Hap, they would like for you to have...your very own -- brand new -- DJ-196 two meter handheld as their token off appreciation for what you have done and for what you and Stephanie both do. Enjoy it my friend." (Applause)

--

But the surprises were over yet. At least not for KC9RP. When the dinner prizes were drawn, the first out of the barrel was Hap Holly. And in addition to the Alinco H-T, Hap also took home a brand new Icom IC-V8000 two meter mobile and base radio.

So what about those who attended. What do they have to say. As everyone was heading out of the HARA Arena following the close of Hamvention 2002, Bob Sherman, K2SJP, summed it up best:

--
Bob Sherman K2SJP: "Its the best Hamvention that I have been to."
--

K2SJP says that he plans on coming back. Many others Amateur Radio Newsline spoke said the same thing. (ARNewsline™)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: ON THE AIR EVENT
Turning to international news, word from GB2RS that members of the Preston Amateur Radio Society are operating GB2COP until the end of May. This, to celebrate Preston being granted city status during The Queen's jubilee year. Activity is on 40, 20 and 15 metres HF, plus 2 metres and 70 centimeters. QSL GB2COP with an SASE either via the bureau or direct to M1KIT. (GB2RS)

**

DX

In D-X, A group of operators from the Kuwait Amateur Radio Society will be active as 9K2F from Failaka Island until the 31st of May. QSL is via 9K2RA either direct or through the bureau. (RSGB)

Also, Team Vertical is heading back to Jamaica for the CQ WPX CW contest. The group will operate from 160 to 6 meters as their home calls slash 6Y5 until the 28th of May. They will participate in the contest as 6Y2A with six full gallon stations. QSL via WA4WTG. (RSGB)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE HAMVENTION THOUGHTS OF W6AQ

And finally this week, another look at Hamvention 2002. This time, through the eyes of a ham who has been to many of them. His name is Dave Bell. His call sign is W6AQ and as Hamvention 2002 was drawing to a close he shared his thoughts with our producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF:

--
Dave Bell W6AQ: "This was a great Hamvention. Except for the weather on Friday it was absolutely perfect.

Bill Pasternak WA6ITF: "What was the highlight to you?"

Dave Bell W6AQ: "I think that the highlight for me was the special ARRL dinner on Friday night for donors to the ARRL where we heard Joe Taylor, K1JT, give a really, really interesting talk. He has got a big sense of humor for a Nobel Prize winner, I must say."

Bill Pasternak WA6ITF: "We saw allot of new products here. Anything catch your eye?

Dave Bell W6AQ: "Actually the Yaesu FT-1000 Field I probably would have bought instead of the Mark V if it had come out at the same time. And I must say that getting an FT-817 little radio for under $500 broke my heart because I paid twice that."
--

Hamvention 2002 is now history, but Hamvention 2003 is now less than a year away. Dave Bell, W6AQ, says he plans to be there. So will we, and we hope to see you there too. (ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, one last call for nominations for our very own Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year award. The final date to postmark a nomination is May 30th. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our website at www.arnewsline.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA, saying 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

4416. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 17:59:59 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <t582fugstfa57hn1psnsgfretfb8s0q1u7@4ax.com>
Source record: 43635
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 24 May 2002 22:36:13 -0500, "Rood" <FRS@myrigs.com> wrote:

>The FRS freqs in our area are not overly busy, but what is heard on them is
>a precursor of what is to come. Cussing, arguing, name-calling, et al are
>already happening. It will only grow worse and MURS will soon follow suit.
>To believe otherwise is foolish and myopic.

FRS has been with us for a few years already with radios available
that anyone could afford. How long will it be before FRS is totally
overrun by nonsense, 20 to 30 years?

MURS activity in my area has dropped since it first became legal. I
expect to hear a small increase in use when MURS specific radios
become available but I don't expect to hear the armageddon that many
are claiming.

Most who will be attracted to MURS will not want to put the effort
into a monster station (which would do little good anyway.) If they
want greater range they'll stick with their cell phones.

Mike

4417. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 18:05:40 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <io82fucluma836abhvi4j1gdck9fqd8s51@4ax.com>
Source record: 43636
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 24 May 2002 22:43:46 -0500, "Rood" <FRS@myrigs.com> wrote:

>I wonder how long it will be before we hear "Roger Beeps" and echo boxes on
>MURS?

I have yet to hear an echo box on FRS.

Roger beeps were initiated by radio manufacturers, not users of FRS
radios.

If you hear roger beeps on MURS you can thank the manufacturers.

Mike

4418. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 18:11:11 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <g092fu8tvoqp63c6oa4ul74d6l35iu5t00@4ax.com>
Source record: 43637
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sun, 26 May 2002 00:28:19 GMT, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
>Maybe or maybe not. The Ham Fox hunters will have a field day tracking down the bozos,
>on VHF it is much harder to hide one's activities and location. The real concern is not
the
>running of power, but the fact that the idiots who do the above will find it almost
irresistible
>to dial their modified 2m rigs down to the Ham 2m band to take advantage of the nation
>wide system of repeaters, some linked in to multistate coverage systems, for a quick QSO
>with other like minded pirate operators. The reason they would even consider dropping
>down to the 2m Ham band is due to the fact that many businesses still use the now
>unlicensed MURS frequencies, and likely will continue to do so. This could make the
>current problem with intruders on 10m and 12m look small.

The one real live problem I've heard about on MURS (as far as
non-certified radios) was with Ham operators using their 2m radios on
MURS.

The fox hunts will turn up some of their own people.

Mike

4419. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 18:21:44 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <sh92fukn6aki18gk89hkivna69dvupd01r@4ax.com>
Source record: 43638
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sat, 25 May 2002 05:59:13 -0500, "Rood" <FRS@myrigs.com> wrote:

>No matter what you post, no matter your arguments, the simple unalterable
>fact remains that the low life
>CBers will soon ruin the MURS frequencies.

When is soon? CBers like to talk skip. Do you expect a particularly
odd sun cycle that will allow skip on VHF?

The only people who will come close to causing problems on MURS are
those who will pay less than $30 for their radio and those radios will
not have the range to bother anyone.

Why would anyone give up all their high powered CB gear that talks all
over the world for more expensive equipment that might possibly talk
to the next town regardless of power?

Mike

4420. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 18:26:32 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <v3a2fuo6j1k7vd61ajj16sudggk6hb2274@4ax.com>
Source record: 43639
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sat, 25 May 2002 01:43:56 GMT, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop> wrote:

> Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
> with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
> does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
> turn chicken and leave you alone.
>
> The second method makes me sick.

The second is kind of like the Boston Tea Party.

Mike

4421. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 18:33:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF12A61.FCAB0F2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43640

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Why should it matter where you learned radio as long as you learned it?

So my EE degree is not meaningless after all?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4422. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 18:34:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF12AB6.CD5893E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43641

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You ignored it all till the grate dumbdown then leaped on the bandwagon with both feet. That
> says it all.

I met the minimum requirements, just like you did.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4423. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 18:43:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <J1aI8.2497$nl5.1446@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43642
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:v3a2fuo6j1k7vd61ajj16sudggk6hb2274@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 25 May 2002 01:43:56 GMT, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop> wrote:
>
> > Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
> > with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
> > does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
> > turn chicken and leave you alone.
>
> The second is kind of like the Boston Tea Party.
>
> Mike

Mike,

Are you suggesting that MURS operators might stage a "Boston Tea Party" to
acquire additional channels?

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4424. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 18:43:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF12CEC.FB42E481@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43643

Dan Finn wrote:
> 3. Barbecue is a noun, never a verb.

From Webster's: "barbecue - vt -cued; -cuing; to roast or broil on a rack
over hot coals or on a revolving spit before or over a source of heat"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4425. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 19:02:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526150200.29862.00000786@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 43644

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/26/02 04:05 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205260005.53b9e812@posting.google.com>

>Read what I've said, and use the WHOLE CONTEXT. I'll repeat my
>thoughts... Other than a couple of high-level repeaters, 2m activity
>is virtually non-existant(or dormant) in San Diego County... and 2m is
>the most active ham VHF/UHF band. You stupid shits extract one word
>out of the statement, and use it out of context... you are no better
>than that stupid cunt Hillary for using a tabloid headline "Bush
>knew".

You are obviously listenting ONLY in FM, Your Ignorantness. FM is NOT the
only band in use in SDG County, and the repeaters are NOT the only activity on
2M in that area.

There IS a a "stupid !@#$" here, but it's YOU Stewie, no one else..

>Do you folks really have such a LOW READING COMPREHENSION level, that
>you can't understand a simple sentence? Or, have you simply lost the
>ability to reason, or except change?

I am sure you meant "accept" change, but MURS will NEVER be any
"competition" for Amateur Radio.

YOU are the one wirh a poor reading comprehenshion, Your Idiotness. I
suggest you re-read the posts by Hans on comparisons of MURS vs Amateur Radio.
It was the best one yet. Very simple facts very clearly presented.

Even YOU should be able to understand it.

>I'll tell you what, when I get my VX-5, I'll run some scans on the
>various bands and post the statistics. I don't think you are going to
>like what you see.

BBBBBWWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

OH YEAH! We'll just be sitting on the edge of our seats...waiting to
determine the fate of Amateur Radio on what some ner'-do-well with a walkie
talkie can hear!

Geezis freakin chicken bones ! ! ! ! !

4426. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 19:02:52 UTC
From: eccraigjr@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020526150252.03812.00000782@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 43645

>> Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
>> with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
>> does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
>> turn chicken and leave you alone.
>>
>> The second method makes me sick.
>
>The second is kind of like the Boston Tea Party.
>
>Mike

Excellent response. How soon some forget the will of the people. After all, it IS still the "Citizen's Band," is it not?

73 de Bert
WA2SI

Anti-Troll Disclaimer: I'm only referring to removing the 155.3 mi. limit on the CB. (i.e. RM-9807)

4427. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 19:05:39 UTC
From: eccraigjr@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020526150539.03812.00000783@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 43646

>> > Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
>> > with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
>> > does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
>> > turn chicken and leave you alone.
>>
>> The second is kind of like the Boston Tea Party.
>>
>> Mike
>
>Mike,
>
>Are you suggesting that MURS operators might stage a "Boston Tea Party" to
>acquire additional channels?
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>ï¿½ï¿½ SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

Actually Hans, I believe he was referring to 11-meters, not MURS. It was a
reference to one of Phil's original posts. CB/11-meters was used as an analogy.
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4428. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 19:23:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526152346.11395.00000938@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 43647

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: G. M. Alf gmalf.ears@verizon.net
>Date: 05/26/02 14:11 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <g092fu8tvoqp63c6oa4ul74d6l35iu5t00@4ax.com>

>The one real live problem I've heard about on MURS (as far as
>non-certified radios) was with Ham operators using their 2m radios on
>MURS.

You should spend a bit of time around major interstates. Maritime frequencies and MURS channels are being usurped by truck drivers. Certainly not to the degree of Channel 19, but it IS a problem.

I am hearing truck driver traffic on MURS 151.82 and .88 from my location in Franklin County, Tennessee, and I am about 20 miles from my nearest aproach to Interstate 24. Those are NOT "legal" MURS radios they are using.

I have yet to hear anyone that was a Ham using MURS.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4429. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 19:26:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526152615.11395.00000941@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 43648

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 05/26/02 15:02 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020526150200.29862.00000786@mb-fy.aol.com>

>FM is NOT the
>only band in use in SDG County,...

Excuse me...I meant "mode".

4430. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 19:46:30 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <ee800a6e025bf8bb01dd557f89f5aef7.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43649
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Stewart, I'll be dipped. You missed the point again. Too bad you were not (obviously) in NYC on 9/11. Go ahead, use your cell phone - IF you can. Amateur radio certainly can't provide the huge infrastructure that commercial concerns can, BUT ...

Beyond that, amateur radio SHOULD be about learning. I've tried to argue that what is being done at my employer's place for data collection is not the way to do it. I think I'll simply leave the latest issue of QST lying around the plant. Maybe someone will read the article on hidden packet stations and come to the realization that what I've been saying for two years is correct. This does relate to amateur radio - do you think we are all still using spark gap and cw or what? I've got news for you - things DO change, but PRINCIPALS and CONCEPTS still apply. 500 volts from that boat anchor can still kill you, despite the fact it was built 50 years ago. Internet, packet, amateur radio - they all have some common grounds. Allowing a CBer a 10,000 watt amplifier will only add to problems, not provide solutions. Your problem is very common - I see it at work every day. This is going to get REALLY funny. I can now retire (I hit 55 on the 21st). You see, many people at work have the same perceptions you do. Once my retirement papers are signed (which won't be for a few more years yet - I want more pension), I will be demonstrating an interesting program. I did it once before with the old Texas Instruments ladder controllers. I wanted to do it 6 years ago (but the young very important folks said - it won't work, you won't have all of the CPU instructions in it - listen to this, Bill Gates!). I can program any of the Allen-Bradley SLCs in under 15 minutes with nothing but the I/O listings. It will be far more efficient than the code they currently use (a 35 ms scan time will be brought down to well under 5 ms). Unfortunatly, I had to sign an agreement with my employer which forbids me to work for a competitor for 2 years - but this was done on MY computer AT HOME with MY software. It has been costing them over $200,000.00 per year for the last 5 years. I will demonstrate it. It will automatically place an OEM LOCK on the program in the controller at which point they can alway leave it in or put their old software back into the controller. My software has a copywrite. Tough ...

BWHAhahahahah

What is pointless is the attitude you and many others display. It is costing FAR more than you will ever have a clue.

Here's to 'pointless' amateur radio!

Jim

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205260028.11111ce6@posting.google.com

> For crying out loud - this was 35 years ago.
>
> The world has totally changed - everyone has cell phones now(except
> me). The govt. is far more prepared to handle emergency comms these
> days. I'm sorry to say, but I think you are living in the past.
>
> But - if you must know, I don't believe ham radio is completely
> pointless yet... but it is heading in that direction.
>
> You know what - I'm starting to think that's why the FCC goes ahead
> and simply allows all these CBers to have illegal amps - it is a
> valuable National Resource :^) Could come in quite useful in an
> emergency.
>
> Stewart - N0MHS

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4431. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 20:06:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526160629.18708.00000120@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 43650

In article <U44I8.2123$yJ4.91632762@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>Anything above that minimum requirement, i.e., General, is superflous.

The FCC doesn't think so.

>The General once granted all priveleges,

all OPERATING privileges

> in a day when you had to beep fast,

13 wpm isn't "fast" at all.

>take exams without question pools, and face down that mean old FCC Examiner.

Don't forget having to pass both code tests before even getting a look at the written, no CSCEs, and the 30 day mandatory wait to retest. Also the experience requirements for the Advanced and Extra.

>The Novice was meant to be a limited license.

And it was.

>The General was not.

That is incorrect. You are mistaken, Brian.

The General class license appeared as part of the restructuring of 1951. It was basically the old Class B, renamed. It was a limited license from the 1951 restructuring until February of 1953 - almost 2 years. The FCC announced that they intended General to be a limited license when they restructured in 1951, and again in 1967 when they announced the "incentive licensing" changes.

The General has also been a limited license since November 22, 1968 - 33-1/2 years.

The General did grant all operating privileges from February 1953 until November
1968 - a little less than 16 years. This came about because of a last-minute decision by the FCC in December of 1952. There was no NPRM, no public debate, no comments, just an order from the FCC that Generals and Conditionals would get the same operating privs as Advanceds and Extras as of Feb 1953.

The General has been a limited license for more than 35 of the 51 years since the it was introduced. FCC has said at least three times that the General is intended to be a limited license (1951, 1968, 1999).

Your claim that the General was not meant to be a limited license is simply incorrect. Mistaken. Untrue. Flat out wrong.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4432. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 20:20:22 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <sjg2fukt9loj08s7v6oujq99um6oclrtna@4ax.com>
Source record: 43701
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 26 May 2002 18:43:53 GMT, "Kï¿½HB"
<KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote:

>
>"G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message
>news:v3a2fuo6j1k7vd61ajj16sudggk6hb2274@4ax.com...
>> On Sat, 25 May 2002 01:43:56 GMT, "Phil Kane"
>> <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop> wrote:
>>
>> > Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
>> > with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
>> > does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
>> > turn chicken and leave you alone.
>>
>> The second is kind of like the Boston Tea Party.
>>
>> Mike
>
>Mike,
>
>Are you suggesting that MURS operators might stage a "Boston Tea Party" to
>acquire additional channels?

That was done years ago and we now have a legal service that will
continue to operate with very few problems for years.

Additional channels are not needed and will probably not be needed for
some time.

Mike

4433. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 20:21:38 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF143D2.8080409@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43702

CAM wrote:

> Dan Finn wrote:
>
>>3. Barbecue is a noun, never a verb.
>>
>
> From Webster's: "barbecue - vt -cued; -cuing; to roast or broil on a rack
> over hot coals or on a revolving spit before or over a source of heat"

Hmmmm....just what is it that this boy Webster does not understand about
Carolina barbeque down East?

4434. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 20:34:35 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF146C3.380AA938@icok.net>
Source record: 43703
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart,
Reality?? Hmmm... Since when does reality have all
that much to do with it?
'Doc

4435. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 20:42:34 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF148A1.4F5DF286@icok.net>
Source record: 43704
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart,
The likelihood of more channels being added to
FRS/MURS/GMRS is very small. If they turn into a
'FUBAR' like other services have, it's a more likely
possibility that they will be deregulated and enforcement
turned over to local government agencies. Come to
think of it, with no license requirements for FRS, it
already falls under PL-106-521. Oh ho!
'Doc

4436. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 20:47:31 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF149E3.4060503@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43705

CAM wrote:

> Dan Finn wrote:
>
>> Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>>> So people who were radio and electronics careerists should be
>>> denied an amateur radio license because it comes to them with
>>> no effort?
>>>
>> If they are careerists, that would be professional. Should
>> professionals be granted amateur radio licenses with no effort?
>>
>
> Some amateurs are granted amateur radio licenses with virtually no
> effort involved. Why should professionals be denied the same right?

Professionals already went through some quantity of effort to obtain a commercial license, so much of their effort for an amateur license has already been spent. However, professionals must still expend a small amount of additional effort to become familiar with those items unique to amateur radio. Of course this contradicts M0iMD's original assertion (above) but I was only trying to be civil by asking him a question whose answer would lead him to an answer that would have caused him to contradict his own original premise. In hindsight it may have been more effective had I asked Mr. Burke "Is it reasonable to expect that it is possible for most professionals to be granted amateur licenses with no effort". Of course, "no effort" at all would not be "reasonable" as an expectation, thus N0iMD's original premise could have been shown to him to be a contruct of his own invent.

4437. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:06:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526170632.02802.00000241@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 43706

In article <3CEF0F73.7F1588B2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> An interesting hypothesis, Cecil, but it has no basis in fact.
>
>Of course it does, Jim. I am relating personal experience.

Your post was written as if the information in it referred to everyone, not
just yourself.

>Are you implying that I am lying?

Nope. Just mistaken.

> Everyone in the world is NOT just like you.

Of course they're not. Where did I say they were?

Everyone in the world is NOT just like you, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

4438. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:12:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526171217.06763.00001003@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 43707

>Yeah, Bruce -- you can go ahead and use your amateur callsign at 1500 watts
>on
>channel 19. Make sure you ID every 10 minutes, though.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

I do already do ED, but I use your Callsign, have you gotten any weird QSLs
Lately

4439. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:28:05 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <Frcl8.2755$nl5.1271@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43708

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CF12CEC.FB42E481@IEEE.org...

> From Webster's:

Webster was a damnyankee. He can't be expected to know about barbeque.

Nice try, but totally irrelevant. (Like you.)

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4440. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:31:54 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <be3de826ce799a3444c1514255bce958.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43709

Yep, almost makes ya forget the original thread was about amateur radio
being pointless ... ;)

There is certainly more work and experimentation being done than most of
us are even 90% aware of.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CF04A1D.D223FBF6@ix.netcom.com

> W1RFI wrote:

> > I agree wholeheartedly, btw; I find QRSS and long-term intergration techniques
> > to be very interesting. I expect to have a DSP-10 up and running fairly soon
> > and will transvert it to HF. I want to see what can be done with QRP that
> > would make a QRPer tremble! :-)
> >
>
> And then there's the LF work in IIRC New Zealand and Europe.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4441. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:35:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwqcbm6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43710
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 25 May 2002 21:19:42 -0700, stewart wrote:

>This is why amps are not going to be used on VHF MURS and have never
>been used on UHF GMRS/FRS -

Very true as long as the operator has a modicum of technical
ubderstnding and/or an advisor/role model who does.

When the above folks are of the "I got more watts than you have"
mindset, all bets are off.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4442. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:35:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwqd217.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43711
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 25 May 2002 22:42:17 -0700, stewart wrote:

>Nobody is using illegal amplifiers on GMRS/FRS - why? Because it
>makes no pratical sense.

It makes no sense to someone like us who has some technical
background. It would appear to make a lot of sense to someone whose
extent of technical knowlesge is limited to or focussed on figuring
that 100 watts has GOT to be better than 4 watts because that's what
happens on 11m and anyway it's more watts.

Consider that I do get greater range (can hit repeater or fixed
stations further away) with my 50 w 2-m rig than when I crank it
down to 10 watts. It almost makes the ",ore watts is better"
argument.

I've been on 2-m proving that for the last 40 years.....

It all boils down to whether the use of amplifiers to increase the
power output of a MURS or FRS station is legal.

It is not.

A regulatory policy decision, not a technical decision.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4443. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:35:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwqdiy8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43712
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 26 May 2002 01:28:01 -0700, stewart wrote:

>You know what - I'm starting to think that's why the FCC goes ahead
>and simply allows all these CBers to have illegal amps - it is a
>valuable National Resource :^) Could come in quite useful in an
>emergency.

The reason is that The Congress does not want to fund the FCC
field enforcement function at a proper level. Put the proper
number of agents on the street (about 10-15 times what is there now
is a good start) and nrvrddstu mstvchingotfrtd yo yhr Justice
Department to stop kissing off such cases and you will see a marked
difference/cleanup of all such problems.

The last people that the gov'mint would entrust backuo
communications to is the "I have a good afterburner" crowd.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4444. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:45:25 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <VHcI8.2782$nl5.2608@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43713
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop> wrote

> and nrvrddstu mstvchingotfrtd yo yhr Justice

Phil,

You're going to need to help us with this legal jargon.

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4445. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:58:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwqf3i9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43714
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 26 May 2002 18:26:32 GMT, G. M. Alf wrote:

>> Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
>> with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
>> does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
>> turn chicken and leave you alone.
>>
>> The second method makes me sick.
>
>The second is kind of like the Boston Tea Party.

See my earlier posting about the Boston Tea Party. It had nothing to
do with taxation and the King. It had everything to do with
protecting something that today would be shut down umder the RICO
laws and the "Patriots" sent to Lompoc or Butner FCIs.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4446. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175929.26816.00000215@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43716

In article <3CEF0F73.7F1588B2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> An interesting hypothesis, Cecil, but it has no basis in fact.
>
>Of course it does, Jim. I am relating personal experience. Are
>you implying that I am lying? Everyone in the world is NOT
>just like you.

...sure they are! :-)

4447. Re: Off Topic...help Find?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175929.26816.00000214@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43724

In article <20020526023705.03263.00000796@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Can anyone suggest a good source for quality plastic scale models,
>especially of light civil aircraft?

There are very few civil aircraft kits or collectables for the smaller general aviation aircraft. Most kits and collectables (ready-built, metal or glass-fiber) are for warbirds. Model hobby industry scale models are shifting towards vehicles. Here are some sites to peruse for kits:

www.hobbypeople.net (retail chain)

www.towerhobbies.com (retail chain)

www.revell-monogram.com (kit manufacturer)

www.testors.com (kit manufacturer)

There are some firms that do custom orders for specific aircraft types, rather expensive per unit but those can be obtained with near-exact color, decoration, insignia, etc. Do a web search for those but those are generally for military or air carrier aircraft as one-of-a-kind gifts.

Avgas getting too expensive for "real" flying? Miss a flight physical? :-)

(Employee of Testor's, 1948-1950)

4448. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175930.26816.00000216@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43719

In article <acm1ol$6da$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>OK. And even if he could, that document would
>not be a reference for Part 97 requirements. If it was in
>any way applicable we'd have heard that a long time ago.
>
>Suffice to say that for amateur regs and S25.5 in particular
>there are NO standards specifically identified for morse code
>specifications.
>
>That's IMHO.

From 97.3 Definitions -

"International Morse Code. A dot-dash code as defined in
International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative
Committee (CCITT) Recommendation F.1 (1984), Division
B, 1. Morse code."

You can get such a document in electronic form direct from
the ITU for a small fee. Electronic format in PDF. Large
document. Nowhere in that document is there any mention
of word rate per any unit of time for International Morse Code.
All that is specified is relative dot-dash-space duration.

S25.5 still says "International Morse Code.".

4449. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175931.26816.00000218@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43718

In article <20020526080559.18807.00000507@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net
>
>>I wouldn't know about that but to pass today's written exams does not
>>even require an education of the same quality as one might obtain from
>>answering an advertisement on a matchbook, much less Milton.
>
>Your exaggeration is ridiculous. I didn't require an education to pass my
>General in 1963 to obtain all Amateur priveleges; I was a 14 year old kid who
>wasn't doing so well in the 8th grade.

Dan demands Effort and Committment. Did you demonstrate that?

4450. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175931.26816.00000217@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43722

In article <igiH8.977$8f5.39030918@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> What obsolete documents does the FCC reference now?
>>
>> Part 97 makes NO reference at all to S25.5 today. The FCC
>> acknowledged the existence of S25.5 as the only justification
>> to retain any code testing at all...BUT that isn't codified into
>> the regulations.
>
>Not in Part 97. Recall the thread where comm lawyer Phil couldn't produce
>the ITU document that title 47 references for the specification of Morse
>code?

It gets better. After I got a copy from the ITU-R I challenged him on WORD RATE (as in WPM or words per minute). The ITU-R cite (actually ITU-T for landlines) does NOT specify anything on word rate. All it specifies are the ratios of dots, dashes, and spaces. Absolutely NO rate specification.

Phil's "comment" was to (in effect) shut up about it, it was "small potatoes" or something like that. Nobody should challenge the FCC about small potatoes (belongs Dept. of Agriculture).

Word rate in amateur radio testing is just one of those "unwritten" laws. I'm sure those things look good in courts. Maybe we could all make all the technical regulations as "unwritten" too? That would save time and trouble for everyone, especially all those hams who've never known how to do it and the many more who haven't bothered.

4451. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175933.26816.00000219@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43725

In article <3CEFD0F8.1090007@bellsouth.net>, Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
writes:

>Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>> news:3CEFC26D.6030102@bellsouth.net...

>>>With all due respect, do not ask me how much more valuable my code is
>>>over your code.
>>
>> Why not?
>
>Because there is no quantitative measure of value for effort and commitment.

Please cite where "value for effort and committment" is required
for any radio hobby activity such as US amateur radio.

>> Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is
>> over a high school diploma.
>>
>> Depends on the H.S., depends on the college.
>
>I agree. And code proficence depends upon the code speed.

Why must there be different "code speeds" (word rates) in
US amateur radio?

OOK CW mode/modulation is NOT mandatory; all allocated
modes and modulations are optional for any licensee.

There is only ONE morse code word rate in present-day US
amateur radio license testing.

>> Dan can accept it, embrace it, or reject it. Dare he change it?
>
>Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.

"Evem Mohammed" could have moved mountains (plural) with
the aid of modern earth-moving equipment.

Are we to embrace Islam on Memorial Day in the USA?

>>>It is simply a fact that one must accept.
>>
>> Accept oppression?
>
>That's Life in the big city, Bud.

Then Dan will have to ACCEPT contrary points of view and also
drop his "I know what is best" attitude. TRY to live with it.

>Whether we care or not onviously does not not matter to you. The fact
>that it matters to many pther people who know nothing else about what a
>great ham you are, Brian, may or may not matter to you. But all I'm
>saying is that certification to a higher standard matters to people in
>general. That is Life.

"Certification" to US amateur radio regulations (being granted an
amateur radio license) matters to a number of people who are NOT
NOW in amateur radio. Holding yourself and your personal
accomplishments as some kind of "role model" to justify keeping
testing standards as they are is a vain, pretentious, self-centered
attitude.

The FCC grants US amateur radio licenses and the FCC is not,
nor has it ever been an academic institution. What the rules and
regulations WERE when Dan Finn was first (or last) licensed has
LITTLE to do with the FCC's task of regulating US civil radio NOW.

>> Messenger? You guys aren't the messengers. You're trying to be the
>> enforcers of a false system of values.
>
>I object to that statement. My role in Life is not to enforce any system
>of values. I merely observe, and I am reporting to you what I observe.

Seems to me that Dan Finn was playing a "Harry Callahan" role to
the hilt. Wrong script. Wrong city. Wrong role.

>You may disagree that what I observe is really true but that is another
>discussion.

Please make up your mind on what you are trying to enforce.

You are busy enforcing in this message, in other messages,
enforcing old standards and practices.

>Go ahead, take a shot at it, explain to us your New Wave
>approach to interpreting Humanity in general.

Please stop representing humanity in general. YOU are only
one very tiny part of it.

Please explain WHY all newcomers to US amateur radio MUST
adhere to the standards and practices and testing that was in
effect when Dan Finn was last licensed?

>Brian, the part about the actuarial tables is not a very nice thing to
>say.

Is Dan facing some kind of "mid-life crisis?" GET OVER IT.

EVERYONE is born, lives, then dies. FACT. WE CAN'T CHANGE
IT. LIVE WITH IT as much as you can.

Being born in 1932, I'm one of the oldest participants here. I've learned to LIVE with an unchangeable fact of human existance.

Rather than putting on blinders and avoiding anything to do with mortality, I just put it aside and concentrate on the FUTURE and those who will become (or not) radio amateurs LATER. All those test regulations will affect THEM, not you.

>The Amateur operator is supposed to be friendly and not darken the
>face of Amateur radio. Part 97 doesn't say that..but you know it is
>true.

IS IT?!? Also unstated in Part 97 (or anything in all of Title 47 CFR) is the enforcement of YOUR standards and practices and testing just because YOU took them or did them when you were last licensed.

>I am ashamed to be associated with a ham who writes like this.

Hey, I'm not "associated" with ham radio and I'm getting a bit pissed at YOUR writing attitude. Who made YOU god of ham radio?

>And you measure a ham by his statistical probability on an actuarial
>table. Nice guy.

I measure them by their attitudes. So far, I've not seen anything worthy of liking the hold-the-status-quo to YOUR liking to be likeable.

>> So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined,
>> in your opinion.
>
>...putting words in my mouth...No, but it is probably more valuable than
>the written test at filtering out effort and commitment to amateur radio.

Brian wasn't putting words at all, simply commenting on what was already written by Dan Finn.

>Now a question for you:
>
>Do you value a person's probability statistic on an actuarial table to
>be more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined?

A question right back -

Who the hell are YOU to demand "effort and committment to amateur radio?!?"

Neither I nor anyone else need PROVE anydamnthing to YOU or any other long-timer ham.

YOU don't "rule" US ham radio. Nobody does. It is primarily a recreational radio avocation, not some fanatical Code of Life or religious experience requiring Devotion to (Ham) Apostles.

When you want to discuss regulations as law rather than items
of a religion or act the fedayin supporting some "corps," fine, I'll
discuss. So far, you've not proved worthy of any newcomer's
demonstrations of "effort and committment."

4452. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175935.26816.00000220@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43720

In article <3CEFC926.1050107@bellsouth.net>, Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
writes:

>Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>> news:3CEF098C.7050404@bellsouth.net...
>
>> The ARRL was the last hold out for you're beloved multiple code exams and
>> excessive license classes. The ARRL has instituted courses that can earn
>> continueing education credits. Milton might even accept them.
>
>I wouldn't know about that but to pass today's written exams does not
>even require an education of the same quality as one might obtain from
>answering an advertisement on a matchbook, much less Milton.

A US amateur radio exam has NEVER been an academic
achievement test. The FCC is not chartered as an academic
instution.

The amount of education needed to pass ANY radio license test
in the US since 1912 has always been rudimentary. "Difficulty"
of tests has always been of a SUBJECTIVE nature...evident by
the previous tests increasing in "difficulty and complexity" as time
went on for all those who DO NOT require any further testing. :-)

>What is *your* vision of the future of amateur radio, Brian?

What is YOURS, Dan? Should everything be geared to the
standards and practices and education of the 1930s well into the
new millennium?

Why do YOU elevate yourself so highly in knowledge and skill of
the radio arts that you have some kind of authority to say what
is "good" or "bad" about testing?

Justify the NEED of morse code skills at high rates in this new
millenium for all future radio amateurs. Please make that an
OBJECTIVE justification, not the highly-subjective ones you've
stated often enough in here.

>A type of radio pest whose species has multiplied many times over since
>the introduction of the 5 wpm General amateur license. This QRMing
>creature has no known natural enemies because it refuses to use a call
>sign to identify himself. They are known to frequent the voice portions
>of HF frequencies, particularly in the 20m and 75 meter bands. They are
>indistinguishable from problem 11 meter operators. They are usually not

>found on the code portions of the bands possibly because they are not
>capable of receiving 13 wpm code transmissions.

There is NO US ham band at "11 meters."

There is NO US amateur radio regulation REQUIRING morse code mode/modulation. All allocated modes are optional for any US radio amateur. That includes use of OOK CW on ham bands above 30 MHz.

The Enforcement Bureau of the FCC is open to any and all complaints of any radio emitter operating outside of regulations. If you are a US citizen, you will be as free as any other citizen to voice your complaints of alleged illegalities.

>I don't need to. The ratio is probably close to zero. Would you expect ARRL
>to have a presence in all major cities so that they could "broadcast" code
>practice via line-of sight communication?

Here in the southwest since 1956, I've NEVER heard any W1AW transmissions. Newington, CT, is rather well up in the northeast of the contiguous 48 states. Why is that relevant?

Why is it so NECESSARY for any US radio amateur to know morse code?

The FCC does not require mandatory OOK CW use...it is as optional as any other allocated mode for any class license.

>Come on Brian, when you studied for your license, surely you memorized
>the part about skywave propagation?

Why is that a relevant question in regards to the "Code Question?"

What is wrong about memorization? In my radio-electronics career I've memorized thousands of things, formulas, facts, figures that have never been formally tested.

I took my First Class Radiotelephone (commercial) test a month after being released from active duty. The amount of "studying" was an intense reading of the ENTIRE FCC rules and regulations as they applied to commercial radiotelephone use in 1955...a MUCH smaller collection of regulations than that of 2001. Passed all four parts in one test session which included multiple-choice, essay, and draw-schematics-of-tube-circuits sections.

"Skywave" propagation was a part of that, but NVIS (Near Vertical Incidence Skywave) was not yet coined in either the military or commercial field. Since I'd already spent 3 years of active duty *IN* HF communications (long-path 'skip') and low microwaves radio relay (line-of-sight), skywave as a path was not an important thing. Why is that so important NOW?

Is skywave propagation an "important" thing to know, just below
the top, morse code skill, in US amateur radio? If so, *WHY* ?

4453. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175937.26816.00000222@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43721

In article <20020524011652.15004.00000470@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>You don't meet the right "code." YOUR building won't stand.
>
> It's been there since 1914, Lennie. Stood up pretty good, I'd say.

The first US amateur radio licenses were granted in 1912, not 1914.

The first US radio club was organized in 1909...the first such in the world...it is still active.

4454. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175937.26816.00000221@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43723

In article <3CEFC26D.6030102@bellsouth.net>, Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
writes:

>Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>> I'm just trying to determine how much more (or less) valuable your code is
>> over my code. I mean, if there's a pecking order and all, and it hinges
>> around code. Because the written exams are harder now than ever before and
>> I've passed them, so I've got rank on you there.
>
>With all due respect, do not ask me how much more valuable my code is
>over your code.

How come for why did you make a big issue over code before
and now you say "with all due respect, do not ask you?"

>Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is
>over a high school diploma.

Amateur radio licenses are grants, permission to transmit RF
energy on certain frequencies with certain modes and technical
requirements granted by a government agency.

Radio licenses are NOT "diplomas" nor are they any form of
academic achievements.

>For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
>bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.
>KR4AJ has nothing to do with it.

Dan Finn seems to be in a big stew over all that pecking, then.
In all due respect, may we ask him anything at all about all
that pecking? :-)

>It is simply a fact that one must
>accept. If you obtain a certification as a dog catcher under a reduced
>set of standards compared to that of another dog catcher's
>certification, you will not be held under the same degree of esteem as
>the dog catcher certified under the higher standard.

Isn't there a dog catcher newsgroup somewhere for all that?

>I don't know Brian,
>that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger. It's something you
>cannot change.

WRONG, mistah messenger. Radio regulations are codified by
humans in government, can be UNDONE by humans in

government at the request of other humans who are citizens.
That's called a "democratic process" of government.

When you keep insisting that radio regulations remain fixed,
unchangeable since the time when you got licensed, then
expect all kinds of shooting at you.

>Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
>hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
>complained to the hilt and took that option away.

The first error above is in "older, higher standard." The "higher" part
is very subjective.

High-speed morse code skill might have been a good thing in radio in
the 1930s. This is 2002, seventy years later.

The FCC "gives and takes" civil radio regulations. "We hams" don't
make regulations, cannot give or take any regulations. That was
your second error.

>Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a higher
>standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
>unfair to the less talented?

An amateur radio license is now a "talent" certificate?!?

An amateur radio license, like all radio licenses, is just a regulatory
tool used by a government commission to regulate US civil radio.
If you need to "test talent," go into the entertainment business. The
FCC grants radio licenses. The National Endowement of the Arts
might do something to recognize "talent."

Please describe this "higher standard of excellence" (in amateur
radio) in more detail and PROVE the "higher standard" part.

Tell us and the FCC how this "higher standard of excellence" (as it
was applied to older hams licensed in the past, along with yourself)
NOW should apply to all future radio amateurs. Please remember
several things -

1. This is the year 2002, not 1982, 1972, 1962, 1952, or 1932.

2. The amateur radio community (of licensees) does NOT grant
licenses.

3. The FCC grants radio licenses and the FCC works for the good
of all US citizens.

>As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with that.

The FCC has placed the amateur radio license test written test
questions and answers in the hands of the VEC Question Pool
Committee. They must generate a minimum of ten questions for
each of the required number of questions stated by the FCC.

Note that there is NO LIMIT on the number of questions above
the minimum of ten per required question.

>Any test in which the questions and answers are available in advance is
>not a test at all.

The FCC considers the US amateur radio license written element
test questions a "test." They ARE the agency granting US civil
radio licenses. The US ARS does not, repeat NOT grant any
amateur radio license.

I've had any number of formal class texts and tests which had
the answers known beforehand. A ham test is NOT an
academic achievement, will never be considered as such.

>The only challenging portion of the amateur radio
>test was the code test. But you know that already.

Keep up the rant that only the old-time ham radio standards
were the "good" ones. Hang in there in supporting standards
and practices of the 1930s in this new millenium as the "only
acceptible marks of excellence." This will make friends among
the old-timers and you can all pretend to defend the virtue and
honor of amateur radio as YOU ALL define it. Do you all also
issue ham licenses and have the authority to regulate US
ham radio?

4455. Re: Wonder what the new band will cost?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175938.26816.00000224@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43715

In article <20020524063335.26572.00000484@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>"Mind control?"
>
>Those were the words Larry used.
>
>Why the rant?

What rant?

4456. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 21:59:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526175938.26816.00000223@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 43717

In article <DEhH8.953$D_4.38010129@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>Welp Dave, if you PCTAs can rant and rave that Len cannot represent or even
>comment on amateur related issues, then it only stands to reason that only
>licensed individuals are capable. Now whether Dick claims to represent
>amateur radio or not, it becomes irrelevant. By virtue of holding a license
>he represents amateur radio.
>
>Which way do you want it?

He wants it HIS way. Naturally.

Noblesse oblige, that sort of thing......:-)

4457. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 22:11:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwqfyfa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43726

Let's try this again in English:

On Sun, 26 May 2002 21:35:44 GMT, Phil Kane wrote:

The reason is that The Congress does not want to fund the FCC field
enforcement function at a proper level. Put the proper number of
agents on the street (about 10-15 times what is there now is a good
start) and issue marching orders to the Justice Department to stop
kissing off such cases and you will see a marked difference/cleanup
of all such problems.

The last people that the gov'mint would entrust backuo
communications to is the "I have a good afterburner" crowd.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4458. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 22:16:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526181647.26558.00001084@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 43727

>It had everything to do with
> protecting something that today would be shut down umder the RICO
> laws and the "Patriots" sent to Lompoc or Butner FCIs.

Exactly

4459. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 23:15:52 UTC
From: aaron_voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <7314c094.0205261515.76966bd9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43728
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0205260028.11111ce6@posting.google.com>...
> You know what - I'm starting to think that's why the FCC goes ahead
> and simply allows all these CBers to have illegal amps - it is a
> valuable National Resource :^) Could come in quite useful in an
> emergency.

Only if the emergency did not require ACTUAL communication. CBers with
illegal amps have perfected the art of "one-way communication". Thier
technology (if you can call it that) is all concentrated on one goal:
transmitting the loudest possible signal. The receiving side of the
equation (DSP filters, narrow IF filters, audio passband filters,
directional antennas, etc) is totally ignored because it isn't
relevant to them.

-Aaron-

4460. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 23:37:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526193733.26353.00000726@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43729

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Word rate in amateur radio testing is just one of those "unwritten"
>laws.

The rate is unwritten in the international treaty. It is set at 5 wpm in the
FCC regulations, so I wouldn't call it unwritten. For whatever reason, the
Commission has decided that 5 wpm is a reasonable rate to test the knowledge of
International Morse code required by the treaty.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4461. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 23:38:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526193859.26353.00000727@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43730

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Dan demands Effort and Committment. Did you demonstrate that?

I studied 16 pages of study guide for about 3 weeks, as memory serves.

If effort is required, I guess I wouldn't be welcome back in ham radio if I ever let my license lapse. I am sure I could pass the tests with almost no effort.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4462. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 23:39:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526193953.26353.00000728@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43731

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Dan Finn seems to be in a big stew over all that pecking, then.
>In all due respect, may we ask him anything at all about all
>that pecking? :-)

Maybe he feels that your posts should not contain any questions. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4463. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 23:41:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526194156.26353.00000729@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43732

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>"Difficulty"
>of tests has always been of a SUBJECTIVE nature...evident by
>the previous tests increasing in "difficulty and complexity" as time
>went on for all those who DO NOT require any further testing. :-)

At the time, I found the General Class license test moderately difficult. Today, I would find it easy. Perhaps some are looking at today's tests and not quite seeing how hard they would be for a 14-year old kid. If I had been required to meet today's requirements when I was 14 years old, I really don't think I would have bothered to do so.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4464. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 23:45:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526194534.26353.00000731@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43733

>There is certainly more work and experimentation being done than most of
>us are even 90% aware of.

I am glad to hear that exerimentation is going on, but I sure wish that 90% of it would be documented somewhere. It would be great to be able to show the FCC more of what hams are doing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4465. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-26 23:48:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526194837.26353.00000732@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 43734

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>>Yeah, Bruce -- you can go ahead and use your amateur callsign at 1500 watts
>>on
>>channel 19. Make sure you ID every 10 minutes, though.

>I do already do ED, but I use your Callsign, have you gotten any weird QSLs
>Lately

Well, I tell you what. If you provide me with the dates, times and a tape
recording of you using my call sign, I will arrange for the appropriate QSL.

So what are you doing back here, Bruce; did you drive everyone off the AOL
boards again, or are you once again in the AOL TOS doghouse?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4466. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:06:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF18664.8421606@att.net>
Source record: 43735

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >What Ed has said is that he couldn't care less about the background of his
> >brain
> >surgeon, if he even has one! Maybe Ed is his very first case, and Ed isn't
> >concerned!
> >Fantastic!
>
> And what Dick is saying is that he cares only about the background of the brain
> surgeon

ONLY??? Learn to read, Lead Head Ed.

4467. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:10:55 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205261710.668ffdaf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43736
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"K?B" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:<J1aI8.2497$nl5.1446@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message
> news:v3a2fuo6j1k7vd61ajj16sudggk6hb2274@4ax.com...
> > On Sat, 25 May 2002 01:43:56 GMT, "Phil Kane"
> > <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop> wrote:
> >
> > > Two methods of Rules changes - go through the procedures starting
> > > with a Petition for Rulemaking, or just go ahead and do what the law
> > > does not allow you to do and if enough people do it the gov'mint will
> > > turn chicken and leave you alone.
> >
> > The second is kind of like the Boston Tea Party.
> >
> > Mike
>
> Mike,
>
> Are you suggesting that MURS operators might stage a "Boston Tea Party" to
> acquire additional channels?

We already had a "VX-5 Tea Party"... but now that all the old Part 90
radios have been made compliant - and all new radios only have to meet
Part 95 regs - the citizenry has been appeased.

Yes - I think the "Boston Tea Party" analogy is a DAMN good one. I
wouldn't look for anything else like this to happen for a couple more
years, however. Right now, we are going to have to fill up the lower
three MURS channels.

Could we see consumer MURS radios by THIS Christmas? I hope so - and I
also hope they come with removable antennas(BNC connectors preferred).

I'd love to see a T7200 clone for MURS(with Wx), but with a BIG
removable antenna, and FULL 2W TPO on all 5 channels. Even if it does
cost $129 - I'd buy a pair... eventually the price will drop below
$100 at Wal-Mart...

http://commerce.motorola.com/cgi-bin/ncommerce3/ProductDisplay?prrfnbr=248016&prmenbr=126&
twoway_cgrfnbr=9&zipcode=&prsdesc=TALKABOUTï¿½%20T7200%20NiMH

Stewart - horseshoe7 - N0MHS - E Pluribus Unum

4468. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:12:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF1880C.F53D3B4D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43737

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> An interesting hypothesis, Cecil, but it has no basis in fact.
> > >
> > >Of course it does, Jim. I am relating personal experience.
> >
> > Your post was written as if the information in it referred to everyone, not
> > just yourself.

I have said before that my posts are my personal opinions often based on
my personal experiences. I am not unique. I was describing how hams like
me react to emotionalism while trying to send CW or type on a keyboard.
I'm sorry you can't stand the truth but that's just the way it is. Some
people cannot send CW while they are angry and therefore cannot vent their
anger while sending CW. Why do you refuse to accept that reality?

> >Are you implying that I am lying?
> >
> Nope. Just mistaken.

How can I be mistaken? I described exactly how hams like me react to
emotionalism while sending CW or typing on a keyboard. I am reporting
facts. There is no possibility of a mistake. Everyone is NOT like you.
I am the only example needed to prove you wrong.

> > Everyone in the world is NOT just like you.
> >
> Of course they're not. Where did I say they were?

You are trying to tell me that my emotional reactions are not possible
i.e. "has no basis in fact". You are the one who is mistaken. My emotional
reactions are a fact and your words cannot change those facts. You're not
going omnipotent on us again, are you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4469. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:17:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF1890F.B8ECFD7C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43738

Len Over 21 wrote:
> It gets better. After I got a copy from the ITU-R I challenged him
> on WORD RATE (as in WPM or words per minute). The ITU-R
> cite (actually ITU-T for landlines) does NOT specify anything on
> word rate. All it specifies are the ratios of dots, dashes, and
> spaces. Absolutely NO rate specification.

Any mention of Farnsworth spacing/timing? If not, doesn't the present
5wpm code exam violate the Morse code specification?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4470. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:31:28 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205261731.5131e980@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43739
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20020526040107.18807.00000590@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
> >From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
> >Date: 05/26/02 03:31 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205252331.57173de3@posting.google.com>
>
> >Who is breaking a rule? Your statement is slanderous. The radio in
> >question is Part 90 approved, and meets all parts of the MURS
> >regulations.
> >
> >Better get your facts straight, before you go accusing people of
> >breaking rules. THAT is illegal, by the way.
>
> I have facts, Stewart, which seems to be YOUR weakness.
>
> Is it just me, or are ALL of the ill-informed and foolish in SoCal these
> days? Certainly they are all west of the Mississippi.
>
> Stewie ought to run on up to SinCity and see His Putziness and maybe they
> can come up with a mutually agreeable "schedule" on MURS so they can bad mouth
> Amateur Radio on license-free channels.

I don't bad mouth Amateur Radio - unless you consider me saying that
it is "becomeing less relevant" is bad-mouthing.

Remember - I still want to open up 1.25 Meters for a "New NoCode
Novice" Class... then, maybe, the Amateur Radio Service would be more
able to compete with the advances that are being made in the Personal
Radio Services... I simply want to make the ARS more relevant in
today's world.

If hams don't want to go this route, then why not give up the
whole(virtually unused) band to a MURS/GMRS-like service - one that
would allow ANYONE to use repeaters, and 56Kbps digital channels, and
10W TPO? Who needs Vegas? THAT'S excitement! It would be like when
they opened up Oklahoma to the settlers! YAHOOO!

Stewart - N0MHS

4471. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:32:45 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526213245.00832.00001144@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 43740

>It would be great to be able to show the FCC
>more of what hams are doing.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

There all talking on there Mics

4472. Re:<<<I LOVE SEX>>>

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:32:54 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF18CC6.20903@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43741

sue@revelations.sh wrote:

> toneladas del aficionado de las fotografï¿½as de los vidï¿½os de los webcams de vidas... ï¿½pero especialmente sin censuras!!
>
> Nueva Abertura : http://www.giga-porno.com
>
Gacias seniorita sue, de los muchos amateuros radio aficionados de los rrap es los cuckaroachas,

especialmente los signor que nonbre es "Brian P Burke" y N0iIMD. Brian requestamunte muchos

email de informationado de los fotografias es de los webcams es vidas.
Gracias de los N0iMD.

4473. Re: Scientology Takes Control of Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:38:55 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF18E2F.7050209@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43742
Cross-posted to: alt.religion.scientology,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well, it's about time scientists took firm control of this hobby. By
gosh, it has gotten way too non-technical.

Phil wrote:

> From the ARRL.org web site
>
> Ham radio could have role in Phenomenon sequel: Amateur Radio is poised to hit
> the big screen yet again in a movie tentatively titled Phenomenon II. Phenomenon
> debuted in 1996 and featured John Travolta and his ham operator friend Forest
> Whitaker. In one scene, Travolta's character appears to be able to copy RTTY
> transmissions by ear. For the original Phenomenon movie, ARRL provided several
> props for the ham radio shack. The sequel is still in the very early stages of
> development. A researcher working on checking facts in the script contacted ARRL
> to ask if operators actually used the term "CQ" when initiating contacts. She
> also told ARRL Media Relations Manager Jennifer Hagy, N1TDY, that the
> possibility exists for the creation of a television series based on the
> Phenomenon movies. Hagy offered further assistance if needed. No further details
> were immediately available.
>
>

4474. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:39:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526213933.00832.00001147@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 43743

>So what are you doing back here, Bruce; did you drive everyone off the AOL
>boards again, or are you once again in the AOL TOS doghouse?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

I have never been in the AOL Doghouse. Im still there agitating and have never left. The only reason Im over here is Im borred, and had some time to kill, and this place is always good for a Laugh or two.

>Well, I tell you what. If you provide me with the dates, times and a tape
>recording of you using my call sign, I will arrange for the appropriate QSL.

Would you prefer Tape or CD?

4475. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:46:53 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205261746.32491053@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43744
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<44da9d49d3dccaa147cb64ea92af10b5.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> Stewart, let's cut the nonsense and I'll ask a serious question - why
> do you seem to believe that amateur radio stopped with spark gap in the
> early 1900's?

I don't - you misinterpreted the point of my post.

What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less relevant
in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating. As this trend
continues, the ARS is losing it's PURPOSE... this is especially true
on the VHF/UHF bands, whose use has dwindled to the point that they
are VIRTUALLY UNUSED. Even 2m has no more than modest activity -
other than a few high-level repeaters, and an occasional simplex or
packet QSO, or some folks doing EME... NADA.

Why not open up 1.25M for a new NoCode Novice Class? At least then we
could start getting families/friends/collegues involved with Amateur
Radio. Otherwise, why not just let the public use these frequencies?
They aren't being used for anything.

Stewart - N0MHS

4476. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 01:53:26 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF19196.5050800@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43745

N2EY wrote:

>(text cut)
> Your claim that the General was not meant to be a limited license is simply
> incorrect. Mistaken. Untrue. Flat out wrong.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
I have found that N0iMD tends to have many contructs under his own invent. He doesn't know

a thing about ham radio history prior to 1999. He has even stated in
this thread that he expects the actuarial tables to take care of the
older ham radio culture, after which he can presumably invent another
mega-construct of an HF ham radio culture that will, as usual, be of his
own invent. Watch out for Brian; he wants to tear it all down and
rebuild it in his own twisted and contorted image, a world of one
license, one "test". His proposed license structure is right out of Karl
Marx: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need
(to fire up on HF)." Obviously Brian is either a Communist, or worse, a
Democrat.

4477. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:02:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526220220.26644.00001084@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 43746

>Otherwise, why not just let the public use these frequencies?
>They aren't being used for anything.
>
>Stewart - N0MHS

Agree 100%, right now there only used by a handful of people. I think its time the FCC put these freqs to some good use, either by issuing them for the Population at large with no License required and no Silly Testing required. Or just sell them Off, and let some company make good use of them.

4478. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:06:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526220627.06857.00000276@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 43747

In article <1%3I8.2118$zI4.91577555@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>You perpetuate the myth that old exams are better than the new exams.

Not a myth. An opinion. I have taken both and passed - have you? I think not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4479. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:06:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020526220627.06857.00000275@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 43748

In article <3CF0F208.CD280EF@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>> >What if there is an emergency?
>>
>> Jim says "IF" is for children.

I got that from Cecil.
>
>Actually, it was Roger Whittaker singing, "I Don't Believe in If Anymore", in
>the context of statements like: If pigs had wings, they could fly. I'm sure
>Roger wasn't singing about valid conditional logical statements.

Probably not. However, Cecil uses that catchphrase whenever convenient.

I simply hold up a mirror to him.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4480. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:09:39 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF19563.1010400@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43749

>sue@revelations.sh wrote:

>toneladas del aficionado de las fotografï¿½as de los vidï¿½os de los webcams de vidas...
ï¿½pero especialmente sin censuras!!
>Nueva Abertura : http://www.giga-porno.com

Gracias seniorita sue, de los muchos amateuros radio aficionados de los rrap es los cuckaroachas,
especialmente los senior que nombre es "Brian P Burke" y N0iIMD. Brian requestamunte muchos email de informationado de los fotografias es de los webcams es vidas.
Gracias sue de los N0iMD.

4481. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:25:41 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <FOgI8.98$2W5.40@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43750
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

> Why not open up 1.25M for a new NoCode Novice Class? At least then we
> could start getting families/friends/collegues involved with Amateur
> Radio.

Good news, Stewart! I just checked, and 222-225MHz is open to NoCode
licensees. I think it happened back in about 1991. And 219-220MHz is
available for high speed data links up to 100KHz wide. Yes, to NoCode
licensees. Go do something cool!

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4482. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:29:22 UTC
From: Paul Peterson <pp23@cox.net>
Message-ID: <6SgI8.90396$Md6.3020010@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 43751
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" wrote
>
> What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less relevant
> in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating.

Amateur Radio has changed. That is a fact. The reason it
changed, is that you can't build a radio cheaper than you can buy it.

All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.

What that leaves, is the Hams who like to interface things to a
pre-built radio. There is a lot of experimentation and fun in doing
those projects.

Radio is not the fascinating thing it was in the 60's and before.
Radio is boring since the invention of the CD. Not many people
stay up all night to here a far away AM station like we did as kids.

Radio is an appliance to Americans, not as much a hobby anymore.

The numbers will never again reach what there was at the peak
of Ham radio. The commercialization of RF to one or two
companies in America will continue, and Ham radio will go to
the same place that model railroaders, and slot car racing went.

Hobbies die, and people die. MURS is still-born.

4483. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:33:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <eWgI8.115$2W5.110@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43752
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Paul Peterson" <pp23@cox.net> wrote

>
> The numbers will never again reach what there was at the peak
> of Ham radio.
>

Don't look now, but the number of Amateur Radio (Ham) licensees is at an all
time high. Never before in history have there been so many us!

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4484. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:36:54 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF19BC6.3070207@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43753

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> Intrinsic value is measured by a federal exam? Try again.

Brian, this is another construct of your own invent.
Dan

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4485. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:41:10 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF19CC6.1020505@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43754

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
>
> It (sic actuarial tables) will eventually get rid of people like me and you who remember that there
> used to be layers of useless licensing requirements. Only then will we
> consider the measure of a good ham by what de does and how he does it
> (rather than by how fast he beeps).

Novus Ordo Seclorum.

de KR4AJ
--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4486. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 02:49:12 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1dc9daf52abd3dd483f6cfdf9e476f06.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43755
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Well, everything changes. Vinyl records are gone, but does it mean the music industry is gone? Are musicians gone? Likewise, amateur radio has changed, but it continues and is quite relevant today. If you understand packet, you won't have any problem understanding how many devices communicate (the first foreign language is difficult; others become easier). You mention the repeaters. Heck, we have a pack of 'em here in Rochester, NY. No, they aren't busy a good deal of the time (like at 3:00 am local time - but I've had interesting chats at those odd hours of the morning too, so they aren't dead even then). The purpose SHOULD be about learning. Just opening up frequencies for unlicensed use won't further learning. There are already a good number of frequencies for unlicensed use (even for wireless local area networks). One of the repeaters here locally is connected to several ports connecting 10, 6, and 2 meters as well as 220 and 440 MHz. I've had chats with stations in England and Australia over these (no, not internet linking - all rf paths courtesy of that 10 meter port). That said, this was just a simply recreation at the time. The learning is what pays off for everyone. Most hams have never been involved in an emergency. The point is that many are trained and could offer assistance
if needed. I guess the best I can offer is this - hospitals have much more equipment and doctors available; therefore we should eliminate ambulances. Right? No, amateurs cannot compete with the huge infrastructure that commercial firms have provided (I've stated that earlier); but some communications are better than none. Don't bet the farm that adding another 10 million people using FRS, CB, MURS, or whatever else that doesn't require a license is likely to help in a real emergency where telephones and power are out for many miles around.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

ps - there are a ton of bands for codeless techs. That is fine. If you suggest they should be open license free, then recheck this post.

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205261746.32491053@posting.google.com

> I don't - you misinterpreted the point of my post.
>
> What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less relevant
> in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating. As this trend
> continues, the ARS is losing it's PURPOSE... this is especially true
> on the VHF/UHF bands, whose use has dwindled to the point that they

> are VIRTUALLY UNUSED. Even 2m has no more than modest activity -
> other than a few high-level repeaters, and an occasional simplex or
> packet QSO, or some folks doing EME... NADA.
>
> Why not open up 1.25M for a new NoCode Novice Class? At least then we
> could start getting families/friends/collegues involved with Amateur
> Radio. Otherwise, why not just let the public use these frequencies?
> They aren't being used for anything.
>
> Stewart - N0MHS

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4487. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:04:25 UTC
From: Paul Peterson <pp23@cox.net>
Message-ID: <ZmhI8.90400$Md6.3028483@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 43756
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K HB" wrote
>
> "Paul Peterson" <pp23@cox.net> wrote
>
> >
> > The numbers will never again reach what there was at the peak
> > of Ham radio.
> >
>
> Don't look now, but the number of Amateur Radio (Ham) licensees is at an all
> time high. Never before in history have there been so many us!

People who died 10 years ago, are still listed as Hams.
Don't believe the numbers.

The other statistic tool you must know about, is per-Capita. That is,
how many Hams per 100,000 Americans in age groups like
9-12, 13-16, 17-20, 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, 71-80?

Have those gone up? No, they've gone down.

4488. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:05:20 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QnhI8.3896$tf7.114134287@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43757

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CF1890F.B8ECFD7C@IEEE.org...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > It gets better. After I got a copy from the ITU-R I challenged him
> > on WORD RATE (as in WPM or words per minute). The ITU-R
> > cite (actually ITU-T for landlines) does NOT specify anything on
> > word rate. All it specifies are the ratios of dots, dashes, and
> > spaces. Absolutely NO rate specification.
>
> Any mention of Farnsworth spacing/timing? If not, doesn't the present
> 5wpm code exam violate the Morse code specification?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

That's what I've been saying.

4489. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:06:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <jphI8.3897$P77.113673463@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43758

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526175929.26816.00000215@mb-mo.aol.com...
> In article <3CEF0F73.7F1588B2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> An interesting hypothesis, Cecil, but it has no basis in fact.
> >
> >Of course it does, Jim. I am relating personal experience. Are
> >you implying that I am lying? Everyone in the world is NOT
> >just like you.
>
> ...sure they are! :-)

Like Jim or like Cecil? If I were like Dick, I would throw myself from a
high bridge.

4490. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:09:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4shI8.3898$6R6.112582769@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43759

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CF0F082.D3D4F9B6@IEEE.org...
> Dan Finn wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:

> > And that very usage must be a signicant indicator that (CW) still has
value.
>
> Of course it has value as a communications mode. It doesn't have any value
> anymore in playing that silly King-of-the-Mountain game.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I'm sure they can squeeze a few more years of greatness out of it.

4491. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:13:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tvhl8.3900$if7.114122940@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43760

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526131138.26555.00000540@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> License class is the only way the FCC measures an amateur.
>
> >So, like Larry and now Dan, the FCC says the old licenses are the good
ones,
> >and the new people just don't measure up?
>
> How the heck did you get that from my post? I think I will be able to
better
> answer your question if I can make some sense of the logic that led you to
> conclude

Did I say, "Like Ed says?" No, I said "Like Larry and now Dan..." I'll see
if you can figure out the rest.

> Is this one of those "what he said; what Brian heard" sort of things?

If you think it, it must be.

When you're ready to follow the thread, you'll see that Dan, like Larry,
values the old exams over the new exams. So much so that he thinks the new
hams are worthless.

4492. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:17:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Uyhl8.3907$Za7.113871201@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43761

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF104D0.2070605@bellsouth.net...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > Yet I hear you say that the only way YOU can know if the ham has given
the
> > proper effort and commitment is by the level and date of his license.
>
> But I provided the qualification that nothing else would be known about
> said amateur. Also, the evaluator would come from the mainstream of
> humanity, not necessarily a 5wpm general lite in rrap.

So you know nothing else about an amateur except license class and date of
exam, and you praise or condemn him.

"Here lies Dann Finn, a pre-restructuring Advanced"

4493. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:18:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_zhI8.3908$li7.114312288@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43762

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF19BC6.3070207@bellsouth.net...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > Intrinsic value is measured by a federal exam? Try again.
>
> Brian, this is another construct of your own invent.
> Dan

It is your construct, re: effort and commitment.

4494. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:40:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020526234000.08779.00000424@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 43763

In article <Zf6I8.3691$IX4.105342145@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >You wanted to measure an amateur. I'm saying the license class isn't a >good
>> >measure - you should look for other indicators.
>>
>> License class is the only way the FCC measures an amateur.
>
>So, like Larry and now Dan, the FCC says the old licenses are the good ones, >and the new people just don't measure up?

Brian:

This is an issue the FCC will not address, because what you just said is absolutely true, but to confirm it publicly would be politically embarrassing.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4495. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:50:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CF1AD18.3EAC2BCF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43764
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Paul Peterson wrote:

> The commercialization of RF to one or two
> companies in America will continue, and Ham radio will go to
> the same place that model railroaders, and slot car racing went.

Don't know about slot cars, but model railroading is alive and well.
They have new technology, called "DCC", where each locomotive
has an addressable decoder and you have handheld controllers
to control individual trains anywhere on the layout. Some of these
handhelds use a radio link instead of a wired link. Frequency around
900MHz.

4496. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:52:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <l4il8.3920$xs7.114865482@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43765

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF10F85.5010104@bellsouth.net...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CF04038.6040804@bellsouth.net...
> > >
> > >>Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >>
> > >>>So people who were radio and electronics careerists should be denied an
> > >>>amateur radio license because it comes to them with no effort?
> > >>>
> > >>If they are careerists, that would be professional. Should professionals
> > >>be granted amateur radio licenses with no effort?
> > >
> > > Yes, that is the question. You demand effort, but there is no effort
for
> > > the radio careerists. Should they be kept out because there is not
> > > sufficient effort?
> >
> > They should not automatically be granted an amateur license as your
propose.
>
I did what? I asked if they should be excluded based on the exam being no
effort to them.
>
> >>>>>Do not ask me how much more valuable a college degree is over a high
> >>>>>
> >>>school diploma.
> >>>
> >>>>>Depends on the H.S., depends on the college.
> >>>>>
> >>>>I agree. And code proficence depends upon the code speed.
> >>>>
> >>>Nope, I could copy 9wpm error free. I could not copy 13wpm at 70%. I
> >>>was proficient at one speed, a failure at another.
> >>
> >>So in this case a neutral observer may conclude that your certification
> >>to operate on the code portions of the band is based on a faulty
> >>standard because it allow you to operate where you are incapable of
> >>communicating.
> >
> > > Slow is not incapable.

>
> Oh yes it is.

Oh no its not.

> If someone is sending to you at 18 wpm, you are incapable
> of copying that communication. I say this not to be mean. You can fix
> that, you know.

You bet. QRS

> > I thought you were Milton educated?
>
> But my placement in the actuarial tables implies that I tend to forget.

Sorry. I get sometimers, too.

> > Perhaps it would be better for you to only operate in the
> >
> >>voice or the old novice code portions. Certainly, you should not be
> >>given privileges in any sub-bands where you cannot understand anyone,
> >>correct?
> >
> > I did that for a while when the Novice Enhancement came along. It was a
> > form of self-punishment for not advancing with the code. It was also
> > stupid.
> >
> >>What if there is an emergency?

911

> > Jim says "IF" is for children.
>
> Suppose there is an emergency?

911

> >>>>>For social lifeforms such as humans, wolves,
> >>>>>bees, ants and even chickens, Life itself is one big pecking order.
> >>>>>Survival of the fittest?
> >>>>>
> >>>>Yes. Do not blame KR4AJ for this one either.
> >>>>
> >>>Who are we trying to oust? Where is this competitiveness AGAINST your
> >>>fellow ham come from?
> >>>
> >>What competitiveness? You keep losing sight of the fact that KR4AJ is
> >>merely trying to state a fact. Is stating a fact competitive?
> >
> > You cannot answer why you engage in competition with your fellow hams?
>
> Even if I did, what would be wrong with that. Have you ever heard of
> contests, ARRL awards and so on? Don't you like competition? You are

> beginning to sound like a Communist again. Everybody should be the same
> and never compete. That is almost unpatriotic. Maybe you are a democrat.

I love contests. Measure the ham by what he does, not which exam he took or
the "use by" date.

> >>>>>>KR4AJ has nothing to do with it.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>Dan can accept it, embrace it, or reject it. Dare he change it?
> >>>>>
> >>>>Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.
> >>>>
> >>>It is your construct, not a mountain.
> >>>
> >>I believe that survival of the fittest was Darwin's construct but it
> >>could be about as difficult to change as moving a mountain.
> >
> > I recall someone parting the sea.
>
> If you can remember that, so much for your actuarial tables. You've got
> me beat by a few years.

1958?

> >>>>>>It is simply a fact that one must accept.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>Accept oppression?
> >>>>>
> >>>>That's Life in the big city, Bud.
> >>>>
> >>>There are idiots in the big city, and you're one of them.
> >>>
> >>Ouch!!!
> >>
> >>Brian, you just come out nowhere and *slam*. You got me on that one!
> >
> > Its Brian or N0iMD. Leave "Bud" in your fridge or your closet.
>
> Or you will do...what?

I'll call you, "Slick?"

> >>>>Whether we care or not onviously does not not matter to you. The fact
> >>>>that it matters to many pther people who know nothing else about what
a
> >>>>great ham you are, Brian, may or may not matter to you. But all I'm
> >>>>saying is that certification to a higher standard matters to people in
> >>>>general. That is Life.
> >>>>
> >>>You've said that the highest license (not certification) is
meaningless.
>

> No, I said it had no measureable value. However, Cecil reminded me that
> that it did have value, i.e. in terms of operating privileges granted.
> That is measureable and I agree with that. However, if it were not
> measureable, it could still have a qualitative value that is not
> measureable by quantitative means.

Intrinsic?

> >>>>>>I don't know Brian,
> >>>>>>that's the way Life is. Don't shoot the messenger.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>Messenger? You guys aren't the messengers. You're trying to be the
> >>>>>enforcers of a false system of values.
> >>>>>
> >>>>I object to that statement. My role in Life is not to enforce any
system
> >>>>of values.
> >>>>
> >>>Then cease and desist.
> >>>
> >>huh?
> >
> > You perpetuate the myth that old exams are better than the new exams.
>
> No, I merely state how other people may tend to perceive it. There you
> go again, Brian. Learn to read.

Help me out here. How do you know how other people perceive it? How do you
perceive it?

> >>>>I merely observe, and I am reporting to you what I observe.
> >>>>You may disagree that what I observe is really true but that is
another
> >>>>discussion. But what do you observe, Brian? That people never observe
a
> >>>>pecking order or that survival of the fittest is not a characteristic
of
> >>>>humanity? Go ahead, take a shot at it, explain to us your New Wave
> >>>>approach to interpreting Humanity in general.
> >>>>
> >>>Kill all the no code Techs?
> >>>
> >>oUCH AGAIn! Where did that one come from???
> >
> > OK. Just harass them?
>
> That is difficult for me because I don't use a repeater.

The moonbouncers use very slow code on VHF+.

Try not to mistake them for codeless Techs and harass them.

> >>>I don't think so.
> >>>
> >>I don't either but we can make no-code-tech-jokes all day long, such
> >>'How many no code techs does it take to replace a 3-500Z?'
> >
> > Cute.
>
> ANS: Three. One NCT forget to unplug the amp, one to dial 911 for the
> NCT who forgot to unplug the amp and one to receive the NAL from the FCC
> for transmitting test signals outside his authorized privilege.

The Amateur operator is supposed to be friendly and not darken the face of
Amateur radio.
Maybe you and Larry can get together and work "welfare mothers of color with
their hands out" into one of your jokes.

> >>>>>>It's something you cannot change.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>I think I've already been part of making the change. The actuarial
tables
> >>>>>will have to take care of the rest.
> >>>>>
> >>>>Brian, the part about the actuarial tables is not a very nice thing to
> >>>>say. The Amateur operator is supposed to be friendly and not darken
the
> >>>>face of Amateur radio. Part 97 doesn't say that..but you know it is
> >>>>true. I am ashamed to be associated with a ham who writes like this.
> >>>>
> >>>Yes Dan, try being friendly. Say friendly things othere than "I only
> >>>observe...Don't shoot the messenger..."
> >>
> >>By all means, *yes*, do *not* shoot the messenger. KR4AJ is only trying
> >>to help you by providing you with information that is extremely relevant
> >>for living Life in general and the Life of a ham in particular but you
> >>know that already as this is all a matter of public knowledge. What I
> >>see has the impeccable credentials of Conventional Wisdom, you know,
> >>"CW". Readers Digest is my infallible source. And one time Readers
> >>Digest had an article about Morse Code saving a ham's life during a
> >>snowstorm in Montana. That ham could have been N0IMD!
> >
> > I would have survived it without Morse Code.
>
> Not according to Reader's Digest.
>
They know me? Oh, thats right, they looked up my license class and the
dates of my excams and made that judgement.
>
> > Why do you speak of yourself in the 3rd person? Larry did that when he
told
> > us that "his friend" used to send QFU on CW.
>
> Does KR4AJ speak of himself in the third person?

> >>>>>>Unfortunately, in our case, there is no option for new
> >>>>>>hams to be certified to the older, higher standard because we hams
> >>>>>>complained to the hilt and took that option away.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>You measure a ham by the exam he took. A better system would be to
measure
> >>>>>a ham by what he does.
> >>>>>
> >>>>And you measure a ham by his statistical probability on an actuarial
> >>>>table. Nice guy.
> >>>>
> >>>I am a nice guy. But I have my faults.
> >>>
> >>I wasn't aware of that (i.e. that you were a nice guy) heh heh...
> >
> > Well, I am. I'm one of the few that will apologize for my mistakes on
here.
>
> Regardless of their actuarial index? You would actually bother to
> apologize to a fellow ham who might kick the bucket soon anyway? That
> seems inefficient.

I've even apologized to Dick. He's beating the odds.

> >> One of them is to accept newcomers to the service without judging them
by the code exam they took, or what
> >>>university they took it at.
> >>>
> >>What did they call this in high school, a mixed metaphor I believe.
> >
> > Ahh. Milton is showing through again.
>
> Well, two out of three ain't bad in the metaphor mix.
> >
> >>>>>But why measure at all?
> >>>>>
> >>>>What? You want no test at all? Just give everybody a ham license?
> >>>>
> >>>You have such a limited mind. Try one exam, one license.
> >>>
> >>I tried it...one exam, one license. Conclusion: Too limited.
> >
> > Why? No visible pecking order?
> >
> > OK, one full license, one limited license.
>
> Better than your communistic one-size-fits-all proposal. Gosh, I really
> think you are a communist. Did you ever work the MIR space station?

You have no idea.

> >>>>>>Do you think it is good to remove options to be certified under a
higher
> >>>>>>standard of excellence, Brian, just because it is perceived as being
> >>>>>>unfair to the less talented?
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>Ah, finally a question. The exam needs to test what is necessary to
equip
> >>>>>and operate a station within the confines of the authorization, and
to
> >>>>>do sosafely. Anything else is irrelevant and superflous.
> >>>>>
> >>>>Aha, so you do want to measure something! At least that is a start.
> >>>>
> >>>Yes, do they know the rules? Can they operate an amateur station
> > >>safely?
> >
> >>Don't stop now, you're making real progress.
> >
> > That's all a regulatory agency can ask for.
>
> What about excellence?

You don't get it by taking an exam. Excellence will have to wait for you to
get on the air.

> > This isn't Milton, you know.
>
> Those mixed metaphors are getting the best of you.
>
> > Yhe BMV didn't stamp your license "cum Loud?"
>
> No Comment. That is one of your dumber one's, Bud.

I guess they didn't, Slick.

> >>>>>>As far as the written portion is concerned, don't even bother with
> >>>>>>that. Any test in which the questions and answers are available in
advance
> >>>>>> is not a test at all. The only challenging portion of the amateur
radio
> >>>>>>test was the code test. But you know that already.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio
> >>>>>combined, in your opinion.
> >>>>>
> >>>>...putting words in my mouth...No, but it is probably more valuable
than
> >>>>the written test at filtering out effort and commitment to amateur
radio.
> >
> >>>Part 97 doesn't ask for effort nor commitment.
> >>>

> >>Nor does an aviator's or a surgeon's license. Just because something
> >>isn't legally mandated does not mean we should not insist on excellence
> >>using the only tools we have available, i.e the CFR's (Codes of Federal
> >>Regulation). Is it against the Constitution to emphasize effort and
> >>commitment by structuring minimum standards as such? Prove it. Take it
> >>to court.
> >
> > Minimum standards to operate at 7100khz are valid at 7099khz, yet the
> > government denies access to 7099.
>
> Not to me!
>
> > The electrical principals are the same,
> > the rf principles are the same, the propagation principles are the same,
the
> > safety principles are the same...
>
> Pecking order, you know. That's life.

It will change soon enough.

> >> You don't even have to raise
> >>>your right hand and swear allegiance to America in order to have a
> > license.
> >
> >>Is this supposed to be logically connected to something else you have
> >>written? Forgive me but I am getting into my statistically disadvantaged
> >>years, you know, according to that Actuarial chart you mentioned, so
> >>please enlighten me if you will how this comment is relevant to anything
> >>in this thread. But noe that you bring it upI will note that Part 97
> >>does require US citizenship, and Naturalized US citizenship does require
> >>the Oath that you mentioned, so, it might be said that swearing
> >>allegiance actually is a prerequisite to a ham license, at least for
> >>some people.
> >
> > You are getting old.
>
> Oh no, not that actuarial sermon again.
>
> > You mentioned effort and "commitment."
>
> Truly a cardinal sin for an NCT.

And radio professionals

> Swearing an
> > oath is a commitment. Taking a test is not. And I would guess that
most
> > Americans have never sworn an oath.
>
> So what? Many have.

You don't know what commitment is. That is all.

> >>>>Now a question for you:
> >>>>
> >>>>Do you value a person's probability statistic on an actuarial table to
> >>>>be more valuable than the rest of amateur radio combined?
> >>>>
> >>>It will eventually get rid of people like me and you who remember that
> >>>there used to be layers of useless licensing requirements. Only then
will we
> >>>consider the measure of a good ham by what de does and how he does it
> >>>(rather than by how fast he beeps).
> >>>
> >>Ouch again!!! Speak for yourself! Truly a grave topic. Let's talk about
> >>something else like Eastern Carolina Barbecue or something on that
general
> >>plane.
> >>
> >>de KR4AJ
> >
> > OK, family cookout at Slate Run Metro Park today. Kids can fish, hike
> > trails, or play on the huge playground. Fantastic!
>
> I gotta go too but before I do I want to leave you with three important
> thoughts. You can forget everything else I have written as long as you
> always remember the following:
>
> 1. Barbecue sauce NEVER includes tomato in any form.
>
> 2. Barbecue never includes anything but pig. No chicken or beef.
> Barbecue is only pig and vinegar.
>
> 3. Barbecue is a noun, never a verb.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

I recall doing a chow run to "Shorty and Red's BBQ" in downtown Petersburg
VA. I got the BBQ, sammich, and my forecaster got the fried pig ear
sammich. That was my first real bbq.

4497. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:54:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <46il8.3921$gt7.114912485@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43766

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526220627.06857.00000276@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <1%3I8.2118$zI4.91577555@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >You perpetuate the myth that old exams are better than the new exams.
>
> Not a myth. An opinion. I have taken both and passed - have you? I think
not.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I passed the Extra in 1994. How old does it have to be?

4498. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:56:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CF1AE4B.6BB35C9B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 43767
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<44da9d49d3dccaa147cb64ea92af10b5.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > Stewart, let's cut the nonsense and I'll ask a serious question - why
> > do you seem to believe that amateur radio stopped with spark gap in the
> > early 1900's?
>
> I don't - you misinterpreted the point of my post.
>
> What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less relevant
> in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating. As this trend
> continues, the ARS is losing it's PURPOSE... this is especially true
> on the VHF/UHF bands, whose use has dwindled to the point that they
> are VIRTUALLY UNUSED. Even 2m has no more than modest activity -
> other than a few high-level repeaters, and an occasional simplex or
> packet QSO, or some folks doing EME... NADA.

You're like the guy living on a tiny island who ponders how small the
world is. If you don't know of something, it can't exist.

Dave K8MN

4499. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:57:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <l8il8.3923$dq7.114723115@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43769

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF0FBEC.91CB9F6E@att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Some amateurs are granted amateur radio licenses with virtually no
effort
> > involved. Why should professionals be denied the same right?
>
> Why should it matter where you learned radio as long as you learned it?
Many
> hams including me got commercial radio licenses before we got the Extra
class
> ham license. The point is it was learned. Today that isn't a requirement.

Dan demands effort. If you already know it, its no effort.

4500. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:57:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <19il8.3924$St7.114943324@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43768

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526131705.26555.00000542@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net
>
> >The point is it was learned. Today that isn't a requirement.
>
> Very few people can study the correct answers to over 1000 questions
without
> learning something. Learning is the easiest way to pass the tests. Why do
you
> keep discouraging people from learning by telling them that they don't
have to?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

So that he can say they are no good at the end of each day.

4501. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 03:59:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <laiI8.3925$iu7.114971876@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43770

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CF12A61.FCAB0F2@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Why should it matter where you learned radio as long as you learned it?
>
> So my EE degree is not meaningless after all?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Sounds like Dick is coming around to Len's way of thinking. We'll wait for
Steve to weigh in on this one.

4502. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:03:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF1B00F.38D32CFE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43771

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Actually, it was Roger Whittaker singing, "I Don't Believe in If Anymore", in
> >the context of statements like: If pigs had wings, they could fly. I'm sure
> >Roger wasn't singing about valid conditional logical statements.
>
> Probably not. However, Cecil uses that catchphrase whenever convenient.

Uhhhhhhh Jim, I wrote the above.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4503. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:05:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kgil8.3928$_t7.114951317@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43772

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF149E3.4060503@bellsouth.net...
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dan Finn wrote:
> >
> >> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >>
> >>> So people who were radio and electronics careerists should be
> >>> denied an amateur radio license because it comes to them with
> >>> no effort?
> >>>
> >> If they are careerists, that would be professional. Should
> >> professionals be granted amateur radio licenses with no effort?
> >
> > Some amateurs are granted amateur radio licenses with virtually no
> > effort involved. Why should professionals be denied the same right?
>
> Professionals already went through some quantity of effort to obtain a
> commercial license, so much of their effort for an amateur license has
> already been spent.

Nope. Unacceptable. You need some kind of new effort. Maybe 30 hours of
cleaning dirty contacts each month.

> However, professionals must still expend a small
> amount of additional effort to become familiar with those items unique
> to amateur radio. Of course this contradicts M0iMD's original assertion
> (above) but I was only trying to be civil by asking him a question whose
> answer would lead him to an answer that would have caused him to
> contradict his own original premise. In hindsight it may have been more
> effective had I asked Mr. Burke "Is it reasonable to expect that it is
> possible for most professionals to be granted amateur licenses with no
> effort". Of course, "no effort" at all would not be "reasonable" as an
> expectation, thus N0iMD's original premise could have been shown to him
> to be a contruct of his own invent.

But you're the one who demands effort. Not me. The FCC doesn't, and they
are the licensing authority. Perhaps its time to ignore all of your
nonsense since it has no bearing of life. At least untill you and Larry
cook up antoher good troll.

73, Brian

4504. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:08:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF1B128.7C7CC7FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43773

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> This is an issue the FCC will not address, because what you just said is
> absolutely true, but to confirm it publicly would be politically embarrassing.

Actually, if the FCC adopted your delusions, it would be more like
psychologically embarrassing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4505. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:11:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QlIl8.3931$_t7.114951317@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43774

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526175933.26816.00000219@mb-mo.aol.com...
> In article <3CEFD0F8.1090007@bellsouth.net>, Dan Finn
<djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian P Burke wrote:

> >> Dan can accept it, embrace it, or reject it. Dare he change it?
> >
> >Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.
>
> "Evem Mohammed" could have moved mountains (plural) with
> the aid of modern earth-moving equipment.
>
> Are we to embrace Islam on Memorial Day in the USA?

Hey, pipe down, Mister. You might get yerself called a Communist on
Memorial Day, like I did.

4506. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:12:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4nil8.3932$Pg7.114212043@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43775

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020526113506.14911.00000786@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <OIPH8.2406$%j4.127255770@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> > >So the code test IS more valuable than the rest of amateur radio
combined,
> > >in your opinion.
>
> Brian:
>
> The PCTA has never argued that, it's only your own twisted construct.

Logic backs you into that corner, not me.

4507. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:17:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mril8.3934$hk7.114429086@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43776

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526130809.26555.00000538@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >The PCTA has never argued that, it's only your own twisted construct.
>
> What is twisted, Larry, is your saying that "the PCTA has never argued
that."
> Those that believe that an Amateur exam must consist of a Morse-decoding
skill
> and a written test that includes all else about Amateur Radio, and that if
they
> fail to pass either they are not given priveleges cannot believe anything
but
> that Morse-decoding skill is equal in important to all else in Amateur
Radio,
> at least in meeting the minimum requirements to enter the avocation.
>
> All the rest is justification.
>
> You are not being very logical.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Larry never has been logical. Its always been an "eyes rolled back and
mouth open" reaction.

Meanwhile Dan Finn says since the advent of the published question pools,
the code exam is the only real test left. It is even more blatant that he
truly thinks that Morse Code is more valuable than the rest of amateur radio
combined.

4508. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:23:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Iwil8.3936$rB7.115313800@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43777

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526160629.18708.00000120@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <U44I8.2123$yJ4.91632762@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >Anything above that minimum requirement, i.e., General, is superflous.
>
> The FCC doesn't think so.

He he. They'll get there.

> >The General once granted all priveleges,
>
> all OPERATING privileges
>
> > in a day when you had to beep fast,
>
> 13 wpm isn't "fast" at all.

It is in my opinion.

> >take exams without question pools, and face down that mean old FCC
Examiner.
>
> Don't forget having to pass both code tests before even getting a look at
the
> written, no CSCEs, and the 30 day mandatory wait to retest. Also the
> experience requirements for the Advanced and Extra.

Oh yeh, all that too.

> >The Novice was meant to be a limited license.
>
> And it was.
>
> >The General was not.
>
> That is incorrect. You are mistaken, Brian.

I am not.

> The General class license appeared as part of the restructuring of 1951.
It was
> basically the old Class B, renamed. It was a limited license from the 1951
> restructuring until February of 1953 - almost 2 years. The FCC announced
> that they intended General to be a limited license when they restructured
in

> 1951, and again in 1967 when they announced the "incentive licensing"
> changes.

All priveleges.

4509. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:29:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <jCiI8.3937$8D7.115414072@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43779

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF19196.5050800@bellsouth.net...
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >(text cut)
> > Your claim that the General was not meant to be a limited license is
simply
> > incorrect. Mistaken. Untrue. Flat out wrong.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

> I have found that N0iMD tends to have many contructs under his own invent.
He doesn't know
> a thing about ham radio history prior to 1999.

Holy Guacamole, Batman. Then who took my Novice exam in 1986?

> He has even stated in
> this thread that he expects the actuarial tables to take care of the
> older ham radio culture, after which he can presumably invent another
> mega-construct of an HF ham radio culture that will, as usual, be of his
> own invent.

Obviously a Milton reader.

Dan, I said that the actuarial tables will take me, too. So do I rise from
the dead like Jesus and become the Saviour of Amateur Radio? A 1,000 years
of freedom from old fools like you?

>Watch out for Brian; he wants to tear it all down and
> rebuild it in his own twisted and contorted image, a world of one
> license, one "test". His proposed license structure is right out of Karl
> Marx: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need
> (to fire up on HF)." Obviously Brian is either a Communist, or worse, a
> Democrat.

You have no idea. But this new attack tells me that you're worried.

4510. Re: Off Topic...help Find?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:29:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527002924.02458.00000638@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 43778

>Subject: Re: Off Topic...help Find?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/26/02 17:59 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020526175929.26816.00000214@mb-mo.aol.com>

>
>There are very few civil aircraft kits or collectables for the smaller
>general aviation aircraft....(SNIP)

Thanks, Len. I didn't know Testor's had a site, but I guess I shudda
known.

>Avgas getting too expensive for "real" flying? Miss a flight
>physical?

Thankfully mogas is available in most places, but actually I am
considering a project at the request of a third party. Been a while since I
built a model and thought I'd take a look. And I just barely squeeked by this
last 3rd class physical without corrective lenses...Guess the next one will be
the one that says "Must wear corrective lenses while executing airman
priviledges" ! ! !

Thanks again ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

4511. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:32:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tFiI8.3940$fD7.115421437@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43780

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526131426.26555.00000541@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>
> >Interesting, we take a Test to get a License, then after we get the
License,
> >the ARRL gives Classes, and provides info about Technical Stuff we should
> >have
> >none before taking the Test.
>
> There were no questions on antenna modeling or DSP (an upcoming topic) on
any
> of the tests I took. How about you?
>
> Are you really suggesting that hams should know the equivalent of the
6-week
> antenna-modeling course that ARRL conducts before being given their
licenses.?
> If not, what did you mean wnen you said that ARRL's courses provide
information
> about the stuff you should have done before you took the test?
>
> I am trying to take you at your word, Bruce, but your words are not making
very
> much sense.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Full moon. Lunatic.

4512. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:34:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <acsd6fvpd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43783

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CEFA31D.6000800@bellsouth.net...
>
> CAM wrote:
> > How many people in the world give a rat's patootie how fast you can
> > read code? *Nobody* cares how fast I can read code, not even I.
>
> There must be a lot of people in the world who care how fast certain
> people can read code. Otherwise there would be no code tests.

That "was" the case and is changing and has changed to
the point where the liklihood that testing will end is
all but certain.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4513. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:35:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2lil8.3941$iE7.115480840@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43781

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526014214.18051.00000811@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >Where do you come up with such NONSENSE - don't you have any concept
> >of reality?
>
> Oh but I do, by the way, I have already received 8 E-Mails from MURS users
> asking how much I want for the Deltas>

How much did you get for them, CB Bruce?

4514. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:37:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <SJil8.3943$WE7.115521739@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43782
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CF1AE4B.6BB35C9B@earthlink.net...
> stewart wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<44da9d49d3dccaa147cb64ea92af10b5.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > Stewart, let's cut the nonsense and I'll ask a serious question - why
> > > do you seem to believe that amateur radio stopped with spark gap in
the
> > > early 1900's?
> >
> > I don't - you misinterpreted the point of my post.
> >
> > What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less relevant
> > in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating. As this trend
> > continues, the ARS is losing it's PURPOSE... this is especially true
> > on the VHF/UHF bands, whose use has dwindled to the point that they
> > are VIRTUALLY UNUSED. Even 2m has no more than modest activity -
> > other than a few high-level repeaters, and an occasional simplex or
> > packet QSO, or some folks doing EME... NADA.
>
> You're like the guy living on a tiny island who ponders how small the
> world is. If you don't know of something, it can't exist.
>
> Dave K8MN

Not bad from a tar paper shack in West Virginia.

4515. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:40:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gNiI8.3946$7D7.115413022@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43784

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020526234000.08779.00000424@mb-mu.aol.com...
> In article <Zf6I8.3691$IX4.105342145@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >You wanted to measure an amateur. I'm saying the license class isn't
a
> >good
> >> >measure - you should look for other indicators.
> >>
> >> License class is the only way the FCC measures an amateur.
> >
> >So, like Larry and now Dan, the FCC says the old licenses are the good
ones,
> >and the new people just don't measure up?
>
> Brian:
>
> This is an issue the FCC will not address, because what you just said is
> absolutely true, but to confirm it publicly would be politically
embarrassing.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Nope. The FCC does not agree. Even Jim quotes the part about keeping the
morse code just because you guys tend to like it. 2003.

4516. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:51:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527005142.02458.00000640@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 43785

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/26/02 21:31 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205261731.5131e980@posting.google.com>

>Remember - I still want to open up 1.25 Meters for a "New NoCode
>Novice" Class... then, maybe, the Amateur Radio Service would be more
>able to compete with the advances that are being made in the Personal
>Radio Services

Here's a hot history lesson, Stew...that band WAS available to "Novices"
for a decade. It went nowhere.

It's been available to the no code Techs for over a decade now and it's
hardly any more populated than it was then.

So WHAT makes you think YOUR new "Novice" license will open it up?

>If hams don't want to go this route, then why not give up the
>whole(virtually unused) band to a MURS/GMRS-like service - one that
>would allow ANYONE to use repeaters, and 56Kbps digital channels, and
>10W TPO? Who needs Vegas? THAT'S excitement! It would be like when
>they opened up Oklahoma to the settlers! YAHOOO!

No, Stew, it will be like channel 19 on a busy day on the freeway.

Sheeesh......

4517. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:55:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527005544.02458.00000641@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 43786

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/26/02 21:46 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205261746.32491053@posting.google.com>

>Why not open up 1.25M for a new NoCode Novice Class? At least then we
>could start getting families/friends/collegues involved with Amateur
>Radio. Otherwise, why not just let the public use these frequencies?
>They aren't being used for anything.

Just because the band is not channelized from wall to wall with repeaters
does NOT mean the band is not being used.

4518. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 04:59:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527005952.02458.00000642@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 43787

>Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 05/26/02 21:17 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3CF1890F.B8ECFD7C@IEEE.org>

>Any mention of Farnsworth spacing/timing? If not, doesn't the present
>5wpm code exam violate the Morse code specification?

What specification?

4519. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 05:02:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527010234.02458.00000643@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 43788

>Subject: Re: Code Question
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/26/02 17:59 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020526175937.26816.00000222@mb-mo.aol.com>

>> It's been there since 1914, Lennie. Stood up pretty good, I'd say.
>
>The first US amateur radio licenses were granted in 1912, not 1914.

So much the better! That's even two years MORE!...

>
>The first US radio club was organized in 1909...the first such in the
>world...it is still active.

yep.

4520. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 05:03:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527010331.10184.00000298@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 43789

In article <3CF1880C.F53D3B4D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>You are trying to tell me that my emotional reactions are not possible
>i.e. "has no basis in fact". You are the one who is mistaken. My emotional
>reactions are a fact and your words cannot change those facts. You're not
>going omnipotent on us again, are you?

...sure he is! :-)

4521. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 05:03:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527010332.10184.00000300@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 43790

In article <20020526220627.06857.00000275@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>Actually, it was Roger Whittaker singing, "I Don't Believe in If Anymore", in
>>the context of statements like: If pigs had wings, they could fly. I'm sure
>>Roger wasn't singing about valid conditional logical statements.
>
>Probably not. However, Cecil uses that catchphrase whenever convenient.
>
>I simply hold up a mirror to him.

Several have held a mirror up to you, but you can't see your
own reflection. Are you a vampire?

4522. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 05:03:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527010332.10184.00000299@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 43791

In article <20020526193733.26353.00000726@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>Word rate in amateur radio testing is just one of those "unwritten"
>>laws.
>
>The rate is unwritten in the international treaty. It is set at 5 wpm in the
>FCC regulations, so I wouldn't call it unwritten. For whatever reason, the
>Commission has decided that 5 wpm is a reasonable rate to test the knowledge
>of International Morse code required by the treaty.

OK, given Part 97 and all referenced documents, recommendations, and specifications, WHAT IS WORD RATE IN MORSE ACCORDING TO REGULATIONS?!?

Absolutely NOTHING in Part 97 specifies WORD RATE.

The ONLY thing specified for International Morse Code is the relative ratio of dot-dash-space durations.

The morse character rate could be sent at anything from 5 to 50 WPM per character and still keep the "conventional" word rate (5 characters plus a space) at "5 words per minute." All legal and per the law...because the law DOESN'T SPECIFY WORD RATE.

Those who are already licensed will see nothing wrong with an incomplete law. They may not dare challenge it for fear of being re-tested.

4523. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 05:03:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527010333.10184.00000301@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 43793

In article <3CF19196.5050800@bellsouth.net>, Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>(text cut)
>> Your claim that the General was not meant to be a limited license is simply
>> incorrect. Mistaken. Untrue. Flat out wrong.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>I have found that N0iMD tends to have many contructs under his own invent. He
>doesn't know
>
>a thing about ham radio history prior to 1999. He has even stated in
>this thread that he expects the actuarial tables to take care of the
>older ham radio culture, after which he can presumably invent another
>mega-construct of an HF ham radio culture that will, as usual, be of his
>own invent.

The "older ham radio culture" will indeed be "taken care of" by
age, mortality, and attrition.

Brian has nothing whatever to do with it, neither do I, nor you.

It is stamped into your DNA and designer genes.

Live with it.

> Watch out for Brian; he wants to tear it all down and
>rebuild it in his own twisted and contorted image, a world of one
>license, one "test".

Poor baby...all upset at only ONE LICENSE CLASS?

How come for why was a SIX CLASS license structure so
manifestly noble, true, and good?

There are NO more "Advanced" class licenses being granted.
Is that what bothers you so much?

>His proposed license structure is right out of Karl
>Marx: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need
>(to fire up on HF)."

Oh, that didn't exist before? My, my, and to think that myself and
two others (one was a ham then and still is) were busy working
three dozen HF transmitters for the US Army during the height of
the Cold War 49 years ago. All legal. No extra licenses or

"incentive upgrades" necessary. No OOK CW either.

Maybe you'd like to fill me and my buddies in on "Karl Marx" theory? Or do you subscribe to what is in the book "My Camp?" [translated title]

>Obviously Brian is either a Communist, or worse, a Democrat.

YOU show ME some effort and committment on why YOUR opinions have to rule on amateur radio regulations.

4524. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 05:03:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527010334.10184.00000302@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 43792

In article <20020526194156.26353.00000729@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>"Difficulty"
>>of tests has always been of a SUBJECTIVE nature...evident by
>>the previous tests increasing in "difficulty and complexity" as time
>>went on for all those who DO NOT require any further testing. :-)
>
>At the time, I found the General Class license test moderately difficult.
>Today, I would find it easy. Perhaps some are looking at today's tests and not
>quite seeing how hard they would be for a 14-year old kid. If I had been
>required to meet today's requirements when I was 14 years old, I really don't
>think I would have bothered to do so.

Should everyone enter amateur radio as a teen-ager? If so, why?

Should these youngsters also have some kind of cute outfit
with short pants and stiff-brim campaign hats and a belt of
merit badges on while operating?

I've been told that today's test requirements are "easy" and
"dumbed down" compared to 15 to 35 years ago. Which is it?

When I keyed on my first HF transmitter the only "license" I had
was a civilian driver's license. No morse code skill needed,
either; no OOK CW was ever sent. I had to know how to kill
others...my "effort and committment" was to stay alive and
destroy the enemy. Are you ignoring Memorial Day's real
meaning?

4525. Re: Off Topic...help Find?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 05:04:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527010431.02458.00000644@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 43794

>Subject: Re: Off Topic...help Find?
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 05/27/02 00:29 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020527002924.02458.00000638@mb-cb.aol.com>
>

>>Subject: Re: Off Topic...help Find?
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 05/26/02 17:59 Eastern Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <20020526175929.26816.00000214@mb-mo.aol.com>
>
>>
>>There are very few civil aircraft kits or collectables for the smaller
>>general aviation aircraft....(SNIP)
>
> Thanks, Len. I didn't know Testor's had a site, but I guess I shudda
>known.

Searched them all and didn't find what I was looking for....Need a Cessna
152/172/182/185 series model with a wing span 8-12"

Oh well...the search continues....

73

Steve

4526. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 05:12:40 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <cfjI8.451$mz2.351@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43795
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> Why not open up 1.25M for a new NoCode Novice Class? At least then we
> could start getting families/friends/collegues involved with Amateur
> Radio. Otherwise, why not just let the public use these frequencies?
> They aren't being used for anything.
>

Four clubs to which I belong (W0EF, K0RT, W0YC, and W0TDX) use 1.25M for extensive digital and analog links for contesting/DX packet clusters, and remote receiver and crossband 2M/75CM repeater links. Additionally, several 1.25M repeater pairs are very popular in our area. I notice that there are at least a couple dozen 1.25M repeaters in San Diego county. And In case you missed it, Amateur Radio is in fact "public use" of these frequencies.

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4527. A Peaceful Memorial Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 07:21:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527032137.02480.00000715@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 43796

This year more than most, I hope we can all take a moment to reflect and offer a silent prayer of thanks and respect to all those who have given or lost thier lives for our Nation.

To all of those of you who have served in the Armed Forces or supported them, may this day bring you peace and comfort.

Thank you for having been there.

Paratus et Vigilans

Steve Robeson, LPN
GySgt, USMC, retired
Winchester, TN

4528. Re: Scientology Takes Control of Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 09:05:58 UTC
From: Rev Norle Enturbulata <noearthlight2k@nohotmail.com>
Message-ID: <acsstm$9lj$1@helle.btinternet.com>
Source record: 43797
Cross-posted to: alt.religion.scientology,rec.radio.amateur.policy

That'd be hilarious to the folks who wrote "Frequency" (Dennis Quaid), wouldn't it?

Does this then confirm that Whittaker is clam fodder? I mean, why else would ANYONE work with the same bunch that gave us all that classic for all time, "Battlefield Earth"?

"Phil" <Phil_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message news:abc7o9028ja@drn.newsguy.com...
> From the ARRL.org web site
>
> Ham radio could have role in Phenomenon sequel: Amateur Radio is poised to hit
> the big screen yet again in a movie tentatively titled Phenomenon II. Phenomenon
> debuted in 1996 and featured John Travolta and his ham operator friend Forest
> Whitaker. In one scene, Travolta's character appears to be able to copy RTTY
> transmissions by ear. For the original Phenomenon movie, ARRL provided several
> props for the ham radio shack. The sequel is still in the very early stages of
> development. A researcher working on checking facts in the script contacted ARRL
> to ask if operators actually used the term "CQ" when initiating contacts. She
> also told ARRL Media Relations Manager Jennifer Hagy, N1TDY, that the
> possibility exists for the creation of a television series based on the
> Phenomenon movies. Hagy offered further assistance if needed. No further details
> were immediately available.
>

4529. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 09:50:54 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <acsvi5$46c$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43798
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:cfjI8.451$mz2.351@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Why not open up 1.25M for a new NoCode Novice Class? At least then we
> > could start getting families/friends/collegues involved with Amateur
> > Radio. Otherwise, why not just let the public use these frequencies?
> > They aren't being used for anything.
> >
>
> Four clubs to which I belong (W0EF, K0RT, W0YC, and W0TDX) use 1.25M for
> extensive digital and analog links for contesting/DX packet clusters, and
> remote receiver and crossband 2M/75CM repeater links. Additionally,
several
> 1.25M repeater pairs are very popular in our area. I notice that there
are
> at least a couple dozen 1.25M repeaters in San Diego county. And In case
> you missed it, Amateur Radio is in fact "public use" of these frequencies.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> ��� SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

```
Myopia is one of Stewart's better qualities.
His seeing eye dog has been tryng to enliglhten him for years...
```

4530. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 12:43:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF229E7.48F45897@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43800

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Any mention of Farnsworth spacing/timing? If not, doesn't the present
> >5wpm code exam violate the Morse code specification?
>
> What specification?

The specification that Len talked about.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4531. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 12:46:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF22ABE.D4708627@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43801

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Should everyone enter amateur radio as a teen-ager? If so, why?

Because one is not a 'Real Ham' unless one entered as a teenager?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4532. My Apologies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 13:00:54 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uf4ack7sgeap26@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 43799

Hell's Bells, you really WERE looking for a
plastic model kit and not making fun of all the
off-topic postings here lately! OUCH!

Sorry about what may have appeared to be
jumping on you.

You'd probably have more luck with European
makers concerning even U.S. civilian aircraft.

Val Germann
KC0MUB
(9th Division, Spec. 5, RVN 1969-70)

4533. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 13:03:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <J8qI8.3423$HN.165475466@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43802

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020527010234.02458.00000643@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Code Question
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 05/26/02 17:59 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <20020526175937.26816.00000222@mb-mo.aol.com>
>
> >> It's been there since 1914, Lennie. Stood up pretty good, I'd say.
> >
> >The first US amateur radio licenses were granted in 1912, not 1914.
>
> So much the better! That's even two years MORE!...
>
> >
> >The first US radio club was organized in 1909...the first such in the
> >world...it is still active.
>
> yep.

Same members.

4534. Re: Scientology Takes Control of Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 13:07:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ucqI8.3424$YO.165558400@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43803
Cross-posted to: alt.religion.scientology,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Reminds me of the USDA/USFS scientist that imported those asian lady beetles
to eat aphids.

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF18E2F.7050209@bellsouth.net...
> Well, it's about time scientists took firm control of this hobby. By
> gosh, it has gotten way too non-technical.
>
> Phil wrote:
>
> > From the ARRL.org web site
> >
> > Ham radio could have role in Phenomenon sequel: Amateur Radio is poised
to hit
> > the big screen yet again in a movie tentatively titled Phenomenon II.
Phenomenon
> > debuted in 1996 and featured John Travolta and his ham operator friend
Forest
> > Whitaker. In one scene, Travolta's character appears to be able to copy
RTTY
> > transmissions by ear. For the original Phenomenon movie, ARRL provided
several
> > props for the ham radio shack. The sequel is still in the very early
stages of
> > development. A researcher working on checking facts in the script
contacted ARRL
> > to ask if operators actually used the term "CQ" when initiating
contacts. She
> > also told ARRL Media Relations Manager Jennifer Hagy, N1TDY, that the
> > possibility exists for the creation of a television series based on the
> > Phenomenon movies. Hagy offered further assistance if needed. No further
details
> > were immediately available.
> >
> >
>
>

4535. Re: Who is the real Wayne Green?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 13:23:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0205270523.3f654e42@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43804

>
> If they (aliens) do take him, you'd lose both. Wayne DID have some good
> ideas...back around 1978.
>
> He could talk up a storm, but then do absolutely nothing about it. He ran
> the life out of "73" magazine until it was bought out and some new money (and
> editorial responsibility) was infused.
>
> Along the way he managed to some little personal credit, to get back into
> the sadle with his tirades and meandering "editorials". he now uses "73" as
> his personal footstool for meaningless rants. Wayne's "Never Say Die"
> editorials were the "rrap" of his day.
>
>
He pulled the same crap when he cranked up the Byte and CD Review
magazines. He's a bloomin' genius at finding new tech-based niche
interests which lead him to creating a magazine to cover those
interests, often the first rag to do so. All of which he turned into
platforms for spreading his never-ending inane rants around.
>
>
In the mid-1980s I went big into collecting music CDs when the medium
was first getting off the ground. The only mag on the subject was "CD
Review" so I subscribed to it. And there was the owner/editor hisself
Our Wayne spouting all kinds of vitriol & puke on the subject of music
CDs, the people involved, the industry standards, yadda, yadda. When I
first saw his byline I was stunned but then all I could do was giggle.
"Where have I seen THIS crap before?" came to mind. CQ mag in 1955 of
course. It took maybe two years worth of gritting my teeth and
ignoring his flamefests in CD Review before some corporate publication
chain bought the magazine from him and immediately turned it into a
pretty decent rag sans even a hint of toxic editorial content.
>
>
Wherin lies his genius and his Midas touch. He makes a huge bundle
every time he pulls off one of these startup turnovers or "salvaging
operations" a la 73 magazine. At the cap gains tax rate of course plus
he gets his own perverted jollies in print.
>
>
We can justifiably bitch about him about his idiotic rants but he's
laughing all the way to the bank and looking for one more tirade
launch pad to invent.
>

>
>
> His big thing is to suggest "someone" could do all these great things for
> Ham Radio, perhaps even supplanting the ARRL. HE might have done it at one
> time, but never did.
>
> Wayne Green is Amateur radio's infamous "also ran".
>
>
He could care less. Money. Buckets of.
>
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
w3rv

4536. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 13:40:47 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <actdg4$i8p$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43805
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CF1AE4B.6BB35C9B@earthlink.net...
> stewart wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<44da9d49d3dccaa147cb64ea92af10b5.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > Stewart, let's cut the nonsense and I'll ask a serious question - why
> > > do you seem to believe that amateur radio stopped with spark gap in
the
> > > early 1900's?
> >
> > I don't - you misinterpreted the point of my post.
> >
> > What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less relevant
> > in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating. As this trend
> > continues, the ARS is losing it's PURPOSE... this is especially true
> > on the VHF/UHF bands, whose use has dwindled to the point that they
> > are VIRTUALLY UNUSED. Even 2m has no more than modest activity -
> > other than a few high-level repeaters, and an occasional simplex or
> > packet QSO, or some folks doing EME... NADA.
>
> You're like the guy living on a tiny island who ponders how small the
> world is. If you don't know of something, it can't exist.
>
> Dave K8MN

You are speaking from first hand experience, huh, ASSHOLE?

4537. Re: Re:<<<I LOVE SEX>>>

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 15:42:41 UTC
From: Jimick <jimick1nospam@nohotmail.com>
Message-ID: <RtsI8.149$Oj7.67350@typhoon.ne.ipsvc.net>
Source record: 43806

LMAO.....

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF18CC6.20903@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> sue@revelations.sh wrote:
>
> > toneladas del aficionado de las fotograf&#65533;as de los vid&#65533;os de los webcams
de vidas... &#65533;pero especialmente sin censuras!!
> >
> > Nueva Abertura : http://www.giga-porno.com
> >
> Gacias seniorita sue, de los muchos amateuros radio aficionados de los
rrap es los cuckaroachas,
>
> especialmente los signor que nonbre es "Brian P Burke" y N0iIMD. Brian
requestamunte muchos
>
> email de informationado de los fotografias es de los webcams es vidas.
> Gracias de los N0iMD.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

4538. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 16:05:18 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <2PsI8.7265$LC3.536770@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43807

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:acsd6fvpd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
That "was" the case and is changing and has changed to
> the point where the liklihood that testing will end is
> all but certain.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

From what I have been reading, there is a pretty good chance the Russians among others will sink the no-code ship without a bubble. The issue is so low on the scale of things that one objection will cause its deferral as I believe has happened at two previous WARCs. The fat lady has yet to limber up the old vocal cords.

On a personal level, I think Morse has more than outlived its regulatory usefulness but at the same time the howling and gnashing of teeth would be a sound to behold.

Beers,
Dick N&#65533;BK

4539. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 17:05:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527130547.20019.00000307@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 43808

In article <QliI8.3931$_t7.114951317@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.
>>
>> "Evem Mohammed" could have moved mountains (plural) with
>> the aid of modern earth-moving equipment.
>>
>> Are we to embrace Islam on Memorial Day in the USA?
>
>Hey, pipe down, Mister. You might get yerself called a Communist on
>Memorial Day, like I did.

No problem, I get called worst names on the other 364 days.

All for having opinions not in the approved mainstream of
US amateur radio.

It would seem that all MUST march in ranks, united under the
Newington banner (or the like), chanting the same mantra,
"the ARS is all about working DX on HF with CW!"

4540. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 17:06:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527130651.10184.00000311@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 43809

In article <6SgI8.90396$Md6.3020010@news1.east.cox.net>, "Paul Peterson"
<pp23@cox.net> writes:

>Amateur Radio has changed. That is a fact. The reason it
>changed, is that you can't build a radio cheaper than you can buy it.

That's been true for decades. One of the reason Heathkits became so popular
is that the cost of one was usually less than the cost of new parts.

I once compared the 1959 cost of a Heath DX-40 with the cost of the parts
as listed in the 1959 Newark catalog. The DX-40 cost less.

The way homebrewers save money is by using parts on hand, surplus
or obtained for cheap.
>
>All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.

Not true. I'm still around, and there are lots more like me.
>
>What that leaves, is the Hams who like to interface things to a
>pre-built radio. There is a lot of experimentation and fun in doing
>those projects.

Sure - that's one aspect. But there are also those of us who build from
scratch, and plenty of kits.
>
>Radio is not the fascinating thing it was in the 60's and before.

Maybe not to you......

>Radio is boring since the invention of the CD. Not many people
>stay up all night to here a far away AM station like we did as kids.

I stay up to work far off CW stations.
>
>Radio is an appliance to Americans, not as much a hobby anymore.

Most technology is an appliance to most Americans - cars, TVs, computers, etc.
>
>The numbers will never again reach what there was at the peak
>of Ham radio.

??

When was the "peak"?

>The commercialization of RF to one or two
>companies in America will continue, and Ham radio will go to

>the same place that model railroaders, and slot car racing went.

Those things are still quite popular.

So when was the "peak" of amateur radio? How many hams were there then?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4541. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 17:14:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF26967.98292533@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43810

N2EY wrote:
> So when was the "peak" of amateur radio? How many hams were there then?

Absolute peak or relative peak?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4542. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 17:41:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CF26FAF.C3287261@earthlink.net>
Source record: 43811
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

AB8MQ wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CF1AE4B.6BB35C9B@earthlink.net...
> > stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:<44da9d49d3dccaa147cb64ea92af10b5.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > > Stewart, let's cut the nonsense and I'll ask a serious question - why
> > > > do you seem to believe that amateur radio stopped with spark gap in
> the
> > > > early 1900's?
> > >
> > > I don't - you misinterpreted the point of my post.
> > >
> > > What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less relevant
> > > in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating. As this trend
> > > continues, the ARS is losing it's PURPOSE... this is especially true
> > > on the VHF/UHF bands, whose use has dwindled to the point that they
> > > are VIRTUALLY UNUSED. Even 2m has no more than modest activity -
> > > other than a few high-level repeaters, and an occasional simplex or
> > > packet QSO, or some folks doing EME... NADA.
> >
> > You're like the guy living on a tiny island who ponders how small the
> > world is. If you don't know of something, it can't exist.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You are speaking from first hand experience, huh, ASSHOLE?

I don't know if you really have anything to say, Roger. You didn't even allow the death of your mother in mid-April (published in the Moundsville Echo) to slow your torrent of filth. If you'd like to continue those of your sociopathic rants about me or my wife, I'll be happy to speak with Chief Stenger about you once again (as I cautioned you when we met face-to-face at the March meeting of Marshall County ARES). As you know, he has seen the posts you've made to and about me and my wife in the past and he seemed well aware of you.

quite sincerely,

Dave Heil K8MN

4543. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 17:47:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tiuI8.4195$c%1.123855141@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43812

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:2PsI8.7265$LC3.536770@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:acsd6fvpd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> That "was" the case and is changing and has changed to
> > the point where the liklihood that testing will end is
> > all but certain.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> From what I have been reading, there is a pretty good chance the Russians
> among others will sink the no-code ship without a bubble. The issue is so
> low on the scale of things that one objection will cause its deferral as I
> believe has happened at two previous WARCs. The fat lady has yet to
> limber up the old vocal cords.
>
> On a personal level, I think Morse has more than outlived its regulatory
> usefulness but at the same time the howling and gnashing of teeth would be
> a sound to behold.
>
> Beers,
> Dick NBK

```
Maybe if we held the oil deal hostage...

;^)
```

4544. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 17:52:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gnuI8.4200$912.123978021@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43813

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020527130547.20019.00000307@mb-fa.aol.com...
> In article <QliI8.3931$_t7.114951317@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> >Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.
> >>
> >> "Evem Mohammed" could have moved mountains (plural) with
> >> the aid of modern earth-moving equipment.
> >>
> >> Are we to embrace Islam on Memorial Day in the USA?
> >
> >Hey, pipe down, Mister. You might get yerself called a Communist on
> >Memorial Day, like I did.
>
> No problem, I get called worst names on the other 364 days.
>
> All for having opinions not in the approved mainstream of
> US amateur radio.
>
> It would seem that all MUST march in ranks, united under the
> Newington banner (or the like), chanting the same mantra,
> "the ARS is all about working DX on HF with CW!"

Len, I march to a different drummer even though I am an ARRL member. The Catholics gave me a good start at reading, and reasoning. No need to throw it all away on cronyism.

4545. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 17:57:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1sul8.4201$RZ1.123775126@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43814

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020526194534.26353.00000731@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >There is certainly more work and experimentation being done than most of
> >us are even 90% aware of.
>
> I am glad to hear that exerimentation is going on, but I sure wish that
90% of
> it would be documented somewhere. It would be great to be able to show
the FCC
> more of what hams are doing.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I'm still waiting on QST to publish Valentine's satellite QSO with the telescope visual on the satellite, and the telescope motor acting as the az-el antenna rotor. What issue do you think that's going to go in?

Any news on his code exam?

Brian/N0iMD

4546. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:03:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <oxuI8.4204$Z32.124138724@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43815

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CF26967.98292533@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > So when was the "peak" of amateur radio? How many hams were there then?
>
> Absolute peak or relative peak?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

How about the "smoothed" peak?

4547. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:05:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <UzuI8.4205$942.124151027@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43816

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CF26FAF.C3287261@earthlink.net...
> AB8MQ wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CF1AE4B.6BB35C9B@earthlink.net...
> > > stewart wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:<44da9d49d3dccaa147cb64ea92af10b5.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > > > Stewart, let's cut the nonsense and I'll ask a serious question -
why
> > > > > do you seem to believe that amateur radio stopped with spark gap
in
> > the
> > > > > early 1900's?
> > > >
> > > > I don't - you misinterpreted the point of my post.
> > > >
> > > > What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less
relevant
> > > > in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating. As this trend
> > > > continues, the ARS is losing it's PURPOSE... this is especially true
> > > > on the VHF/UHF bands, whose use has dwindled to the point that they
> > > > are VIRTUALLY UNUSED. Even 2m has no more than modest activity -
> > > > other than a few high-level repeaters, and an occasional simplex or
> > > > packet QSO, or some folks doing EME... NADA.
> > >
> > > You're like the guy living on a tiny island who ponders how small the
> > > world is. If you don't know of something, it can't exist.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > You are speaking from first hand experience, huh, ASSHOLE?
>
> I don't know if you really have anything to say, Roger. You didn't even
> allow the death of your mother in mid-April (published in the
> Moundsville Echo) to slow your torrent of filth. If you'd like to
> continue those of your sociopathic rants about me or my wife, I'll be
> happy to speak with Chief Stenger about you once again (as I cautioned
> you when we met face-to-face at the March meeting of Marshall County
> ARES). As you know, he has seen the posts you've made to and about me
> and my wife in the past and he seemed well aware of you.
>

> quite sincerely,
>
> Dave Heil K8MN

Holy Cow! Another ham stalker? And I thought they we all in 3-land?

4548. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:21:46 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF2793A.5020202@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43817

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020527130547.20019.00000307@mb-fa.aol.com...
>
>>In article <QliI8.3931$_t7.114951317@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
>>Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>>Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.
>>>>>
>>>>"Evem Mohammed" could have moved mountains (plural) with
>>>>the aid of modern earth-moving equipment.
>>>>
>>>>Are we to embrace Islam on Memorial Day in the USA?
>>>>
>>>Hey, pipe down, Mister. You might get yerself called a Communist on
>>>Memorial Day, like I did.
>>>
>>No problem, I get called worst names on the other 364 days.
>>
>>All for having opinions not in the approved mainstream of
>>US amateur radio.
>>
>>It would seem that all MUST march in ranks, united under the
>>Newington banner (or the like), chanting the same mantra,
>>"the ARS is all about working DX on HF with CW!"
>>
>
> Len, I march to a different drummer even though I am an ARRL member. The
> Catholics gave me a good start at reading, and reasoning. No need to throw
> it all away on cronyism.

I wonder over which cliff that drummer is headed? Sorry comrade but you
have mistaken the drummer you are marching to. It is really a pied piper
that you and your co-dependent crony Len are following under the guise
of no-code everywhere, anywhere at all.
dididit dididididit dit-dit dah
73
KR4AJ
--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4549. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:29:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <WVuI8.2678$Dt4.121020685@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43819

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020527005544.02458.00000641@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
> >From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
> >Date: 05/26/02 21:46 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205261746.32491053@posting.google.com>
>
> >Why not open up 1.25M for a new NoCode Novice Class? At least then we
> >could start getting families/friends/collegues involved with Amateur
> >Radio. Otherwise, why not just let the public use these frequencies?
> >They aren't being used for anything.
>
> Just because the band is not channelized from wall to wall with
repeaters
> does NOT mean the band is not being used.

At least on 2m, a callsign goes out every hour.

4550. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:31:38 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@BARF14313org.net>
Message-ID: <actttqhum0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43818
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flame

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message
news:acmsc2$7b8$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> wrote in message
> news:3CEC3CDB.EEF43F4B@mailcity.net...
> >
> >
> > 2test wogie banged on his keyboard and attempted to write:
> >
> > > Maybe you should get a second one, that way, you can get a keybaord
> that has a comma key Or at least English lessons, you Mexican refugee.
> > ^^^^^^^
> > You as well, wogie, there should be a comma after the word "key"
> > and the word "or" should not be capitalized. You really should not
> > post when you are in your drunken stupor.
>
> There also should not be a comma after way.
>
>
AB8MQ@OVIS.NET wrote:

2Test Wiseman = REMF, Netcopped SLee, & President of the
Lavender Lads of Glendale WV

50 year old lives with his mommy, no life, no job.

4551. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:41:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF27DBA.7413835@att.net>
Source record: 43820

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:acsd6fvpd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> That "was" the case and is changing and has changed to
> > the point where the liklihood that testing will end is
> > all but certain.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> From what I have been reading, there is a pretty good chance the Russians
> among others will sink the no-code ship without a bubble.

Well, well....so there is some life left in the old CW machine, after all.
No surprise, some societies find it very easy to refrain from tossing out
cheap, useful things.

> The issue is so
> low on the scale of things that one objection will cause its deferral as I
> believe has happened at two previous WARCs. The fat lady has yet to
> limber up the old vocal cords.

but, but, but (splutter) you can't DO that!!! It just ain't **RIGHT**!!!

>
>
> On a personal level, I think Morse has more than outlived its regulatory
> usefulness

Can't argue with your logic. If that was the only facet to the problem it
would have been gone long ago with my support.

> but at the same time the howling and gnashing of teeth would be
> a sound to behold.
>

I think I'll invest in a new set of earplugs. I can always use 'em when
mowing the lawn, also...

>
> Beers,
> Dick Nï¿½BK

ditto fm EX

4552. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:42:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <T6vI8.2692$fz4.121359567@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43821

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF2793A.5020202@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020527130547.20019.00000307@mb-fa.aol.com...

> >>It would seem that all MUST march in ranks, united under the
> >>Newington banner (or the like), chanting the same mantra,
> >>"the ARS is all about working DX on HF with CW!"
> >>
> >
> > Len, I march to a different drummer even though I am an ARRL member.
The
> > Catholics gave me a good start at reading, and reasoning. No need to
throw
> > it all away on cronyism.
>
> I wonder over which cliff that drummer is headed?

I wonder? I sure don't think we need superflous license classes, nor do we
need a code exam. Lets see if we can stay alive long enough to see how this
all plays out.

> Sorry comrade but you
> have mistaken the drummer you are marching to. It is really a pied piper
> that you and your co-dependent crony Len are following under the guise
> of no-code everywhere, anywhere at all.

Don't call me comrade, Slick. And Len can handle his own affairs. No
co-dependency required.

4553. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:43:35 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <r7vl8.37347$jm.3728352@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 43822
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:g092fu8tvoqp63c6oa4ul74d6l35iu5t00@4ax.com...
> The one real live problem I've heard about on MURS (as far as
> non-certified radios) was with Ham operators using their 2m radios on
> MURS.
>
> The fox hunts will turn up some of their own people.

I hear this typical "garbage" from CBers all the time, Hams operating out of band. However where are all of those so called "Hams" operating out of band, and getting busted? I see far more CBers getting busted for freebanding, and running power. In fact several CBers have said they even heard me ID on the freeband using my Ham Callsign. Since I never operate there it's clear to me that somebody was bootlegging on HF using my call. Then to claim same instance as "proof positive" that Hams operate out of band, stupidly ID'ing themselves, does not persuade me in the least. Any further argument runs into the same problem, just because somebody hears a Ham callsign, does not imply it belongs to the person using it on the air. So until somebody can provide proof positive the accusation is basically BS.

The idea that Hams would limit themselves to 2 watts on five frequencies on MURS, compared with up to 1500 watts over 4 MHz on 2m, is so ridiculous as to not even be worthy of serious consideration.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

4554. Re: Off Topic...help Find?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:44:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527144442.24062.00000515@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 43823

In article <20020527010431.02458.00000644@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Searched them all and didn't find what I was looking for....Need a
>Cessna 152/172/182/185 series model with a wing span 8-12"
>
> Oh well...the search continues....

This is a reminder to all: The purpose of this newsgroup is to DISCUSS AMATEUR RADIO POLICY matters.

Such regulations INCLUDE policy in regards to GETTING INTO amateur radio through licensing and the governmental regulations related to that.

Model building, including "scale" models has been long enjoyed by thousands the world over since before WW2 and there are plenty of other venues to discuss, ask questions concerning that particular hobby.

Neither is this newsgroup a venue for other off-topic postings concerning railroads, flying, personal gunnery, or the like not having any direct application to amateur radio.

The grant of an amateur radio license does NOT grant immunity from actions of controlling, shouting-down "lesser" individuals, or being generally uncivil through personal insults directed at individuals having opposing viewpoints (signing "putz" using a Yiddish pejorative).

All of that applies to ALL DAYS of the year, not just a national holiday in one nation.

Leonard H. Anderson
Sgt, SigC, US Army, RA16408336 (1952-1960)
71st Signal Service Battalion, 8235th Army Unit, Far East Command (1953-1956)

The 71st lost 23 members (KIA) of the battalion in the first two weeks of the Korean War, June 1950.

4555. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:44:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527144442.24062.00000514@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 43824

In article <J8qI8.3423$HN.165475466@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> >> It's been there since 1914, Lennie. Stood up pretty good, I'd say.
>> >
>> >The first US amateur radio licenses were granted in 1912, not 1914.
>>
>> So much the better! That's even two years MORE!...
>>
>> >The first US radio club was organized in 1909...the first such in the
>> >world...it is still active.
>>
>> yep.
>
>Same members.

Not quite. :-) Carl Stevenson is a member of the RCA (Radio Club of America) which was the first-ever radio interest club in the world, formed in 1909. Neither Carl, you, myself, or any other participant in this newsgroup were in existance in 1909...or 1912 when the first US radio regulatory agency came into being.

The ARRL was formed in 1914 as a local New England radio club to act as a substitute Western Union telegraph relay service to cheat costs of telegrams. The origins of the ARRL are NOT as noble, good, and pure as their PR would make them out to be.

The first two trials of a "national traffic service" message relay system organized by the ARRL were failures. That happened after 1914 when there were a number of different amateur radio clubs and organizations vying for members.

The "two hundred meters and down" banishment of amateurs to wavelengths shorter than 200 meters by the government came about through interference of radio amateurs to other radio services. It was NOT some noble, good, and true effort to "explore and pioneer the short waves" for international radio communications as has been made out by cult followers. It was simply that licensed radio amateurs were unable to avoid interfering with other services.

All of that is recorded history but the not-so-good side is selectively omitted or kept to an absolute minimum. That is necessary to keep myths alive and to preserve the image of a "service" (to country and citizens) with pseudo-military and religious overtones.

Amateur radio has always been a primarily recreational activity, a hobby. It has been emblazoned with false glory and honor by those who have a need for such things in order to make them feel better in their minds. Some, as in the original quote above, become confused on facts when awash in myths. Their problem, not mine, although they cannot admit to it.

Electronics and radio can be absolutely fascinating as a subject. To some, not all. We all have a choice. The "belongers" and myth-worshippers step in and DEMAND demonstrations of "EFFORT and COMMITMENT" to THEM by meeting a morse code test for an amateur radio license.

That demand is truly preposterous, a monstrous elevation of themselves and their inherent nobility that is perverse in its self-grandeur. They are radio gods and that is their justification, their belief system in a false religion of Self.

Laws and regulations must reflect their own inherent superiority. There is no arguing or discussion with gods. It is a fantastic and very memorable thing, appropriate for a Memorial Day? Not.

4556. Re: My Apologies!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 18:54:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527145442.12387.00001091@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 43825

>Subject: My Apologies!
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 05/27/02 09:00 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <uf4ack7sgeap26@corp.supernews.com>
>
>Hell's Bells, you really WERE looking for a
>plastic model kit and not making fun of all the
>off-topic postings here lately! OUCH!

Apology not needed but appreciated none-the-less.

Thanks! es 73

Steve, K4YZ

4557. Re: Scientology Takes Control of Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 19:06:33 UTC
From: Dan Garvin <noaddress@noisp.com>
Message-ID: <1tvl8.197$5u5.66527@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 43835
Cross-posted to: alt.religion.scientology,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I hope not and don't think so.

Everybody makes mistakes. Whittaker was good in other movies. Even Barry Pepper was pretty good in Green Mile.

Dang

"Rev Norle Enturbulata" <noearthlight2k@nohotmail.com> wrote in message news:acsstm$9lj$1@helle.btinternet.com...
> That'd be hilarious to the folks who wrote "Frequency" (Dennis Quaid),
> wouldn't it?
>
> Does this then confirm that Whittaker is clam fodder? I mean, why else
> would ANYONE work with the same bunch that gave us all that classic for all
> time, "Battlefield Earth"?
>
> "Phil" <Phil_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
> news:abc7o9028ja@drn.newsguy.com...
> > From the ARRL.org web site
> >
> > Ham radio could have role in Phenomenon sequel: Amateur Radio is poised to
> hit
> > the big screen yet again in a movie tentatively titled Phenomenon II.
> Phenomenon
> > debuted in 1996 and featured John Travolta and his ham operator friend
> Forest
> > Whitaker. In one scene, Travolta's character appears to be able to copy
> RTTY
> > transmissions by ear. For the original Phenomenon movie, ARRL provided
> several
> > props for the ham radio shack. The sequel is still in the very early
> stages of
> > development. A researcher working on checking facts in the script
> contacted ARRL
> > to ask if operators actually used the term "CQ" when initiating contacts.
> She
> > also told ARRL Media Relations Manager Jennifer Hagy, N1TDY, that the
> > possibility exists for the creation of a television series based on the
> > Phenomenon movies. Hagy offered further assistance if needed. No further
> details
> > were immediately available.

> >
>
>

4558. It Was Nice While It Lasted.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 19:21:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527152122.12387.00001092@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 43826

>Subject: Re: Off Topic...help Find?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/27/02 14:44 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020527144442.24062.00000515@mb-ck.aol.com>

>This is a reminder to all: The purpose of this newsgroup is to
>DISCUSS AMATEUR RADIO POLICY matters.

Well damn, Lennie...we shared a civil moment and I thought, for just a moment, that a breath of fresh air had been breathed into this "relationship".

Then you kicked back into the rant mode.

And I will bookmark this post, Lennie...everytime you dive off into technical matters or take one of your OWN diversions, I will copy your own words back to you.

>Neither is this newsgroup a venue for other off-topic postings
>concerning railroads, flying, personal gunnery, or the like not
>having any direct application to amateur radio

Herr NG Reichsmarschall has spoken, so ya'll klick to and obey!

Actually, I brought my question here because in my PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE in Amateur Radio, there seem to be common threads of interest that permeate the community.

We "get into" it for a mutual interest in radios. We stay in it because we find a thread of other commonalities with other operators...a fellowship, if you will. A "relationship" you too could enjoy, Lennie, if you'd only allow yourself.

>The grant of an amateur radio license does NOT grant immunity
>from actions of controlling, shouting-down "lesser" individuals,
>or being generally uncivil through personal insults directed at
>individuals having opposing viewpoints (signing "putz" using a
>Yiddish pejorative)

Yes yes, Lennie...we know your position on such things...all 30 tons of it.

>Leonard H. Anderson
>Sgt, SigC, US Army, RA16408336 (1952-1960)
>71st Signal Service Battalion, 8235th Army Unit, Far East Command
>(1953-1956)
>
>The 71st lost 23 members (KIA) of the battalion in the first two weeks
>of the Korean War, June 1950.

Two things, Lennie...First you go ballistic on what does and does not constitute appropriate NG content, but then you sign the post with your veteran statistics. Please enlighten me as to how any of your non-combatant Army tour is germane to Amateur Radio newsgroup content appropriateness....?!?!

Secondly, what in the hell are you trying to pull off by claiming membership in a unit that suffered terrible combat losses three years before you were posted there? Hero by association? If that were true, I am due about 100 Purple Hearts, a couple dozen Bronze and Silver Stars, and at least two Congressional Medal's of Honor. I was in the same units as those who were awarded them, Lennie. Doesn't that count?

Do you know how really, REALLY foolish that looks? Those deaths occured three years before you joined it. So please tell me how any of that was germane to your rant on NG appropriateness.

Just wondering.

Steve, K4YZ

4559. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 19:23:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527152353.12387.00001093@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 43827

>Subject: Re: Code Question
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/27/02 14:44 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020527144442.24062.00000514@mb-ck.aol.com>

>
>Laws and regulations must reflect their own inherent
>superiority. There is no arguing or discussion with gods.
>It is a fantastic and very memorable thing, appropriate for
>a Memorial Day? Not.

Too bad you couldn't have responded to the Memorial Day greetings made herein in humble fashion...Instead you use it as an opportunity to (once more) take another swipe at those who you hate more than all others.

How pitiful.

4560. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 19:41:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527154143.05208.00000102@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 43829

In article <3CF1880C.F53D3B4D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >> An interesting hypothesis, Cecil, but it has no basis in fact.
>> >
>> >Of course it does, Jim. I am relating personal experience.
>>
>> Your post was written as if the information in it referred to everyone, not
>> just yourself.
>
>I have said before that my posts are my personal opinions often based on
>my personal experiences.

So are everyone else's.

Your hypothesis attempted to explain why CW ops are, as a general rule, so well behaved compared to 'phone ops. For your hypothesis to be valid, your observations would have to be true for practically all CW operators, not just you.

(For proof of mode-related behavior, just look at FCC enforcement letters and NALs and see what modes are used for practically all violations).

> I am not unique.

Everyone is unique, even identical twins.

>I was describing how hams like
>me react to emotionalism while trying to send CW or type on a keyboard.

That's fine. You did not make that clear in your original description.

However, your hypothesis attempted to explain why CW ops are, as a general rule, so well behaved compared to 'phone ops. For your hypothesis to be valid, your observations would have to be true for practically all CW operators, not just you. Your description of yourself may be accurate, but unless it applies to practically all CW operators, it does not prove your hypothesis. Basic Logic 101.

>I'm sorry you can't stand the truth but that's just the way it is. Some
>people cannot send CW while they are angry and therefore cannot vent their
>anger while sending CW. Why do you refuse to accept that reality?

I don't "refuse" or "deny" that reality at all. Your hypothesis attempted to explain why CW ops are, as a general rule, so well behaved compared to 'phone ops. For your hypothesis to be valid, your observations would have to be true for practically all CW operators, not just you. Your description of yourself may be accurate, but unless it applies to practically all CW operators, it does not prove your hypothesis.

Some people can send CW while they are angry and therefore can vent their anger while sending CW. Same for keyboards. They simply control their behavior.

In other words, "some" does not automatically mean "all" or even "most".

Some people cannot talk into a microphone while they are angry and therefore cannot vent their anger while using voice modes on the air.
>
>> >Are you implying that I am lying?
>>
>> Nope. Just mistaken.
>
>How can I be mistaken?

Your hypothesis of general behavior by hams on CW is not proved by your description of yourself.

>I described exactly how hams like me react to
>emotionalism while sending CW or typing on a keyboard.

That's fine. All hams are not like you.

>I am reporting facts.

OK

>There is no possibility of a mistake.

Are you perfect? If not, there is always the possibility of a mistake.

In fact, the claim that there is no possibility of a mistake is, in itself, a mistake. It therefore proves itself false.

> Everyone is NOT like you.

Where do I claim that?

>I am the only example needed to prove you wrong.

Have I put forth any hypothesis as to why hams on CW are so well behaved? Not that I know of. I simply point out that, according to FCC enforcement actions and my own experience, hams on CW are, as a rule, practically all well behaved. As a general rule, on CW there is practically no cussing, no jamming, no heated arguments, no stuff to make the ARS look bad that I know of. There may be some, but I haven't heard it and nobody here has been able to provide concrete examples. Compare that record to voice modes.

Your hypothesis attempted to explain why CW ops are, as a general rule, so well behaved compared to 'phone ops. For your hypothesis to be valid, your

observations would have to be true for practically all CW operators, not just you.
You have not proved your hypothesis.

>> > Everyone in the world is NOT just like you.
>>
>> Of course they're not. Where did I say they were?
>
>You are trying to tell me that my emotional reactions are not possible
>i.e. "has no basis in fact".

Nope. You are mistaken.

I am saying your hypothesis has no basis in fact because you have not shown your observations to be the general rule among hams using CW.

>You are the one who is mistaken.

Only if I accept your invalid logic, or think you are serious about any of this.

>My emotional
>reactions are a fact and your words cannot change those facts.

Nobody is debating your emotions.

>You're not going omnipotent on us again, are you?

Not me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4561. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 19:41:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527154144.05208.00000103@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 43828

In article <3CF26967.98292533@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> So when was the "peak" of amateur radio? How many hams were there then?
>
>Absolute peak or relative peak?
>--
Both.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4562. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 20:19:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF294DA.376281C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43830

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Well, well....so there is some life left in the old CW machine, after all.
> No surprise, some societies find it very easy to refrain from tossing out
> cheap, useful things.

You are delusional if you think anyone who matters wants to "toss out" CW.
OTOH, the Morse code *requirement* is NOT cheap and has outlived its
usefulness.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4563. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 20:38:49 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <jr55fug07uu8io8rng7778ua6lknlia88q@4ax.com>
Source record: 43831
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Mon, 27 May 2002 18:43:35 GMT, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

>
>"G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:g092fu8tvoqp63c6oa4ul74d6l35iu5t00@4ax.com...
>> The one real live problem I've heard about on MURS (as far as
>> non-certified radios) was with Ham operators using their 2m radios on
>> MURS.
>>
>> The fox hunts will turn up some of their own people.
>
>I hear this typical "garbage" from CBers all the time,
>Hams operating out of band.

I heard it from a Ham.

>So until somebody can provide proof positive the accusation
>is basically BS.

You'd have a hard time convincing the person who posted about the
situation.

>The idea that Hams would limit themselves to 2 watts on five frequencies
>on MURS, compared with up to 1500 watts over 4 MHz on 2m, is so
>ridiculous as to not even be worthy of serious consideration.

It would seem ridiculous to limit themselves to 2 watts on MURS, they
were running well in excess of 2 watts on MURS.

On with the fox-hunts.

Mike

4564. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 20:39:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF2999E.397D59E4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43833

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> Your hypothesis attempted to explain why CW ops are, as a general rule, so well
> behaved compared to 'phone ops. For your hypothesis to be valid, your
> observations would have to be true for practically all CW operators, not just
> you.

It was a hypothesis based on personal experience and may or may not apply to
the majority of hams. Just how many hams do you know who can send code when
their hands are shaking in anger. I know I cannot. I assume there are many
more hams like me. In fact, I would challenge anyone to send decent code when
their hands are shaking in anger.

> > I am not unique.
>
> Everyone is unique, even identical twins.

Are you saying that I am the only human being whose hands shake when he is
extremely angry? Get real. I would say it is extremely common.

> >I was describing how hams like
> >me react to emotionalism while trying to send CW or type on a keyboard.
>
> That's fine. You did not make that clear in your original description.

I have made it clear in subsequent postings. Why are you still arguing?

> >I'm sorry you can't stand the truth but that's just the way it is. Some
> >people cannot send CW while they are angry and therefore cannot vent their
> >anger while sending CW. Why do you refuse to accept that reality?
>
> I don't "refuse" or "deny" that reality at all.

Then why did you say "it has no basis in fact"? That certainly sounds like
a denial and a refusal to accept reality to me. What I posted is 100% factual.

> Some people can send CW while they are angry and therefore can vent their
> anger while sending CW. Same for keyboards. They simply control their behavior.

And I wasn't describing people like that. I was speaking from experience and
describing people like me. Sorry you refuse to accept that fact. I would
estimate that people who can send CW while extremely angry are a small
minority of the ham population.

> Your hypothesis of general behavior by hams on CW is not proved by your
> description of yourself.

You are mistaken. It was not a hypothesis of general behavior. It was a description of hams like me of which there must be a considerable number.

> >There is no possibility of a mistake.
>
> Are you perfect? If not, there is always the possibility of a mistake.

I am perfect in reporting my capabilities while under emotional stress. There is *NO* possibility of a mistake. I am an ordinary prudent man.

> In fact, the claim that there is no possibility of a mistake is, in itself, a
> mistake. It therefore proves itself false.

Bull$hit! I cannot send CW when I am very angry. That is a fact. No mistake is possible.

> Have I put forth any hypothesis as to why hams on CW are so well behaved?

Yes, and my personal experience contradicts what you said.

> You have not proved your hypothesis.

My hypothesis is that hams like me cannot send CW while extremely angry. That is a fact not subject to question.

> >You are trying to tell me that my emotional reactions are not possible
> >i.e. "has no basis in fact".
>
> Nope. You are mistaken.

Go back and read your posting. You are either mistaken or lying.

> >My emotional
> >reactions are a fact and your words cannot change those facts.
>
> Nobody is debating your emotions.

You are. You said my inability to send CW while extremely angry has "no basis in fact". Go back and read your own posting.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4565. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 20:40:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gws6exd.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43832
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 26 May 2002 18:10:55 -0700, stewart wrote:

>Yes - I think the "Boston Tea Party" analogy is a DAMN good one.

Do you really understand what the Boston Tea Party was all about
and who were the participants?

Hint - it had nothing to do with what we all learned in the 4th
grade about taxation and the rebelling against the King and had
everything to to with preserving the import monopoly that the
"patriots" had going from being competed with.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4566. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 20:41:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF299EF.216E9A0D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43834

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CF26967.98292533@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> So when was the "peak" of amateur radio? How many hams were there then?
> > >
> >Absolute peak or relative peak?

> Both.

Then we need the per capita statistics.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4567. Re: A Peaceful Memorial Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 21:51:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@mindspringnospam.com>
Message-ID: <acu9pspkf1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43836

May I second this post Steve? Thank you and all the others for your service.

Dan/W4NTI

1964-1968 USAF
1971-1979 USArmy

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020527032137.02480.00000715@mb-cb.aol.com...
> This year more than most, I hope we can all take a moment to reflect and
> offer a silent prayer of thanks and respect to all those who have given or lost
> thier lives for our Nation.
>
> To all of those of you who have served in the Armed Forces or supported
> them, may this day bring you peace and comfort.
>
> Thank you for having been there.
>
> Paratus et Vigilans
>
> Steve Robeson, LPN
> GySgt, USMC, retired
> Winchester, TN

4568. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 22:11:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020527181115.12333.00000882@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 43837

>Subject: Re: Code Question
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/27/02 13:05 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020527130547.20019.00000307@mb-fa.aol.com>

>No problem, I get called worst names on the other 364 days.
>
>All for having opinions not in the approved mainstream of
>US amateur radio.

No....for not having your facts right and getting caught with your virtual britches down on more occiasions than we care to see them!

4569. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 22:37:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gws8p0f.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 43838
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 27 May 2002 02:29:22 GMT, Paul Peterson wrote:

>Not many people
>stay up all night to here a far away AM station like we did as kids.

We can thank the broadcast industry who found ways to drop in local
or regional AMs where the clear channel "holes" were and the
manufacvturers who now make AM broadcast transmitters that are much
more reliable and therefore do not need to go off the air on Sunday
nights for "maintenance".

>Radio is an appliance to Americans, not as much a hobby anymore.

It's our job as hams to make it a hobby again.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4570. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 23:01:15 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acuejfckk0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43839
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CF26FAF.C3287261@earthlink.net...
> AB8MQ wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CF1AE4B.6BB35C9B@earthlink.net...
> > > stewart wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:<44da9d49d3dccaa147cb64ea92af10b5.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > > > Stewart, let's cut the nonsense and I'll ask a serious question -
why
> > > > > do you seem to believe that amateur radio stopped with spark gap
in
> > the
> > > > > early 1900's?
> > > >
> > > > I don't - you misinterpreted the point of my post.
> > > >
> > > > What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less
relevant
> > > > in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating. As this trend
> > > > continues, the ARS is losing it's PURPOSE... this is especially true
> > > > on the VHF/UHF bands, whose use has dwindled to the point that they
> > > > are VIRTUALLY UNUSED. Even 2m has no more than modest activity -
> > > > other than a few high-level repeaters, and an occasional simplex or
> > > > packet QSO, or some folks doing EME... NADA.
> > >
> > > You're like the guy living on a tiny island who ponders how small the
> > > world is. If you don't know of something, it can't exist.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > You are speaking from first hand experience, huh, ASSHOLE?
>
> I don't know if you really have anything to say, Roger.

There's a whole WORLD of things you don't know, ASSHOLE. In fact by the
expression on your gorilla-like face, It'd be hard to believe that you know
anything.
Funny, the First amendment allows me to have the opinion that you are a
narrow-minded, stupid son of a bitch. See you engage in the very same
tactics you say I use with Jim here.

For instance, did you get touch with Carl Stevenson's local police, too?

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Subject: Re: Carl Steveson-Super Racist was: Morse causes amnesia
Date: 1998/04/14
Message-ID: <01bd6762$7860aee0$0100005a@wa6vse>#1/1
References: <352AB6F4.9D60189E@erols.com>
<1998040806005101.CAA22437@ladder01.news.aol.com> <352BF59A.31C4@clinet.fi>
<01bd65c7$27902fa0$0100005a@wa6vse> <3530C329.3B3A@clinet.fi>
<MPG.f9a90514be7d42a98999e@news.planet.net> <6gquog$5de@btc3.up.net>
<MPG.f9ad63be75f34ef98999f@news.planet.net>
<01bd664f$07a5d540$0100005a@wa6vse> <35321C78.4D63@clinet.fi>
<01bd66e6$4b14af80$0100005a@wa6vse> <3532A345.7D9@clinet.fi>
Organization: Consulting Engineer
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

Dave Heil <k8mn@clinet.fi> wrote in article <3532A345.7D9@clinet.fi>...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >
> > Gee, Dave ... I have no problem with that (it being there for
> > all to see) ... anyone with half a brain can see that it was
> > a comparison of pro-code attitudes to racist attitudes and not
> > a racist remark in itself.
> > (of course, that leaves you out as far as understanding is
> > concerned)
>
>
> I did not accuse you of being a racist. I have serious problems with
> the type of name-calling you resorted to, Carl. That's why I'm glad
> it's there to be seen. The crap you spewed forth demonstrates what kind
> of individual you are. The last line of your post above is typical
> "Carl".
> You refer to yourself as Libertarian but the freedom's you espouse seem
> only to extend to yourself. You deny them to others frequently.
>
> Dave OH2/K8MN
>

Dave,

I have never denied you any rights. I have only said I think
you're a stupid, ignorant, facist, asshole. You have every
right to your opinions and to voice them no matter how disgusting
they may be. I hope my postion is perfectly clear.

- --
Carl - wa6vse
wa6vse@fast.net
NCI #1052

Join No Code International!
Support the modernization of ham radio and
help to assure its survival into the 21st century!

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBNTLtwZe+N6+q84HiEQJ8TACeLnw3lWRj65wIV0rYsZnzsOapEHsAoMiG
5aRypOlWaofb1qEqG39GQN9o
=RQ3v
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

Learn to use a killfile on my posts, dumbass.

> You [whining]

Yet you don't allow anything to try to stop you from censoring others. You can fucking say whatever the fuck you want, but you seem to want to censor others.

So just fuck off, you slobbering dullard. You have a history of causing trouble with people you disagree with as well, and I have some of those posts archived like the above one. Now you're stalking me? Bwhahahahahaha!!!!!!

> If you'd like to continue those of your sociopathic rants about me or my wife,

I can have opinions, Heil, you fucking asshole. And my opinion of you is that you are a fucking retard. Use a fucking post filer/killfile or just fuck off.

>I'll be happy to speak with Chief Stenger about you once again (as I cautioned
> you when we met face-to-face at the March meeting of Marshall County
> ARES).

Stalker boy, you go right ahead. I still have the freedom of speech, you neo-nazi asshole. I have evidence that the only reason you went to the ARES meeting is to try to stalk me, too, ASSHOLE. And it didn't work, you made yourself out to be a desperate whining ass, former government errand boy. And after the inquiry why the police is harassing me (and your harassment) will look funny down at the Prosecutor's Office.

> As you know, he has seen the posts you've made to and about me
> and my wife in the past and he seemed well aware of you.

But he hasn't seen you threats made to me by e-mail yet, but he will, ASSHOLE.

> quite sincerely,
>
> Dave Heil K8MN

Fuck off. Learn to killfile me or just shut the fuck up.

4571. Re: Eduardo Hernandez

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-27 23:01:31 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <acuejgckk1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 43840
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.lloyd-davies,alt.flame

Llllardasssssss "Lloyd" <Lloyd@BARF14313org.net> whined in message
news:actttqhum0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> slobbered in message
> news:acmsc2$7b8$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Jizzswallowing Junior" <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> whined in message
> > news:3CEC3CDB.EEF43F4B@mailcity.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > 2test

What's "2test, " Junior?

> wogie banged

I also banged your momma, best $2 I ever spent.

>on his keyboard and attempted to write:
> > >
> > > > Maybe you should get a second one, that way, you can get a keybaord
> > that has a comma key. Or at least English lessons, you Mexican refugee.
> > > ^^^^^^^
> > > You as well, wogie, there should be a comma after the word "key"

No stupid, you post edited out the period.

> > > and the word "or" should not be capitalized. You really should not
> > > post when you are in your drunken stupor.
> >
> > There also should not be a comma after way.

You'd better go back to school, Doggie Dicksucker.

> >
> AB8MQ@alt.net wrote:
>
> 2Test Wiseman = REMF,

What's 2 Test," Lllardasssss?? you still have failed the code test at least
10 times.

>Netcopped SLee,

I did? Looks like I am the ONLY customer of Altopia, huh, Fuckhead?

> & President of the
> Lavender Lads of Glendale WV

Poor Pink lady Lllardasssss Llllloyd, lambda member and known homosexual.

> 50 year old lives with his mommy, no life, no job.
^^^

4572. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 00:21:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <b50b7bac0bfcc7a4bb372bf8e097a033.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43841
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I dunno, Paul. The thread started about how great MURS is. How is MURS more relevent than amateur radio? As far as your per-captia stats, you might have a point. U.S. colleges are graduating more and more foreign engineers and doctors than ever. You may have a valid point. I wouldn't be surprised to find the U.S. an also-ran 3rd world country in another 25 or 30 years. Everyone wants an MBA. Read Dilbert. It is one comic strip worth reading. Don't worry - Japan will design and build all the FRS, cell phones, stereos, and televisions you want. (oops, make that design. I forgot. The little dragon is building the stuff now - at least the stuff that China isn't.)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Paul Peterson" <pp23@cox.net> wrote in message
news:ZmhI8.90400$Md6.3028483@news1.east.cox.net
> "Paul Peterson" <pp23@cox.net> wrote
>
> People who died 10 years ago, are still listed as Hams.
> Don't believe the numbers.
>
> The other statistic tool you must know about, is per-Capita. That is,
> how many Hams per 100,000 Americans in age groups like
> 9-12, 13-16, 17-20, 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, 71-80?
>
> Have those gone up? No, they've gone down.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4573. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 01:01:30 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF2D6EA.20409@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43842

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> Don't call me comrade, Slick. And Len can handle his own affairs. No
> co-dependency required.

No code, no code, rah rah rah

dididit dididididit ditdit dah

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4574. Re: <<<I LOVE SEX>>>

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 01:14:14 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF2D9E6.1050001@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43843

Jimick wrote:

> LMAO.....

So did I, after I posted it. I think N0iMD missed this one.

73 de KR4AJ

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4575. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 01:54:10 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <6rBI8.8326$LC3.596947@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43844

>>> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>>> Any mention of Farnsworth spacing/timing? If not,
>>> doesn't the present 5wpm code exam violate the
>>> Morse code specification?

>> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>> What specification?

> CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> The specification that Len talked about.

I got just two words for all you guys:

PARIS CODEX

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4576. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 01:54:11 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <7rBI8.8327$LC3.599374@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43845

Richard McCollum wrote:

> From what I have been reading, there is a pretty
> good chance the Russians among others will sink
> the no-code ship without a bubble. The issue is so
> low on the scale of things that one objection will
> cause its deferral as I believe has happened at
> two previous WARCs. The fat lady has yet to
> limber up the old vocal cords.

If that happens, the fat lady better get out the
score for the Requiem Mass. The coffin lid will
definitely have been nailed shut on amateur radio.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4577. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 01:54:12 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <8rBI8.8328$LC3.597272@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43846

>>Evem Mohammed could not move the mountain.

> "Evem Mohammed" could have moved mountains (plural) with
> the aid of modern earth-moving equipment.

Or Pakistani H-bombs.

4578. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 03:01:54 UTC
From: Dan Martin <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com>
Message-ID: <uf5svdkud9r837@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 43847
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Well I have seen hams use out of band freqs, 151.055, 451.1875.... not just heard, but seen. Don't for a minute think that hams don't go out of bandm they do it all the time, for various "reasons". Threy don;t get busted, cuz they don;'t cause interference, they run open pl, and aren't running dirty amps.

de ve3lix
Dan

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message news:r7vI8.37347$jm.3728352@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...

"G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message news:g092fu8tvoqp63c6oa4ul74d6l35iu5t00@4ax.com...
> The one real live problem I've heard about on MURS (as far as
> non-certified radios) was with Ham operators using their 2m radios on
> MURS.
>
> The fox hunts will turn up some of their own people.

I hear this typical "garbage" from CBers all the time, Hams operating out of band. However where are all of those so called "Hams" operating out of band, and getting busted? I see far more CBers getting busted for freebanding, and running power. In fact several CBers have said they even heard me ID on the freeband using my Ham Callsign. Since I never operate there it's clear to me that somebody was bootlegging on HF using my call. Then to claim same instance as "proof positive" that Hams operate out of band, stupidly ID'ing themselves, does not persuade me in the least. Any further argument runs into the same problem, just because somebody hears a Ham callsign, does not imply it belongs to the person using it on the air. So until somebody can provide proof positive the accusation is basically BS.

The idea that Hams would limit themselves to 2 watts on five frequencies on MURS, compared with up to 1500 watts over 4 MHz on 2m, is so ridiculous as to not even be worthy of serious consideration.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me

running
try to keep up "

4579. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 03:36:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020527233608.06852.00000766@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 43848

In article <20020526130901.26555.00000539@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>The dumbing-down of the written tests was
>>supported by the ARRL because they saw their membership
>>numbers tanking, and felt this was the way to stop the hemmorage.
>
>In the one place that matters -- before the FCC in a rulemaking procedure --
>ARRL asked the FCC to make the written exams more difficult.

Ed:

Hmmm. I must have missed that, somehow. If this is true, then
I sit corrected, and humbly beg the ARRL's forgiveness for making
a false accusation. No need to provide any proof, I'll take your
word for it.

>You are not being very logical.

I'll admit that it happens, sometimes.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4580. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 03:47:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF2FDB2.CA3C2C2@att.net>
Source record: 43849

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Well, well....so there is some life left in the old CW machine, after all.
> > No surprise, some societies find it very easy to refrain from tossing out
> > cheap, useful things.
>
> You are delusional if you think anyone who matters wants to "toss out" CW.
> OTOH, the Morse code *requirement* is NOT cheap and has outlived its
> usefulness.

Maybe, maybe not. If enough other countries, of whatever technical advancment, see it otherwise you lose. Maybe the Russians and a few likeminded would be enough to cause it to be delayed for another WRC cycle.

4581. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 03:48:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF1C942.2E9ED3CA@att.net>
Source record: 43850

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CF0F082.D3D4F9B6@IEEE.org...
> > Dan Finn wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
>
> > > And that very usage must be a signicant indicator that (CW) still has
> value.
> >
> > Of course it has value as a communications mode. It doesn't have any value
> > anymore in playing that silly King-of-the-Mountain game.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> I'm sure they can squeeze a few more years of greatness out of it.

You pair of simpletons can't grasp that morse code is only a part of the whole package. You never will.

4582. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 03:53:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF2FF19.D97C483F@att.net>
Source record: 43851

K7JEB wrote:

> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > From what I have been reading, there is a pretty
> > good chance the Russians among others will sink
> > the no-code ship without a bubble. The issue is so
> > low on the scale of things that one objection will
> > cause its deferral as I believe has happened at
> > two previous WARCs. The fat lady has yet to
> > limber up the old vocal cords.
>
> If that happens, the fat lady better get out the
> score for the Requiem Mass. The coffin lid will
> definitely have been nailed shut on amateur radio.

Jim, if ham radio dies because too many potential hams
skip the
whole thing solely because they believe it isn't worth it to
learn the Morse code to 5 words per minute, nothing whatever
in Creation itself could possibly save it. What a concept -
kill off ham radio because I refuse to do the code.

That kind of people are no asset to ham radio nor anything
else.

4583. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 04:04:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528000404.20019.00000317@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 43852

In article <T6vI8.2692$fz4.121359567@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>news:3CF2793A.5020202@bellsouth.net...
>>
>> Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20020527130547.20019.00000307@mb-fa.aol.com...
>
>> >> >>It would seem that all MUST march in ranks, united under the
>> >> >>Newington banner (or the like), chanting the same mantra,
>> >> >>"the ARS is all about working DX on HF with CW!"
>> >> >
>> > Len, I march to a different drummer even though I am an ARRL member.
>> > The
>> > Catholics gave me a good start at reading, and reasoning. No need to
>> > throw it all away on cronyism.
>>
>> I wonder over which cliff that drummer is headed?
>
>I wonder? I sure don't think we need superflous license classes, nor do we
>need a code exam. Lets see if we can stay alive long enough to see how this
>all plays out.
>
>> Sorry comrade but you
>> have mistaken the drummer you are marching to. It is really a pied piper
>> that you and your co-dependent crony Len are following under the guise
>> of no-code everywhere, anywhere at all.
>
>Don't call me comrade, Slick. And Len can handle his own affairs. No
>co-dependency required.

This god of radio doesn't understand the difference between
Catholicsm and Lutheranism. I am a Lutheran...of the spirit
of ol' Marty when he nailed those Theses on the church door.
:-)

He thinks there is "cronyism" there, but cannot understand
(gods seldom do) that there is NO real difference between our
opinions in regard to earthly matters, such as laws and
regulations on radio.

Lacking understanding and the ability to comment coherently
on earthly legislative matters, this "god" resorts to nastygrams
such as "comrade" and accusations of "communism" in regard
to amateur radio regulation opinions.

That results in the usual rationalizations of amateur radio having
some kind of weird socio-political-religious overtones. Anything
out of the mainstream (as in communiques from Newington) is
now un-American, un-democratic, and religious heresy.

Gods are like that. :-)

4584. Re: It Was Nice While It Lasted.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 04:34:02 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <cCDI8.45817$7S6.18253689@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 43853

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" wrote in part ...

" Well damn, Lennie...we shared a civil moment and I thought, for just a moment, that a breath of fresh air had been breathed into this "relationship".

Steve,

I am just amazed that you ever thought Lennie would (or could) be civil. That's why I put him on the "reject" list long ago. You should too.

Arnie -
KT4ST
FISTS 2940, CC 337

"What Hath God Wrought?"

4585. Off-Topic Postings

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 05:12:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528011227.13744.00000335@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 43855

In article <20020527152122.12387.00001092@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>This is a reminder to all: The purpose of this newsgroup is to
>>DISCUSS AMATEUR RADIO POLICY matters.
>
> Well damn, Lennie...we shared a civil moment and I thought, for just a
>moment, that a breath of fresh air had been breathed into this
>"relationship".

Robeson asked an off-topic question. He got a civil reply on that off-topic question.

Robeson has some delusion that this newsgroup is for any subject a licensee wishes to bring up and NO ONE may dare challenge a licensee on anything.

This is NOT a model aircraft newsgroup. It is a newsgroup created for discussing amateur radio policy, specifically created to handle the morse code testing issue in regards to US amateur radio licensing requirements.

Robeson has NO rank that justifies his constant personal insults and misapplied pejoratives when encountering opposite opinions or criticsm. Robeson is NOT any kind of NCO or officer in here. He should quit acting like one...it reflects badly on the US amateur radio community.

4586. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 05:12:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528011227.13744.00000334@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 43856

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gws8p0f.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Mon, 27 May 2002 02:29:22 GMT, Paul Peterson wrote:

>>Radio is an appliance to Americans, not as much a hobby anymore.
>
> It's our job as hams to make it a hobby again.

I thought US amateur radio was a SERVICE?

4587. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 05:12:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528011229.13744.00000336@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 43854

In article <6rBI8.8326$LC3.596947@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>>>> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>>>> Any mention of Farnsworth spacing/timing? If not,
>>>> doesn't the present 5wpm code exam violate the
>>>> Morse code specification?
>
>>> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>> What specification?
>
>> CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> The specification that Len talked about.
>
>I got just two words for all you guys:
>
> PARIS CODEX

Neither word is regulatory law. At question is the regulations in Part 97, Title 47 CFR in regards to CODE RATE.

Here's the exact words out of Part 97.3 -

"(26) International Morse code. A dot-dash code as defined in International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT) Recommendation F.1 (1984), Division B, I. Morse Code."

I have a copy of that CCITT document, obtained from the ITU. All it defines for International Morse Code is the relative ratio of durations of dots, dashes, and spaces.

It says NOTHING about code rate in WPM, characters per minute, or anything else in terms of communication rate.

YOU show me where in Part 97, Title 47 CFR, where there is any morse code RATE defined. I don't see it. You can't see it because the FCC did not define word rate in morse.

The VECs can send test element 1 at ANY rate they want for license testing. Since there is NO legal specification on word rate in the regulations, the character speed could be anything from a 5 WPM equivalent on up to a 100 WPM equivalent or faster and any rate in between. It's all very legal the way Part 97 is now written.

Part 97 can say "5 WPM" all it wants but that doesn't mean that there is some "automatic definition" of rate. Regulations are supposed to define things it is talking about and the test element 1 rate is NOT so defined.

You can explain all you want about the word "PARIS" and "CODEX" and "what it means" but you are NOT stating anything that should be defined in Part 97 as regulatory statements.

4588. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 05:14:35 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF3123B.9070800@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43857

Len Over 21 wrote:

(text cut)
> That results in the usual rationalizations of amateur radio having
> some kind of weird socio-political-religious overtones. Anything
> out of the mainstream (as in communiques from Newington) is
> now un-American, un-democratic, and religious heresy.
>
> Gods are like that. :-)

Sorry if you think I offended your loyal Bud (comrade). Why can you not default on the side of excellence in your so-called earthly matters such as laws and regulations on radio. Instead, you default on minimum requirements, i.e the minimum that you think should be necessary to hold a license to use a highly desirable portion of the radio spectrum. From there you say that all that is necessary are said minimum requirements in order to be fair to those less inclined to strive for excellence. So committed are you to minimum requirements that your invoke those NAZI national socialistic epithets to attack those who would like to see a return to excellence. The victims of your NAZI's were rich bankers, industrialists and even farmers who needed to be 'stopped' because they were able to accomplish what the mainstream refused to accomplish. They practiced excellence. Therefore they must have been evil. Let's be fair to the less driven people! Let the peasants arise with their pitchforks and drive excellent people back to the 14th century.

Some people are driven to excellence. Some people are driven to minimum requirements. Because the laws in our country necessarily tend to favor the minority minimum-driven populace who do not want to learn code, i.e. they default to worse case in terms of being fair to protect even the idiots, you seem to be winning the battle. I happen to agree with the spirit those laws but they were intended to protect the less intellectually endowed, not to sow a culture of dumbing down. However, in taking advantage of such laws, you and your ilk have accomplished exactly that.

You and Brian seem like very intelligent people who could easily do well in striving for excellence but something stops both of you...you step back as if in fear...perhaps you would be guilty to be able to earn what others cannot, and with very little effort. I wonder why? This is a very interesting news group.

73 de KR4AJ
--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone else in the universe.

Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4589. Never Trust Leonard H. Anderson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 07:26:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528032643.20500.00001102@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43858

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/28/02 01:12 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020528011227.13744.00000335@mb-ma.aol.com>

>Robeson asked an off-topic question. He got a civil reply on that off-
>topic question.

And was subsequently served an off-topic tongue lashing about what is and is not appropriate for this NG...Which was in and of itself inappropriate in light of Lennie's inability to stay topic focused himself. Shall we count YOUR topic diversions, Your Putziness? Over a DECADE'S worth?

>Robeson has some delusion that this newsgroup is for any subject
>a licensee wishes to bring up and NO ONE may dare challenge
>a licensee on anything.

A lie by the liemaster.

There are a great many "off topic" conversations here. I keep out of most of them as they do belong elsewhere. However I don't as a rule "answer" them, and THEN tell them it's "inappropriate".

That's YOUR job, Lennie...Not that you are any good at it.

>This is NOT a model aircraft newsgroup.

Then you should not have answered the post, Lennie. In retrospect, I now see that this was but one more opportunity for you to inject another "been there-done that" with your revelation of having worked at one of the model builders.

I thought you were trying to be a nice guy. Shame on me.

>Robeson has NO rank that justifies his constant personal insults
>and misapplied pejoratives when encountering opposite opinions
>or criticsm. Robeson is NOT any kind of NCO or officer in here.
>He should quit acting like one...it reflects badly on the US amateur
>radio community.

This was not about personal insults nor perjoratives, Your Lyingness. I asked a civil question, and for once you were able to answer accordingly. Threw me off for a moment. But then you sank right back in to the same routine.

You are the one who needs the lessons about rank/priviledge, Your Foolishness. You accuse others of it, however YOU are the one who finds it necessary to bandy about his CV, (non-existant) war record, and sign "off topic" posts with ranks and serial numbers of long-ago abandoned military

service.

The funny thing is, YOU are the only one who can't see how foolish you look.

Wake up, Lennie. Time is not ALL lost yet.

4590. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 07:30:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528033014.20500.00001103@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43859

>Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/28/02 01:12 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020528011229.13744.00000336@mb-ma.aol.com>

>The VECs can send test element 1 at ANY rate they want
>for license testing. Since there is NO legal specification on
>word rate in the regulations, the character speed could be
>anything from a 5 WPM equivalent on up to a 100 WPM
>equivalent or faster and any rate in between. It's all very
>legal the way Part 97 is now written.

Well lucky for us then that the VEC's not only comply with the LETTER of the Law, but the spirit of it too, huh Lennie?

The VE system has been with us almost 20 years now, and it's held up pretty well.

Too bad you've not availed your self of it.

Putz.

4591. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 07:33:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528033312.20500.00001104@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43860

>Subject: Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/28/02 01:12 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020528011229.13744.00000336@mb-ma.aol.com>

>
>I have a copy of that CCITT document, obtained from the ITU.

I have no doubt that you do...As a matter of fact, I visualize you surrounded by stacks of unkempt books and files, all to chronicle your meaningless romp through radio rules trivia.

You shudda tried sex once, Lennie. Man cannot live by radio alone.

4592. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 07:35:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528033520.20500.00001105@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43861

>Subject: Re: Code Question
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 05/28/02 00:04 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020528000404.20019.00000317@mb-fa.aol.com>

>Lacking understanding and the ability to comment coherently
>on earthly legislative matters, this "god" resorts to nastygrams
>such as "comrade" and accusations of "communism" in regard
>to amateur radio regulation opinion

And who should know LESS about radio legislative matters and more about
communism than Lennie?

>Gods are like that.

From the lips of one, Lennie?

4593. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 09:52:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <arII8.3856$gw7.189936813@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43862

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF1C942.2E9ED3CA@att.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CF0F082.D3D4F9B6@IEEE.org...
> > > Dan Finn wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > And that very usage must be a signicant indicator that (CW) still
has
> > value.
> > > >
> > > > Of course it has value as a communications mode. It doesn't have any
value
> > > > anymore in playing that silly King-of-the-Mountain game.
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > I'm sure they can squeeze a few more years of greatness out of it.
>
> You pair of simpletons can't grasp that morse code is only a part of the
whole
> package. You never will.

Thats correct, Dick. You're beloved code which you value more than all of the rest of amateur radio combined is only part of it. And when the Morse exam goes out the window, CW will still remain as part of amateur radio.

I don't know why you have such a problem with it.

4594. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 11:58:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF370E5.3FC53D40@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43864

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Well, well....so there is some life left in the old CW machine, after all.
> > > No surprise, some societies find it very easy to refrain from tossing out
> > > cheap, useful things.
> >
> > You are delusional if you think anyone who matters wants to "toss out" CW.
> > OTOH, the Morse code *requirement* is NOT cheap and has outlived its
> > usefulness.
>
> Maybe, maybe not. If enough other countries, of whatever technical advancment,
> see it otherwise you lose. Maybe the Russians and a few likeminded would be
> enough to cause it to be delayed for another WRC cycle.

During the cold war, the Russians were still using vacuum tubes after the US
had progressed to solid state. The cost of their military is one cause of the
demise of the Soviet Union. The Russians are struggling into the 21st century
in many ways, are hanging on to a lot of things that have outlived their usefulness,
and so are you. Why do you want to stand in the way of freedom of choice of modes
in amateur radio along with inevitable progress? Would you also like our armed
forces to go back to bows and arrows and catapults?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4595. Re: Who is the real Wayne Green?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 11:59:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528075922.15943.00000783@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43863

From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)

>We can justifiably bitch about him about his idiotic rants but he's
>laughing all the way to the bank and looking for one more tirade
>launch pad to invent.

From the scuttlebutt I have heard, he has not done very well financially, in the long run. If you look at the size and circulation figures for 73 magazine, it doesn't look very good for him.

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

4596. Re: Off Topic...help Find?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:01:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528080100.15943.00000784@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43865

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>This is a reminder to all: The purpose of this newsgroup is to
>DISCUSS AMATEUR RADIO POLICY matters.

Can we quote you on this the next time YOU bring up an off-topic subject?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4597. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:03:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF37201.11168A47@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43866

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Of course (CW) has value as a communications mode. It doesn't have any value
> > > anymore in playing that silly King-of-the-Mountain game.
> > >
> > I'm sure they can squeeze a few more years of greatness out of it.
>
> You pair of simpletons can't grasp that morse code is only a part of the whole
> package. You never will.

Point is, the silly King-of-the-Mountain game needs to be laid to rest. I agree
with you that Morse code is only a part of it but is probably the most irrational
part.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4598. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:05:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528080522.15943.00000785@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43867

From: "Paul Peterson" pp23@cox.net

>All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.

I will tell that to all of my QRP buddies and listen to the roar of laughter.
:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4599. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:07:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528080721.15943.00000786@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43868

From: "Paul Peterson" pp23@cox.net

>The other statistic tool you must know about, is per-Capita. That is,
>how many Hams per 100,000 Americans in age groups like
>9-12, 13-16, 17-20, 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, 71-80?
>
>Have those gone up? No, they've gone down.

I hate to bust your bubble, but the percentage of hams per-capita is about
double what it was when I was first licensed.

It does not help your doom-and-gloom soapbox if you make up facts that are
demonstrably wrong.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4600. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:12:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528081208.15943.00000787@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43873

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>Remember - I still want to open up 1.25 Meters for a "New NoCode
>Novice" Class...

The 1.25 meter band is already open to Novices and no-code-test licencees...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4601. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:13:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528081308.15943.00000788@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43869

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>Right now, we are going to have to fill up the lower
>three MURS channels.

Three whole channels? Wow!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4602. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:14:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528081456.15943.00000789@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43870

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>I'm still waiting on QST to publish Valentine's satellite QSO with the
>telescope visual on the satellite, and the telescope motor acting as the
>az-el antenna rotor. What issue do you think that's going to go in?

You could ask the editor, qst@arrl.org, whether he sent in the writeup and whether it was accepted or "returned with thanks." That is what I would have to do even if I was at work.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4603. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:15:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528081527.15943.00000790@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 43871

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>There all talking on there Mics

Where are the mics that are there?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4604. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:17:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF3756D.86193F61@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43872

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Jim, if ham radio dies because too many potential hams skip the
> whole thing solely because they believe it isn't worth it to
> learn the Morse code to 5 words per minute, nothing whatever
> in Creation itself could possibly save it. What a concept -
> kill off ham radio because I refuse to do the code.

You are confusing cause and effect, Dick. It is outdated requirements
like Morse code that can *result* in killing off ham radio. If ham
radio is to survive it must be attractive to potential hams. Leave
the Morse code requirement and fast forward to 2050. What do you
see?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4605. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:23:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF376D5.F9B7BC5F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43874

Dan Finn wrote:
> Why can you not
> default on the side of excellence in your so-called earthly matters such
> as laws and regulations on radio.

Following that logic, the FCC should raise the Morse code requirement to
50 wpm. What do you think would happen to the Amateur Radio Service?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4606. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:32:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528083252.02559.00001403@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 43876

>Leave
>the Morse code requirement and fast forward to 2050. What do you
>see?
>--
>cheers, CAM

CB

4607. Off-Off-Topic!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 12:50:32 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uf6u5cm03t3ab1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 43875

Hello, all!

Hobbyline shows a 1/48th-scale Cessna 150, wingspan
about 8-inches, made by Hasegawa, for about eight dollars.

Heading for cover now . . .

Val Germann
KC0MUB

4608. Re: Never Trust Leonard H. Anderson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 14:22:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF3925B.F474531B@att.net>
Source record: 43877

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

Never trust him? Why not just totally ignore him? When everyone did that he went away for a long time. All you're doing is giving him a platform and an opponent to spar with.

4609. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 14:26:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF3936C.9B71ED5@att.net>
Source record: 43878

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:3CF1C942.2E9ED3CA@att.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3CF0F082.D3D4F9B6@IEEE.org...
> > > > Dan Finn wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > And that very usage must be a signicant indicator that (CW) still
> has
> > > value.
> > > > >
> > > > Of course it has value as a communications mode. It doesn't have any
> value
> > > > anymore in playing that silly King-of-the-Mountain game.
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > > I'm sure they can squeeze a few more years of greatness out of it.
> >
> > You pair of simpletons can't grasp that morse code is only a part of the
> whole
> > package. You never will.
>
> Thats correct, Dick. You're beloved code which you value more than all of
> the rest of amateur radio combined is only part of it. And when the Morse
> exam goes out the window, CW will still remain as part of amateur radio.
>
> I don't know why you have such a problem with it.

Can't you get *anything* right, Gadfly? The simple Morse code, which you hate more than everything else in life, is only a small bump in the road to most everyone else. You totally fail to understand that your 20 year nonstop whine makes you out to be a complete juvenile imbecile.
Only such would allow himself to shut himself out like you and the others have.

4610. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 14:37:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF39607.EF358F67@att.net>
Source record: 43879

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Well, well....so there is some life left in the old CW machine, after all.
> > > > No surprise, some societies find it very easy to refrain from tossing out
> > > > cheap, useful things.
> > >
> > > You are delusional if you think anyone who matters wants to "toss out" CW.
> > > OTOH, the Morse code *requirement* is NOT cheap and has outlived its
> > > usefulness.
> >
> > Maybe, maybe not. If enough other countries, of whatever technical advancment,
> > see it otherwise you lose. Maybe the Russians and a few likeminded would be
> > enough to cause it to be delayed for another WRC cycle.
>
> During the cold war, the Russians were still using vacuum tubes after the US
> had progressed to solid state. The cost of their military is one cause of the
> demise of the Soviet Union. The Russians are struggling into the 21st century
> in many ways, are hanging on to a lot of things that have outlived their usefulness,

BS. Russians are sharp enough to let us do all the R&D and pay for it so they can just go ahead and copy it for their own use. Surely you've heard about their copies of things like the BC348 and B-29. Not to mention the A-bomb.
One primary reason we have such an advanced economy over theirs is a little thing known as a credit line. Ours runs to multiple $trillions while theirs is nonexistent. Beware when they finally do develop their economy and resources.

>
> and so are you.

Screwe youe. You're a real dim bulb.

> Why do you want to stand in the way of freedom of choice of modes
> in amateur radio along with inevitable progress? Would you also like our armed
> forces to go back to bows and arrows and catapults?

What would you know about our military, Mr 4F? Not much, clearly. We never had a military that uses bows and catapults.

4611. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 14:57:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF39ABC.49269EB9@att.net>
Source record: 43880

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Jim, if ham radio dies because too many potential hams skip the
> > whole thing solely because they believe it isn't worth it to
> > learn the Morse code to 5 words per minute, nothing whatever
> > in Creation itself could possibly save it. What a concept -
> > kill off ham radio because I refuse to do the code.
>
> You are confusing cause and effect, Dick. It is outdated requirements
> like Morse code that can *result* in killing off ham radio. If ham
> radio is to survive it must be attractive to potential hams. Leave
> the Morse code requirement and fast forward to 2050. What do you
> see?

You're a real joke, Cecil. Why would the most basic means of
radiocommunication be anything less than attractive to potential hams?
Just because you can't do much with it doesn't mean no one else can.

If there exists such a things as ham radio in 2050 it will look much
more like CB or your RF internet.

4612. Re: Off-Off-Topic!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 16:23:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528122347.22748.00000961@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 43881

>Subject: Off-Off-Topic!
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 05/28/02 08:50 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <uf6u5cm03t3ab1@corp.supernews.com>
>
>Hello, all!
>
>Hobbyline shows a 1/48th-scale Cessna 150,

DUCK VAL!

The NG Cop will get you!

4613. Re: Off Topic...help Find?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 16:25:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528122530.22748.00000962@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 43882

>Subject: Re: Off Topic...help Find?
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 05/28/02 08:01 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020528080100.15943.00000784@mb-cr.aol.com>

>Can we quote you on this the next time YOU bring up an off-topic subject?

.....or spin the topic into yet another one of his "Back in 1953..."
dissertations?

73

Steve, K4YZ

4614. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 16:38:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528123800.22748.00000963@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 43883

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 05/27/02 20:21 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <b50b7bac0bfcc7a4bb372bf8e097a033.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>

>As far as your per-captia stats,
>you might have a point. U.S. colleges are graduating more and more
>foreign engineers and doctors than ever. You may have a valid point. I
>wouldn't be surprised to find the U.S. an also-ran 3rd world country in
>another 25 or 30 years.

At the rate technology is advancing Jim, I'd say we are barely
nose-above-water now.

At the risk of offending some persons, I believe that part of our problem
is we are so involved in Affirmative Action and other social engineering
programs that we are inhibiting the flow of otherwise qualified candidates to
those educational programs.

And as one involved in healthcare such that I am, I can say we are driving
away American candidates for those programs by refusing to put caps on tort
laws and by refusing to reign in healthcare conglomerates from unethical work
practices. We can't get Americans to go into those fields in sufficient
numbers, but foreign candidates are chomping at the bit to get here that they
will accept the wages and risks. If they get sued, they can split. Happens
every day.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4615. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 16:40:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528124034.22748.00000964@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 43884

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 05/28/02 08:05 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020528080522.15943.00000785@mb-cr.aol.com>

>From: "Paul Peterson" pp23@cox.net
>
>>All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.
>
>I will tell that to all of my QRP buddies and listen to the roar of laughter.
>:-)

Don't let the guys at Elecraft and Wilderness Radio know they are dead,
either! They are making a fistful of money!

Steve, K4YZ

4616. Re: Never Trust Leonard H. Anderson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 17:51:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CF3C3B3.F3BEE425@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 43885

Looks like Lennie has a license: WA6HKH, though he needs
to renew it, he's in the grace period. Of course that could be
another Leonard.... He's an Advanced.

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> Never trust him? Why not just totally ignore him? When everyone did that he went
> away for a long time. All you're doing is giving him a platform and an opponent to
> spar with.

4617. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 17:57:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF3C506.5B0A4568@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43886

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Leave
> >the Morse code requirement and fast forward to 2050. What do you
> >see?
>
> CB

That's because you always wear CB-tinted glasses.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4618. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 18:09:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF3C7C7.6138E303@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43887

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> One primary reason we have such an advanced economy over theirs is a little thing
> known as a credit line. Ours runs to multiple $trillions while theirs is nonexistent.

So credit is the primary reason that we are technologically advanced over the Russians? Of course, Capitalism Vs Communism couldn't have anything to do with it. The Morse code testing is basically Capitalism (freedom) Vs Communism (statist control) all over again. "Mr. FCC, tear down that Morse code requirement wall."

> Screwe youe. You're a real dim bulb.

Hey Jim, Dick just proved my premise that people can't type when they are angry.

> What would you know about our military, Mr 4F? Not much, clearly. We never had a
> military that uses bows and catapults.

There certainly was a time when we (the human race) had a military that used bows/arrows and catapults. Some of them were probably your ancestors.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4619. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 18:16:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF3C99B.3FD95972@IEEE.org>
Source record: 43888

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You are confusing cause and effect, Dick. It is outdated requirements
> > like Morse code that can *result* in killing off ham radio. If ham
> > radio is to survive it must be attractive to potential hams. Leave
> > the Morse code requirement and fast forward to 2050. What do you
> > see?
>
> You're a real joke, Cecil. Why would the most basic means of
> radiocommunication be anything less than attractive to potential hams?

CW *is* attractive to a lot of potential hams. What is unattractive is
the Morse code *requirement* that puts Morse code on a pass/fail level
with everything else in ham radio combined. You are continuing to
confuse CW, the mode, with the Morse code requirement. The two
subjects are virtually unrelated. The Morse code requirement is
like forcing everyone to pass their driving exam in a 1950 stick-
shift Ford before being allowed to drive any other vehicle. Do
you support that concept?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4620. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 18:52:25 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <4C09A28D6EEF1EE5.87618B62942AE06F.546F913254A829AC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43889
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Mon, 27 May 2002 02:29:22 GMT, "Paul Peterson" <pp23@cox.net>
wrote:

>All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.

Well, then I wish you'd tell me what I've been building since I passed
General. They're not exactly state-of-the-art, and are mostly
rockbound, but they make beeps come out of a receiver when I press the
key.

What could they be? Or am I dead and just haven't noticed?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4621. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 19:01:58 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <E65FE992D8E0AFF5.2486FE6CDA441A11.EAE036F368553DB9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43891

On 27 May 2002 17:06:51 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <6SgI8.90396$Md6.3020010@news1.east.cox.net>, "Paul Peterson"
><pp23@cox.net> writes:
>
>>Amateur Radio has changed. That is a fact. The reason it
>>changed, is that you can't build a radio cheaper than you can buy it.
>
>That's been true for decades.

Then why hasn't anybody told me where I can buy an 80M transceiver for
the low, low price of a broken TV?

>>Radio is boring since the invention of the CD. Not many people
>>stay up all night to here a far away AM station like we did as kids.
>
>I stay up to work far off CW stations.

And I still get quite a few emails on the AM BCB DX lists. About as
many as any of the SWL or ham lists I've been on. Only the Crystal
Set Society seems to generate more traffic on its list.

>>The commercialization of RF to one or two
>>companies in America will continue, and Ham radio will go to
>>the same place that model railroaders, and slot car racing went.
>
>Those things are still quite popular.

Hell, I've been pondering the possibilities for "steam engine mobile"
ever since I first saw these:
http://www.hals.org/

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4622. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 19:04:24 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205281104.68645442@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43890
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<WVuI8.2678$Dt4.121020685@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020527005544.02458.00000641@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
> > >From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
> > >Date: 05/26/02 21:46 Eastern Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205261746.32491053@posting.google.com>
>
> > >Why not open up 1.25M for a new NoCode Novice Class? At least then we
> > >could start getting families/friends/collegues involved with Amateur
> > >Radio. Otherwise, why not just let the public use these frequencies?
> > >They aren't being used for anything.
> >
> > Just because the band is not channelized from wall to wall with
> repeaters
> > does NOT mean the band is not being used.
>
> At least on 2m, a callsign goes out every hour.

SSSShhhh!!! We don't want this SECRET to get out... that 1.25m is not
being used for anything.

Heaven forbid that we actually allow these frequencies to be used for
something!

Stewart - N0MHS

4623. Re: Off-Off-Topic!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 19:05:50 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <0415641DC9FE9694.93DAB9B56A8E6BF0.097E8D2F2FDCD304@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43892

On Tue, 28 May 2002 07:50:32 -0500, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> wrote:

>Hobbyline shows a 1/48th-scale Cessna 150, wingspan
>about 8-inches, made by Hasegawa, for about eight dollars.

Sounds like a desk-decorator, but it brings up an interesting
possibility; has anyone tried using an RC plane or helicopter to
string wire antennas in the field?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4624. Re: Never Trust Leonard H. Anderson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 19:18:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528151822.08308.00000891@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 43893

>Subject: Re: Never Trust Leonard H. Anderson
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 05/28/02 13:51 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3CF3C3B3.F3BEE425@ix.netcom.com>
>
>Looks like Lennie has a license: WA6HKH, though he needs
>to renew it, he's in the grace period. Of course that could be
>another Leonard.... He's an Advanced.

Nope...we went through this. Lennie adamantly denies being THAT LHA.
Small world, eh?

73

Steve, K4YZ

4625. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 19:21:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528152100.08308.00000893@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 43894

>Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/28/02 15:04 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205281104.68645442@posting.google.com>

>SSSShhhh!!! We don't want this SECRET to get out... that 1.25m is not
>being used for anything.
>
>Heaven forbid that we actually allow these frequencies to be used for
>something

A quick tour through the repeater guide indicates a LOT of repeaters within access range of Murietta, Stew.

And I also know for a fact that 222mHz is very active for remote base controlling, auxiliary control and other "non-traditional" applications (ie" honey-do traffic at rush hour)

4626. Re: Off-Off-Topic!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 19:23:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528152319.08308.00000894@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 43895

>Subject: Re: Off-Off-Topic!
>From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
>Date: 05/28/02 15:05 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id:
><0415641DC9FE9694.93DAB9B56A8E6BF0.097E8D2F2FDCD304@lp.airnews.net>

>
>Sounds like a desk-decorator, but it brings up an interesting
>possibility; has anyone tried using an RC plane or helicopter to
>string wire antennas in the field?

Neat idea, but I have never seen it. I did see a CH-54 Tarhe lift a tower on Mt Wilson once! Whew!

The kerosene alone could fund my Ham Radio needs for a decade!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4627. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 20:50:23 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <c386a55a6f2be0f4e867e9b57971b54e.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43896

Ed, I rest my case from a different thread. The amateur tests ARE too
easy. I would be happy with a fair knowlege of the regulations and
basic safety. That, sadly, appears to be beyond the reach of some folks
that have already obtained licenses.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020528081208.15943.00000787@mb-cr.aol.com

> From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>
> >Remember - I still want to open up 1.25 Meters for a "New NoCode
> >Novice" Class...
>
> The 1.25 meter band is already open to Novices and no-code-test licencees...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4628. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 20:54:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205281254.6c129026@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43897

Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:<3CF19196.5050800@bellsouth.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >(text cut)
> > Your claim that the General was not meant to be a limited license is simply
> > incorrect. Mistaken. Untrue. Flat out wrong.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

> I have found that N0iMD tends to have many contructs under his own invent.

Yup.

> He doesn't know a thing about ham radio history prior to 1999.

Not true. Brian knows quite a few things about ham radio history prior to
1999. However, his claim that "the General was not meant to be a limited
license" is simply incorrect.

> He has even stated in this thread that he expects the actuarial tables
> to take care of the older ham radio culture, after which he can presumably
> invent another mega-construct of an HF ham radio culture that will, as
> usual, be of his own invent.

The "actuarial tables" will eventually "take care" of all of us. Note
that the "older" ham radio culture is not defined.

I would define "older" or "traditional" ham radio culture this way:

- Genuine interest in radio for its own sake
- Polite, civil behavior on the air (and off) at all times
- Operating skills
- Practical technical skills and knowledge
- Homebrewing and modifying equipment
- Public Service
- "G-rated" content
- Healthy, friendly competition
- No barriers because of age, gender, race, or socioeconomic status
- Play by the rules at all times

There are lots of younger hams who identify with this "older"
ham radio culture.

> Watch out for Brian; he wants to tear it all down and
> rebuild it in his own twisted and contorted image, a world of one
> license, one "test".

Beware of taking certain people in this newsgroup seriously.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4629. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 21:23:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8zSI8.3572$%Y3.149322955@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43898

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0205281254.6c129026@posting.google.com...
> Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<3CF19196.5050800@bellsouth.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > He has even stated in this thread that he expects the actuarial tables
> > to take care of the older ham radio culture, after which he can
presumably
> > invent another mega-construct of an HF ham radio culture that will, as
> > usual, be of his own invent.
>
> The "actuarial tables" will eventually "take care" of all of us. Note
> that the "older" ham radio culture is not defined.
>
> I would define "older" or "traditional" ham radio culture this way:

Dan used older. I simply said those who remember numerous, superflous
license classes will be gone one day. After that, hams will just consider
themselves hams without all this false class distiction.

> - Genuine interest in radio for its own sake
> - Polite, civil behavior on the air (and off) at all times

Hoo boy. That would be nice.

> - Operating skills
> - Practical technical skills and knowledge
> - Homebrewing and modifying equipment
> - Public Service
> - "G-rated" content
> - Healthy, friendly competition
> - No barriers because of age, gender, race, or socioeconomic status
> - Play by the rules at all times
>
> There are lots of younger hams who identify with this "older"
> ham radio culture.

Fantastic! Nothing wrong with that until you add:

Cronyism
Double Standards
Cliques
Intolerance for newcomers and beginners
and
License class bigotry

> > Watch out for Brian; he wants to tear it all down and
> > rebuild it in his own twisted and contorted image, a world of one
> > license, one "test".
>
> Beware of taking certain people in this newsgroup seriously.

Beware of certain people in this newsgroup taking themselves so seriously.

4630. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 21:27:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FCSI8.3575$IQ3.148830457@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43899

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF3936C.9B71ED5@att.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CF1C942.2E9ED3CA@att.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > > news:3CF0F082.D3D4F9B6@IEEE.org...
> > > > > Dan Finn wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > And that very usage must be a signicant indicator that (CW)
still
> > has
> > > > > value.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Of course it has value as a communications mode. It doesn't have
any
> > value
> > > > > anymore in playing that silly King-of-the-Mountain game.
> > > > > --
> > > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > > > >
> > > > I'm sure they can squeeze a few more years of greatness out of it.
> > >
> > > You pair of simpletons can't grasp that morse code is only a part of
the
> > whole
> > > package. You never will.
> >
> > Thats correct, Dick. You're beloved code which you value more than all
of
> > the rest of amateur radio combined is only part of it. And when the
Morse
> > exam goes out the window, CW will still remain as part of amateur radio.
> >
> > I don't know why you have such a problem with it.
>
> Can't you get *anything* right, Gadfly? The simple Morse code, which you
hate
> more than everything else in life, is only a small bump in the road to

most
> everyone else. You totally fail to understand that your 20 year nonstop
whine
> makes you out to be a complete juvenile imbecile.
> Only such would allow himself to shut himself out like you and the others
> have.

Dick, your tirades not only discredit you, but they embarass me as a member
of the amateur radio culture. Grow up.

4631. Re: Never Trust Leonard H. Anderson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 21:28:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YDSI8.3577$V_3.149445839@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43900

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF3925B.F474531B@att.net...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>
>
> Never trust him? Why not just totally ignore him? When everyone did that
he went
> away for a long time. All you're doing is giving him a platform and an
opponent to
> spar with.
>

So why can't you leave him alone?

4632. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 21:30:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gGSI8.3579$504.149523751@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43951

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020528081527.15943.00000790@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>
> >There all talking on there Mics
>
> Where are the mics that are there?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Irishmen. There [sic] all talking on there [sic] Irishmen.

4633. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 22:11:31 UTC
From: Paul Peterson <pp23@cox.net>
Message-ID: <ngTI8.1420$ib4.110550@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 43952
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote
>
> >All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.
>
> Well, then I wish you'd tell me what I've been building since I passed
> General. They're not exactly state-of-the-art, and are mostly
> rockbound, but they make beeps come out of a receiver when I press the
> key.
>
> What could they be? Or am I dead and just haven't noticed?

Typical response to one line out of context.

When you can debate with intelligence, let us know, and
we can then have a discussion.

4634. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 22:54:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CF40AD8.DE41C3BB@adelphia.net>
Source record: 43953

I took yout test, Jim

N2EY wrote:

> I would define "older" or "traditional" ham radio culture this way:
>
> - Genuine interest in radio for its own sake

Yup, very interested. I'm actually more interested in the radio aspect
than yakking.

> - Polite, civil behavior on the air (and off) at all times

On air, always... But off the air, well I love playing hockey, and that
just isn't polite.

> - Operating skills

Enjoying learning

> - Practical technical skills and knowledge

Pretty good

> - Homebrewing and modifying equipment

Now yer talking!

> - Public Service

Every one of my clubs.

> - "G-rated" content

Aww gee

> - Healthy, friendly competition

Yup

> - No barriers because of age, gender, race, or socioeconomic status

Who's keeping track? Of course not.

> - Play by the rules at all times

No point doing otherwise!

Well, I passed Jim. I'm an "old ham"

> Beware of taking certain people in this newsgroup seriously.

Rofl! Was that an extra credit question Jim?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4635. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 23:52:52 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF41854.5000207@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43954

CAM wrote:

> Dan Finn wrote:
>
>> Why can you not default on the side of excellence in your
>> so-called earthly matters such as laws and regulations on radio.
>>
>
> Following that logic, the FCC should raise the Morse code
> requirement to 50 wpm. What do you think would happen to the
> Amateur Radio Service?
>
No, not exactly true. Raising code speed to 50 wpm is not a default. Instead. it would effectively be a decision to require Morse above everything else at the risk of losing a large part of the amateur community. Only a few Countries have done that. Certainly the US has not. A decision to default on the side of excellence would simply be to not lower the present standards with respect to the simplest form of RF communication known to man. For example, where I live, parallel parking is almost never required. In Raleigh, I could easily get through life without ever knowing how to parallel park. Yet, North Carolina society deems it valuable for me to know how to parallel park and require that ability in order to obtain a drivers license. Why? Perhaps parallel parking is an indicator as to how a person knows how to judge the operation of a motor vehicle. If one does not know the fundamentals of parallel parking, how can the State of North Carolina sign up to the fact that one knows how to operate a motor vehicle and issue a candidate driver a license. Besides, if I travel to Manhattan, I really must know how to parallel park. If I don't, I will tie up their traffic. If I QSO with a ham in Cuba who is touching 2 wires together, I need to know Morse code, otherwise the Cuban loses the ability to communicate with me and I have no business cluttering his bandwidth because there is someone else who knows code that he should be communicating with. Basically, if you can't play with the big boys, don't ruin it for everyone else. Ham radio is not a game, it's a service. If you can't ride a bicycle and you're on US-1, don't slow the traffic for everyone else just because one is capable of pedaling only at 5 mph. Yes, we do care if you know how to ride a bicycle. And you do...you can ride (copy code) at 25 mph (wpm)or more. Why defend the Brian P Burkes' who cannot copy now but could if they tried?

73 de KR4AJ

4636. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-28 23:58:03 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF4198B.5020107@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43955

N2EY wrote:

> Beware of taking certain people in this newsgroup seriously.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
I agree Jim, and believe me, I don't.

73 de KR4AJ

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4637. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:07:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528200726.18708.00000143@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 43956

In article <46iI8.3921$gt7.114912485@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020526220627.06857.00000276@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <1%3I8.2118$zI4.91577555@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
>> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>>
>> >You perpetuate the myth that old exams are better than the new exams.
>>
>> Not a myth. An opinion. I have taken both and passed - have you? I think
>not.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I passed the Extra in 1994.

Then why do you still have a General license?

> How old does it have to be?

Older than that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4638. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:07:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528200733.18708.00000144@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 43957

In article <IwiI8.3936$rB7.115313800@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020526160629.18708.00000120@mb-cc.aol.com...
>> In article <U44I8.2123$yJ4.91632762@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
>> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>>
>> >Anything above that minimum requirement, i.e., General, is superflous.
>>
>> The FCC doesn't think so.
>
>He he. They'll get there.

When? It's been 34 years since "incentive licensing" became effective. The R&O for 98-143 did not give any indication that the FCC saw the role of the General license changing.

>
>> >The General once granted all priveleges,
>>
>> all OPERATING privileges
>>
>> > in a day when you had to beep fast,
>>
>> 13 wpm isn't "fast" at all.
>
>It is in my opinion.

The consensus of those who can actually do it is that it's not fast at all.

>
>> >take exams without question pools, and face down that mean old FCC
>Examiner.
>>
>> Don't forget having to pass both code tests before even getting a look at
>the
>> written, no CSCEs, and the 30 day mandatory wait to retest. Also the
>> experience requirements for the Advanced and Extra.
>
>Oh yeh, all that too.

Been there, done that.

>
>> >The Novice was meant to be a limited license.
>>
>> And it was.

>>
>> >The General was not.
>>
>> That is incorrect. You are mistaken, Brian.
>
>I am not.

Yes, you are. You simply don't want to admit a mistake, despite
all the evidence presented that you are, indeed, mistaken.
>
>> The General class license appeared as part of the restructuring of 1951.
>> It was
>> basically the old Class B, renamed. It was a limited license from the 1951
>> restructuring until February of 1953 - almost 2 years. The FCC announced
>> that they intended General to be a limited license when they restructured
>> in
>> 1951, and again in 1967 when they announced the "incentive licensing"
>> changes.
>
>All priveleges.
>
Which means what? It's not even a sentence.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4639. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:07:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528200735.18708.00000145@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 43958

In article <3CF370E5.3FC53D40@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>During the cold war, the Russians were still using vacuum tubes after the US
>had progressed to solid state.

The Russia and the Soviet Union are not the same thing.

So what? Did their equipment fail because it had tubes?

The Soviet defense philosophy was different than ours, that's all. If the USA had gone through what the Soviets did during WW2, our defense philosophy might be a bit different.

The Soviets were the first to orbit an artificial satellite, first to put an animal in space, first to put a human in space (who also was the first human to orbit the earth) first to photograph the far side of the moon. They also built rockets that could be launched at 30 below zero without blowing up.

>The cost of their military is one cause of the
>demise of the Soviet Union.

How much of their GDP did they spend on their military, compared to the USA?

>The Russians are struggling into the 21st century
>in many ways, are hanging on to a lot of things that have outlived their
>usefulness, and so are you.

The only things the Russians are hanging onto that have outlived their usefulness
are some old ideas about the West.

>Why do you want to stand in the way of freedom of choice of modes
>in amateur radio along with inevitable progress?

Who is standing in the way of freedom of coice of modes? Certainly not W0EX.

Progress is not inevitable.

>Would you also like our armed forces to go back to bows and arrows and
>catapults?

"Our armed forces" never had them in the first place.

and, by the way,

Today, May 28, 2002, Russia joined NATO. That's a good thing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4640. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:11:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528201135.17509.00000941@mb-ft.aol.com>
Source record: 43959

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>> 13 wpm isn't "fast" at all.

>>It is in my opinion.

There was a time in my Novice days that I thought I would never be able to get to 13 wpm. It has always been relative.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4641. Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:16:40 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205281616.4a5ccf0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43960
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Like any of the classic urban legands - LSD tattoos, Kidney theft,
Alligators in the sewers - the GMRS/FRS/MURS high-power amplifier myth
just keeps making the rounds...

http://www.urbanlegends.com/

The myth - spread by hams having a strong "radio cop" slant - has
absolutely no basis in fact. The motivation for spreading the rumor
is somewhat complex - but, the main motivation appears be to maintain
some kind of "superiority complex" these hams harbor over "CB users".
A secondary motivation seems to be to stop the growth of these
wildly-popular radio services - as ham VHF/UHF usage has continued to
decline in recent years, these services are rapidly growing in
popularity.

There has never been a reported violation involving amplifiers on any
of these VHF/UHF frequencies; and, the fact is, there is simply no
real motivation for the average person to use amplifiers on these
frequencies.

THE BASIS FOR THE LEGEND:

Illegal amplifier use on 11m CB frequencies has been an ongoing
problem for many years. However, the dynamics of radio wave
propagation on HF CB vs. VHF MURS or UHF FRS/GMRS are quite different.
Sky wave, or "skip" propagation is commonplace on HF frequencies. To
take advantage of this propagation requires running more than the
legally-allowed 4W output allowed on 11m CB... as a result, many
truckers(and other citizens) have resorted to using illegal amplifiers
to raise the output of their radio stations to outrageosly-high
values; 500, 1000, 1500, even 2000 Watt amplifier use is commonplace -
allowing these individuals to communicate great distances(sometimes
1,000s of miles when the "skip is in"). A side result of this
"culture", has been that these individuals resort to a kind of
"entertainment" by jamming smaller-powered stations ("squashing") when
the "skip is out".

However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
on these frequencies.

The fact that there has never been any direct proof of individuals
running amplifiers on these frquencies, seems to be of no consequence
to the professors of this urban legend. They will come up with all

kinds of contorted reasons why "The end is near", and "widespread amplifier use on these frequencies is just a matter of time". Of course, these are the same arguments these individuals have been making for YEARS, and still - as there are no alligators in the sewers, there are no high-powered amplifiers on GMRS/FRS/MURS.

Stewart Teaze - N0MHS

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

4642. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:19:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528201949.17509.00000943@mb-ft.aol.com>
Source record: 43961

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Dan used older. I simply said those who remember numerous, superflous
>license classes will be gone one day. After that, hams will just consider
>themselves hams without all this false class distiction.

When I was licensed in 1963, there was Novice, Tech, General and Extra. Even though the General carried all operating privileges, we saw the Extra as a cut above. Unless the FCC goes to one license class, your vision of a classless society will never come to pass.

In your classless vision, do you think the requirements should be at today's entry level, ensuring maximum number of new hams, or at today's Extra, ensuring few new hams, albeit fairly well versed in Amateur practice before they even begin?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4643. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:22:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528202210.17509.00000944@mb-ft.aol.com>
Source record: 43962

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> - Operating skills
>> - Practical technical skills and knowledge
>> - Homebrewing and modifying equipment
>> - Public Service
>> - "G-rated" content
>> - Healthy, friendly competition
>> - No barriers because of age, gender, race, or socioeconomic status
>> - Play by the rules at all times
>>
>> There are lots of younger hams who identify with this "older"
>> ham radio culture.
>
>Fantastic! Nothing wrong with that until you add:

>Cronyism
>Double Standards
>Cliques
>Intolerance for newcomers and beginners
>and
>License class bigotry

He didn't add that; you did.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4644. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:28:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528202849.17509.00000945@mb-ft.aol.com>
Source record: 43963

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Would you also like our armed
>forces to go back to bows and arrows and catapults?

Of course not, Cecil; our armed forces have some very sophisticated weaponry
nowadays.

They still train them in hand-to-hand combat skills, though...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4645. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:32:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528203222.17509.00000946@mb-ft.aol.com>
Source record: 43964

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@att.net

>Why would the most basic means of
>radiocommunication be anything less than attractive to potential hams?

>If there exists such a things as ham radio in 2050 it will look much
>more like CB or your RF internet.

The above two sentences are very contradicdtory, unless you are saying that you think that the internet or CB will have potential users who are attracted to Morse code use.

Are you finally coming around that Morse code will be attractive to newcomers with or without the testing?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4646. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:34:49 UTC
From: Jack Thorpe <jthorpe1234@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <JmVI8.106$G81.62274@dca1-nnrp2.news.algx.net>
Source record: 43965
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205240958.50295699@posting.google.com...
> "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message
news:<ackekk$dq5$0@pita.alt.net>...
>
> This is the same old argument that we've been hearing for years... FRS
> will become just like 11m(with illegal amplifiers), or MURS will
> become just like 11m... of course it has been proved completely
> wrong. The reason that folks on 11m went to amplifiers was because it
> actually helps them increase their communications range - the fact
> that they interfere with others when the skip is out is simply a
> side-effect. With no skip, there is no incentive to go with
> exceedingly higher power in the first place, because it serves
> virtually no useful purpose on VHF/UHF.
>

So you're saying that doing 100 watts on VHF isn't going to help much over 2
watts? What pipe are you smoking?

4647. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:35:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528203559.17509.00000947@mb-ft.aol.com>
Source record: 43966

From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net

>Ed, I rest my case from a different thread. The amateur tests ARE too
>easy.

They are harder today than they were when I studied 16 pages to get a General
in 1963,

>I would be happy with a fair knowlege of the regulations and
>basic safety. That, sadly, appears to be beyond the reach of some folks
>that have already obtained licenses.

From what I have seen of the posts of some here, it is beyond the reach of some
who obtained licenses when I did! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4648. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:42:54 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <iuVI8.53037$%o.5248933@bin3.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 43967
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:jr55fug07uu8io8rng7778ua6lknlia88q@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 27 May 2002 18:43:35 GMT, "Leland C. Scott"
> <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> >
> >"G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:g092fu8tvoqp63c6oa4ul74d6l35iu5t00@4ax.com...
> >> The one real live problem I've heard about on MURS (as far as
> >> non-certified radios) was with Ham operators using their 2m radios on
> >> MURS.
> >>
> >> The fox hunts will turn up some of their own people.
> >
> >I hear this typical "garbage" from CBers all the time,
> >Hams operating out of band.
>
> I heard it from a Ham.

He was jerking your chain and you fell for it.

>
> >So until somebody can provide proof positive the accusation
> >is basically BS.
>
> You'd have a hard time convincing the person who posted about the
> situation.
>
> >The idea that Hams would limit themselves to 2 watts on five frequencies
> >on MURS, compared with up to 1500 watts over 4 MHz on 2m, is so
> >ridiculous as to not even be worthy of serious consideration.
>
> It would seem ridiculous to limit themselves to 2 watts on MURS, they
> were running well in excess of 2 watts on MURS.

I've been monitoring all 5 MURS frequencies for some time now mobile. All I have ever heard is the typical business junk and fast food drive through order windows with just one single exception. I hear low power 1.2KBS FSK packet activity on 151.880 MHz around the Square Lake and Interstate 75 junction in the city of Troy Michigain. Once you get more that a mile or two from that area the signal drops from a S9+20 to almost nothing. A high power signal this is not. And this is in a metro area of several million people with a good percentage of active Hams. So if what you say is true then I should have picked up more that one lousy low power packet station in the last year I have been monitoring, particulary given the size of the Detroit area.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

4649. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:44:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528204419.17509.00000949@mb-ft.aol.com>
Source record: 43968

From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net

>Then why hasn't anybody told me where I can buy an 80M transceiver for
>the low, low price of a broken TV?

A broken TV has never been worth anything, so a free rig is probably out of the question. Of course, even in the 60s, one usually had to buy a chassis, knobs, etc., unless one had a well-stocked junkbox.

One could probably salvage all the parts needed to build a transmitter from today's junk TVs, too, but it is probably a lot more cost effective to buy a kit.

See http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/qrpkits.html

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4650. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:49:43 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <99D9649F8D98E774.A6021DB2A98300B3.A27C3049357B4F9B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43970

On 29 May 2002 00:44:19 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
>
>>Then why hasn't anybody told me where I can buy an 80M transceiver for
>>the low, low price of a broken TV?
>
>A broken TV has never been worth anything, so a free rig is probably out of the
>question. Of course, even in the 60s, one usually had to buy a chassis, knobs,
>etc., unless one had a well-stocked junkbox.

Well, OK, I had to come up with my own solder and PCB.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4651. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:51:43 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <2A4049EF666BA123.F2A1B9B0EDB3F2FF.15BC7BA46DAFADF4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43972
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Tue, 28 May 2002 22:11:31 GMT, "Paul Peterson" <pp23@cox.net>
wrote:

>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote
>>
>> >All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.
>>
>> Well, then I wish you'd tell me what I've been building since I passed
>> General. They're not exactly state-of-the-art, and are mostly
>> rockbound, but they make beeps come out of a receiver when I press the
>> key.
>>
>> What could they be? Or am I dead and just haven't noticed?
>
>Typical response to one line out of context.

Typical response to a comment for which no response can support your
position.

>When you can debate with intelligence, let us know, and
>we can then have a discussion.

Since your intelligence is becoming more and more debatable, there's
no need.
Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4652. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:55:09 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <NFVI8.48797$jm.5088882@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 43969
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan Martin" <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com> wrote in message
news:uf5svdkud9r837@corp.supernews.com...
> Well I have seen hams use out of band freqs, 151.055, 451.1875.... not
> just heard, but seen. Don't for a minute think that hams don't go out of
> bandm they do it all the time, for various "reasons".

And some of them may in fact be legitimate depending on the Ham. Some do have license privileges to transmit on other than the Ham Bands. In one case I remember seeing a Royal Oak city cop, in full uniform with side arm, sitting at a table in a small restaurant on Woodward Avenue with a very plainly obvious Yeasu HT. His heavy duty Motorola radio was nowhere to be seen. Was he a Ham? I don't know because I didn't ask, and I didn't see him making a transmissions with it while I was there to check for a callsign.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

4653. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 00:58:37 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF427BB.5B5CEC16@icok.net>
Source record: 43971
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb

Stew,
So far, you're the only one spreading these rumors, then
'debunking' them. A lot like the 'fire-bugs' who start a
fire, then report it to be a 'hero'. You need help, boy...
'Doc

4654. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 01:01:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528210135.17509.00000952@mb-ft.aol.com>
Source record: 43974

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>A secondary motivation seems to be to stop the growth of these
>wildly-popular radio services - as ham VHF/UHF usage has continued to
>decline in recent years, these services are rapidly growing in
>popularity.

In the first place, your math is a bit defective, Stew; there are more hams today, not fewer. It seems to me that you are the one trying to misrepresent ham radio to further your cause.

Why would hams care what happens on a handful of MURS channels?

>There has never been a reported violation involving amplifiers on any
>of these VHF/UHF frequencies; and, the fact is, there is simply no
>real motivation for the average person to use amplifiers on these
>frequencies.

Only because useage is light. :-)

> Sky wave, or "skip" propagation is commonplace on HF frequencies. To
>take advantage of this propagation requires running more than the
>legally-allowed 4W output allowed on 11m CB...

Nonsense. I have worked US to Europe on 21 MHz with about 1 milliwatt of transmit power.

You have it wrong, Stew; the power is needed on VHF to work various scatter modes, not on HF, where propagation allows QRP signals to propagate worldwide.

Nice try, but you shot your argument in the foot.

>A side result of this
>"culture", has been that these individuals resort to a kind of
>"entertainment" by jamming smaller-powered stations ("squashing") when
>the "skip is out".

That IS the reason that people have to run more power on HF or VHF, Stew, and human nature being what it is, people are predicting that it will happen on the MURS channels, too. To promote MURS use, you seem to want to deny that.

>However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
>propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
>motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
>on these frequencies.

You need to learn about the backscatter modes on VHF, Stew; hams use them all the time, and power is needed to make them work.

>Of
>course, these are the same arguments these individuals have been
>making for YEARS, and still - as there are no alligators in the
>sewers, there are no high-powered amplifiers on GMRS/FRS/MURS.

How many years have the MURS channels been available, Stew? Just curious. How many users in your area?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4655. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 01:02:23 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF4289D.6D539A11@icok.net>
Source record: 43973
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart,
Sorry, forgot to add this to the preceding post.
Your license proposal is a REAL stupid idea. Some
how, it 'fits' you.
'Doc

4656. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 01:17:25 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <F_VI8.53363$%o.5288192@bin3.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 43975
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"horseshoe7" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:u6CH8.43700$db7.1534281@news2.west.cox.net...
>
> So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using amps on
> VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS.

It is not "VIRTUALLY USELESS". For operating well beyond the LOS for two stations it would be true most of the time. However for two stations within LOS of each other it is not. One of the factors is the about of ground clutter between them, and how much of the RF power is either reflected off in to space or absorbed. The only other way to beat path loss, while using the same rigs, other than antenna gain, is to boost TX power, thus the market for V/UHF amplifiers. Think about it the next time your cell phone will not connect while inside of the big department store or a customer's factory location etc.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

4657. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 01:49:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ad1cil$5pp$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43978

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:2PsI8.7265$LC3.536770@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:acsd6fvpd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> That "was" the case and is changing and has changed to
> > the point where the liklihood that testing will end is
> > all but certain.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> From what I have been reading, there is a pretty good chance the Russians
> among others will sink the no-code ship without a bubble. The issue is so
> low on the scale of things that one objection will cause its deferral as I
> believe has happened at two previous WARCs. The fat lady has yet to
> limber up the old vocal cords.

In the past there was NO general agreement beforehand. Not so now.

> On a personal level, I think Morse has more than outlived its regulatory
> usefulness but at the same time the howling and gnashing of teeth would be
> a sound to behold.

So how come we've seen no such howling and gnashing
of teeth so far? Sure there are some outspoken PCTAs,
but nothing that even comes close to any strong
support. As to the soviets, they are but ONE contrary
in the face of a unanomous group in favor of ending code
testing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4658. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 01:50:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1uWI8.417$V15.18092337@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43976

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020528201949.17509.00000943@mb-ft.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Dan used older. I simply said those who remember numerous, superflous
> >license classes will be gone one day. After that, hams will just
consider
> >themselves hams without all this false class distiction.
>
> When I was licensed in 1963, there was Novice, Tech, General and Extra.
Even
> though the General carried all operating privileges, we saw the Extra as a
cut
> above.

"We" also looked upon experienced hams who were doing things as a cut above the rest. Many were/are Extra class, but not all. Several were lowly Techs running circles around most of the Extras I've known.

>Unless the FCC goes to one license class, your vision of a classless society will never come to pass.

Dammit Ed, can't I have a dream without you messing it up?

> In your classless vision, do you think the requirements should be at
today's
> entry level,

No, but I do think todays entry level license is very difficult to attain, and conveys dangerous power authorizations for and entry level license. It needs to be reworked.

> ensuring maximum number of new hams, or at today's Extra, ensuring
> few new hams, albeit fairly well versed in Amateur practice before they
even
> begin?

Don't be silly. Can't you envision a license presently called "General" that is a middle ground, and was good enough for all priveleges back in the heyday of slipstick competency?

4659. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 01:52:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <jvWI8.418$i%4.17931584@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43977

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020528202210.17509.00000944@mb-ft.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> - Operating skills
> >> - Practical technical skills and knowledge
> >> - Homebrewing and modifying equipment
> >> - Public Service
> >> - "G-rated" content
> >> - Healthy, friendly competition
> >> - No barriers because of age, gender, race, or socioeconomic status
> >> - Play by the rules at all times
> >>
> >> There are lots of younger hams who identify with this "older"
> >> ham radio culture.
> >
> >Fantastic! Nothing wrong with that until you add:
>
> >Cronyism
> >Double Standards
> >Cliques
> >Intolerance for newcomers and beginners
> >and
> >License class bigotry
>
> He didn't add that; you did.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Don't Shoot Me, I'm Only The Messenger. I Only Observe...blah blah blah

4660. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 01:57:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5AWI8.423$555.18282872@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43979

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020528200733.18708.00000144@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <IwiI8.3936$rB7.115313800@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020526160629.18708.00000120@mb-cc.aol.com...
> >> In article <U44I8.2123$yJ4.91632762@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> >> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >Anything above that minimum requirement, i.e., General, is superflous.
> >>
> >> The FCC doesn't think so.
> >
> >He he. They'll get there.
>
> When? It's been 34 years since "incentive licensing" became effective. The
> R&O for 98-143 did not give any indication that the FCC saw the role of
the
> General license changing.

I thought the FCC wanted to simplify the book keeping. What would make it
simpler?

> >> >The General once granted all priveleges,
> >>
> >> all OPERATING privileges
> >>
> >> > in a day when you had to beep fast,
> >>
> >> 13 wpm isn't "fast" at all.
> >
> >It is in my opinion.
>
> The consensus of those who can actually do it is that it's not fast at
all.

And the consensus of those of us who aren't in love with the code is that
its fast.

> >> >take exams without question pools, and face down that mean old FCC
> >Examiner.
> >>
> >> Don't forget having to pass both code tests before even getting a look

at
> >the
> >> written, no CSCEs, and the 30 day mandatory wait to retest. Also the
> >> experience requirements for the Advanced and Extra.
> >
> >Oh yeh, all that too.
>
> Been there, done that.
> >
> >> >The Novice was meant to be a limited license.
> >>
> >> And it was.
> >>
> >> >The General was not.
> >>
> >> That is incorrect. You are mistaken, Brian.
> >
> >I am not.
>
> Yes, you are. You simply don't want to admit a mistake, despite
> all the evidence presented that you are, indeed, mistaken.

Scan in Part 97 from those years and post it.

> >> The General class license appeared as part of the restructuring of
1951.
> >> It was
> >> basically the old Class B, renamed. It was a limited license from the
1951
> >> restructuring until February of 1953 - almost 2 years. The FCC
announced
> >> that they intended General to be a limited license when they
restructured
> >> in
> >> 1951, and again in 1967 when they announced the "incentive licensing"
> >> changes.
> >
> >All priveleges.
> >
> Which means what? It's not even a sentence.

G-E-N-E-R-A-L conveyed A-L-L P-R-I-V-E-L-E-G-E-S.

4661. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 02:02:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <AEWI8.426$265.18345000@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43980

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020528200735.18708.00000145@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <3CF370E5.3FC53D40@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

A lot of contrary stuff snipped for the sake of brevity.

> Today, May 28, 2002, Russia joined NATO. That's a good thing.

What is good about it?

4662. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 02:03:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <OFWI8.427$e75.18406653@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43981

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020528200726.18708.00000143@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <46iI8.3921$gt7.114912485@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020526220627.06857.00000276@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >> In article <1%3I8.2118$zI4.91577555@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> >> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >You perpetuate the myth that old exams are better than the new exams.
> >>
> >> Not a myth. An opinion. I have taken both and passed - have you? I
think
> >not.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I passed the Extra in 1994.
>
> Then why do you still have a General license?
>
> > How old does it have to be?
>
> Older than that.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

How much older?

4663. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 02:08:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8KWI8.430$h25.18116887@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43982

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF41854.5000207@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dan Finn wrote:
> >
> >> Why can you not default on the side of excellence in your
> >> so-called earthly matters such as laws and regulations on radio.
> >
> > Following that logic, the FCC should raise the Morse code
> > requirement to 50 wpm. What do you think would happen to the
> > Amateur Radio Service?
> >
> No, not exactly true. Raising code speed to 50 wpm is not a default.

What would the default be, if not 50wpm? 70wpm?

> Instead. it would effectively be a decision to require Morse above
> everything else at the risk of losing a large part of the amateur
> community.

An Amateur Service of One? What's wrong with that? Would it exclude KR4AJ?

4664. Re: Off-Off-Topic!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 02:09:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <6LWI8.431$J95.18569312@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 43983

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uf6u5cm03t3ab1@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> Hobbyline shows a 1/48th-scale Cessna 150, wingspan
> about 8-inches, made by Hasegawa, for about eight dollars.
>
> Heading for cover now . . .
>
> Val Germann
> KC0MUB

Val, long time, no hear. How's the 20wpm coming? Brian

4665. Re: A Peaceful Memorial Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 02:11:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020528221159.08779.00000590@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 43984

In article <20020527032137.02480.00000715@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> To all of those of you who have served in the Armed Forces or supported >them, may this day bring you peace and comfort.
>
> Thank you for having been there.

Steve:

Thanks, and all of the same to you.

73 de Larry, K3LT
MSgt, USAF (Retired)

4666. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 02:17:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528221742.17205.00001347@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 43985

>Subject: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/28/02 20:16 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205281616.4a5ccf0@posting.google.com>

>The myth - spread by hams having a strong "radio cop" slant - has
>absolutely no basis in fact

No "radio cop" problems here, Stewart...Just facts. Either truckers are using linear amplifiers on MURS or they are using Amateur Gear.

>The motivation for spreading the rumor
>is somewhat complex - but, the main motivation appears be to maintain
>some kind of "superiority complex" these hams harbor over "CB users".

No...the motivation is debuking your lying..either that or youa re grossly ignorant. In either case I would not want to be the one with my britches hanging out like you let yours.

>A secondary motivation seems to be to stop the growth of these
>wildly-popular radio services....(SNIP)

"Wildly popular"...?!?!

GMRS is dead in all except a few heavy metro areas. I have had the GMRS pairs programed and scanning for almost as long as I have lived in the greater Chattanooga area, and have only heard sparse traffic, and it's all from Nashville. Atlanta fares better, however not by much.

FRS? FRS is a kiddie band. Anyone who considers FRS as a serious "hobby" band is only fooling themselves. It has it's utility, but that's all it has.

MURS? I have been to every Radio Shack store from Marietta, GA to Manchester Tennessee and no one knows what it is. When I asked about the "color dot" business radios, only one store (Chattanooga) had sold any in recent memory.

CB? HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

> as ham VHF/UHF usage has continued to
>decline in recent years, these services are rapidly growing in
>popularity.

Yeah...Wal-Mart sells a bunch of those for 8-12 year olds.

>There has never been a reported violation involving amplifiers on any
>of these VHF/UHF frequencies...(SNIP)

I see...if the FCC doesn't mail a copy of the NAL to Stewie, it didn't happen.

(UNSNIP)...>and, the fact is, there is simply no
>real motivation for the average person to use amplifiers on these
>frequencies.

Just as there is none for thier use on 11 meters.

>However, the dynamics of radio wave
>propagation on HF CB vs. VHF MURS or UHF FRS/GMRS are quite different.

Stewie, the issue is "how far can I talk, and who can I talk over". That equates to power, be it DC power or ERP. Current Amateur gear is already being used for illegal purposes as is maritime VHF radios.

> Sky wave, or "skip" propagation is commonplace on HF frequencies. To
>take advantage of this propagation requires running more than the
>legally-allowed 4W output allowed on 11m CB..

Thank you for clearly demonstrating your IGNORANCE of HF propagation, Stewie, especially at the 10/11 meter region. Four watts is moe than enough power for the purposes for which the service was created.

>as a result, many
>truckers(and other citizens) have resorted to using illegal amplifiers
>to raise the output of their radio stations to outrageosly-high
>values; 500, 1000, 1500, even 2000 Watt amplifier use is commonplace -

Ignorant putz.....

CBers were talking coast to coast in the 60's and 70's with "legal" power. Linears are only used to be able to overcome perceived interference.

>allowing these individuals to communicate great distances(sometimes
>1,000s of miles when the "skip is in"). A side result of this
>"culture", has been that these individuals resort to a kind of
>"entertainment" by jamming smaller-powered stations ("squashing") when
>the "skip is out".

No...that's a 24/7 affair.

>However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
>propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
>motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
>on these frequencies.

It's not about skip...Get it through your toilet papner thin mind, Stewie...

>and still - as there are no alligators in the
>sewers, there are no high-powered amplifiers on GMRS/FRS/MURS.

You ARE an idiot.

4667. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 02:32:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020528223237.17205.00001352@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 43986

>Subject: Re: Code Question
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 05/28/02 20:07 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20020528200735.18708.00000145@mb-cc.aol.com>

>>Would you also like our armed forces to go back to bows and arrows and
>>catapults?
>
>"Our armed forces" never had them in the first place.

I dunno, Jim...The U.S.Navy has made pretty good use out of catapults!
Big ones, but catapults nonetheless!

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

4668. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 02:33:40 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <86XI8.10302$LC3.745021@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43987

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ad1cil$5pp$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:2PsI8.7265$LC3.536770@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:acsd6fvpd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > That "was" the case and is changing and has changed to
> > > the point where the liklihood that testing will end is
> > > all but certain.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > From what I have been reading, there is a pretty good chance the
Russians
> > among others will sink the no-code ship without a bubble. The issue
is so
> > low on the scale of things that one objection will cause its deferral
as I
> > believe has happened at two previous WARCs. The fat lady has yet to
> > limber up the old vocal cords.
>
> In the past there was NO general agreement beforehand. Not so now.
>
> > On a personal level, I think Morse has more than outlived its
regulatory
> > usefulness but at the same time the howling and gnashing of teeth
would be
> > a sound to behold.
>
> So how come we've seen no such howling and gnashing
> of teeth so far? Sure there are some outspoken PCTAs,
> but nothing that even comes close to any strong
> support. As to the soviets, they are but ONE contrary
> in the face of a unanomous group in favor of ending code
> testing.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

>

And in the wonderful world of negotiations of very lo-priority issues, anything that threatens to take time in the meeting kills it deader than hell. One is all it takes.

Lighten up, Bill. It is not in our hands anyway. Kind of reminds me of an Ayn Randism, "The most unpopular man in the room is he who articulates what everyone in the room already knows." Is foot-stamping and messenger-shooting going to help?

Go back to gnat-straining and camel-swallowing.

Beers!
Dick N�BK

4669. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 03:02:29 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF444C5.30008@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43988

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:3CF41854.5000207@bellsouth.net...
>
>>
>>CAM wrote:
>>
>> > Dan Finn wrote:
>> >
>> >> Why can you not default on the side of excellence in your
>> >> so-called earthly matters such as laws and regulations on radio.
>> >
>> > Following that logic, the FCC should raise the Morse code
>> > requirement to 50 wpm. What do you think would happen to the
>> > Amateur Radio Service?
>> >
>>No, not exactly true. Raising code speed to 50 wpm is not a default.
>>
>
> What would the default be, if not 50wpm? 70wpm?

Hmm, CAM builds the straw man base for N0iMD, steps back and N0iMD adds
more pieces of straw to make the construct larger but more unstable.

CAM knows how to push the ON switch to activate N0iMD. N0iMD has no idea
that CAM is playing him like a Stradivarius.

Q: Who will shoot it the straw man down?

>>Instead. it would effectively be a decision to require Morse above
>>everything else at the risk of losing a large part of the amateur
>>community.
>>
>
> An Amateur Service of One? What's wrong with that? Would it exclude KR4AJ?

A: N0iMD. Through no creativity of his own, Brian shoots down the straw
man. Even KR4AJ is excluded from ham radio, according to the straw
logic, therefore the KR4AJ position cannot be valid. N0iMD is actually
exposed as a part time puppet of CAM.

The straw logic can hardly stand up on its own weight and Brian
easily topples the straw construct and claims victory.

Rather stupid, don't you think? Vladimir Lenin used to do the same
thing. He got it from Karl Marx, Comrade Burke.

heh heh heh...and it's the oldest 6th grade trick in the book.

73 de KR4AJ

4670. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 03:20:32 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <faf2118571a2a9bddafcb1abbc0e2be6.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43989
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Good grief, Stewart. One begins to wonder exactly what you are trying to promote. I've run phone patches from Guam to Webster, NY, running only 15 watts! I've gotten into a cw net thousands of miles away - running MILLIWATTS. Power is needed in VHF/UHF for some of the more exotic modes. Meteor trails, moonbounce, some scatter work ... heck, with my 6 double a alkalines, I can open repeaters close to 100 miles away (well, one that is high - and that is when I'm up on the 23rd floor of an apartment complex, but you get the idea). Problems happen when unknowlegable folks apply the golden screwdriver. I've seen posts which state you only have to turn a pot to make your FRS radio 'louder'. I doubt going into deviation and descriminators would help as it is likely over that user's head. Believe me, I've had a lot of fun back in the early 70s with CB. The urban legends usually circulate amongst those who don't know enough technology to know when something is simply not true. I saw a post perhaps not a week ago on a board from someone looking for a mod for a radio. Another guy posted a link to a website with the mod. Sure enough, TWO DAYS LATER, the first guy posts again with the subject 'HELP'. Seems he let the smoke out of the components. Seems the radio is stuck on 28.500, won't transmit, and squeals when the audio gain is turned up. You seem to think the amateurs are putting people down. The problem is that some folks are being led into things that they know nothing about - and it shows when some 27 MHz signals are 50 KHz wide. Unless you are working moonbounce, a 3 dB signal gain or loss won't usually amount to anything - yet people mod their rigs to try and get that 3 dB extra, which is usually spread where they don't want it. My guess is that the majority of amateurs are running 150 watts or less. The large majority. And working stations worldwide every day. Why do you think one necessarily needs a linear? Sure, the big gun DXCC guys run 'em (often with a mentality that is similar to yours), but most don't honestly need 'em. Besides, going from a ground mounted vertical to a 3 element beam up 60 feet will often gain you as much or more than increasing from 100 to 1000 watts and cost less.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205281616.4a5ccf0@posting.google.com

> Like any of the classic urban legands - LSD tattoos, Kidney theft,
> Alligators in the sewers - the GMRS/FRS/MURS high-power amplifier myth
> just keeps making the rounds...
>
> http://www.urbanlegends.com/

>
> The myth - spread by hams having a strong "radio cop" slant - has
> absolutely no basis in fact. The motivation for spreading the rumor
> is somewhat complex - but, the main motivation appears be to maintain
> some kind of "superiority complex" these hams harbor over "CB users".
> A secondary motivation seems to be to stop the growth of these
> wildly-popular radio services - as ham VHF/UHF usage has continued to
> decline in recent years, these services are rapidly growing in
> popularity.
> Stewart Teaze - N0MHS
>
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4671. Re: A Peaceful Memorial Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 03:26:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <2d6166b929753270a82c5219b1be489e.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 43990

I'll second that - and especially note those who did not come back.
They were the ones making the ultimate sacrifice.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim RM3, US Navy, Vietnam vet

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020527032137.02480.00000715@mb-cb.aol.com

> This year more than most, I hope we can all take a moment to reflect and
> offer a silent prayer of thanks and respect to all those who have given or lost
> thier lives for our Nation.
>
> To all of those of you who have served in the Armed Forces or supported
> them, may this day bring you peace and comfort.
>
> Thank you for having been there.
>
> Paratus et Vigilans
>
> Steve Robeson, LPN
> GySgt, USMC, retired
> Winchester, TN

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4672. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 03:40:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF44D6A.504F0016@att.net>
Source record: 43991

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Dan used older. I simply said those who remember numerous, superflous
> >license classes will be gone one day. After that, hams will just consider
> >themselves hams without all this false class distiction.
>
> When I was licensed in 1963, there was Novice, Tech, General and Extra. Even
> though the General carried all operating privileges, we saw the Extra as a cut
> above. Unless the FCC goes to one license class, your vision of a classless
> society will never come to pass.
>
> In your classless vision, do you think the requirements should be at today's
> entry level, ensuring maximum number of new hams, or at today's Extra, ensuring
> few new hams, albeit fairly well versed in Amateur practice before they even
> begin?

Don't confuse poor Brian, he doesn't know what he thinks. He just, uh, thinks.

4673. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 04:02:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF452BD.8B52EB7E@att.net>
Source record: 43992

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You are confusing cause and effect, Dick. It is outdated requirements
> > > like Morse code that can *result* in killing off ham radio. If ham
> > > radio is to survive it must be attractive to potential hams. Leave
> > > the Morse code requirement and fast forward to 2050. What do you
> > > see?
> >
> > You're a real joke, Cecil. Why would the most basic means of
> > radiocommunication be anything less than attractive to potential hams?
>
> CW *is* attractive to a lot of potential hams. What is unattractive is
> the Morse code *requirement* that puts Morse code on a pass/fail level
> with everything else in ham radio combined. You are continuing to
> confuse CW, the mode, with the Morse code requirement. The two
> subjects are virtually unrelated. The Morse code requirement is
> like forcing everyone to pass their driving exam in a 1950 stick-
> shift Ford before being allowed to drive any other vehicle. Do
> you support that concept?

I totally reject your "concept" because it is grossly inaccurate, not to mention plain old wrong. Requiring learning the code is more like requiring one to learn to drive on a two lane highway before going onto a freeway. Can you say THE BASICS?

4674. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 04:05:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF45342.6891354E@att.net>
Source record: 43993

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Why should it matter where you learned radio as long as you learned it?
>
> So my EE degree is not meaningless after all?
>

It's YOU that are meaningless.

4675. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 04:12:12 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF4551C.EBA965A5@hotmail.com>
Source record: 43994

Dan Finn wrote:
> If I QSO
> with a ham in Cuba who is touching 2 wires together, I need to know
> Morse code, otherwise the Cuban loses the ability to communicate with me
> and I have no business cluttering his bandwidth because there is someone
> else who knows code that he should be communicating with.

Why should someone who hates Morse code and will never use it have
to meet the Morse code requirement? For him, it is a 'make work'
requirement like digging a hole and filling it up again.

> Basically, if
> you can't play with the big boys, don't ruin it for everyone else.

I fail to see how someone who doesn't know Morse code could ruin CW
QSOs since he wouldn't be operating in that part of the band.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4676. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 04:19:18 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF456C6.AAC77941@hotmail.com>
Source record: 43995

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CF370E5.3FC53D40@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >During the cold war, the Russians were still using vacuum tubes after the US
> >had progressed to solid state.
>
> The Russia and the Soviet Union are not the same thing.

Are you saying that Russia was not part of the Soviet Union during the
cold war?

> The only things the Russians are hanging onto that have outlived their
> usefulness are some old ideas about the West.

Many Russians want to bring Communism back.

> >Why do you want to stand in the way of freedom of choice of modes
> >in amateur radio along with inevitable progress?
>
> Who is standing in the way of freedom of coice of modes? Certainly not
> W0EX.

He wants every HF ham's first "mode" to be Morse code.

> Progress is not inevitable.

If you're not part of the solution, you are part of the problem.

> >Would you also like our armed forces to go back to bows and arrows and
> >catapults?
>
> "Our armed forces" never had them in the first place.

Human being's armed forces never had bows and arrows and catapults?
I'll bet some of your ancestors used them during wartime.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4677. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 04:27:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF45894.DAC5729D@att.net>
Source record: 43996

CAM wrote:

> > Who is standing in the way of freedom of coice of modes? Certainly not
> > W0EX.
>
> He wants every HF ham's first "mode" to be Morse code.

Another fine example of the absolute propensity of the code haters' routine outright lying about the actions, activities and viewpoints of anyone who supports a code qualification for hams. You should be ashamed of yourself, but of course you aren't capable of that.

4678. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 04:32:43 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <utl8fuou71v39mu2tvd00u0hr7h89dmp1r@4ax.com>
Source record: 43997
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Wed, 29 May 2002 00:42:54 GMT, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

>> >I hear this typical "garbage" from CBers all the time,
>> >Hams operating out of band.
>>
>> I heard it from a Ham.
>
>He was jerking your chain and you fell for it.

I know the fellow. He wasn't jerking anyone's chain. He was a bit
upset by their arrogance, not really caring if anyone found out who
they were.

>So if what you say is true then I should have picked up more that
>one lousy low power packet station in the last year I have been
>monitoring, particulary given the size of the Detroit area.

Sure, if VHF had skip. I have not heard any high powered MURS
stations anywhere between Everett and Seattle WA.

If you'd like to chat with your high powered buddies on MURS you might
take a little trip to Billerica, MA. Sounds like it would be an easy
fox hunt, well, more like an elephant hunt.

Mike

4679. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 04:38:30 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF45B46.6B326C32@hotmail.com>
Source record: 43998

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Requiring learning the code is more like requiring
> one to learn to drive on a two lane highway before going onto a freeway.

Nope, it's not, Dick. Driving on a two lane highway and driving on a
freeway are both "driving". It's like allowing automatic transmission
drivers on two lane highways but requiring them to demonstrate stick shift
skill before allowing them on a freeway. There is nothing to keep a
ham from achieving excellence sans Morse code skill just as there
is nothing to keep an automatic transmission only person from being a
good driver. You are still demonstrating the "No Code = No Ham" mentality.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4680. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 04:52:19 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF45E83.F5C086F9@hotmail.com>
Source record: 43999

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > He (Dick) wants every HF ham's first "mode" to be Morse code.
>
> Another fine example of the absolute propensity of the code haters' routine
> outright lying about the actions, activities and viewpoints of anyone who supports
> a code qualification for hams. You should be ashamed of yourself, but of course you
> aren't capable of that.

Anyone who supports a code qualification for hams before they are allowed on HF
wants every HF ham's first "mode" to be Morse code. That's prima facie, Dick.
You want every ham to possess Morse code skill before being allowed to use
any other mode on HF. How you can deny that is beyond belief.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4681. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 05:11:10 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205282111.1f78557b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44000

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20020528152100.08308.00000893@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MURS gets boost
> >From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
> >Date: 05/28/02 15:04 Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205281104.68645442@posting.google.com>
>
> >SSSShhhh!!! We don't want this SECRET to get out... that 1.25m is not
> >being used for anything.
> >
> >Heaven forbid that we actually allow these frequencies to be used for
> >something
>
> A quick tour through the repeater guide indicates a LOT of repeaters within
> access range of Murietta, Stew.
>
> And I also know for a fact that 222mHz is very active for remote base
> controlling, auxiliary control and other "non-traditional" applications (ie"
> honey-do traffic at rush hour)

Hans, Steve;

Come on you guys... I'm not about to run out and buy a 1.25M rig ;^)

Now - I'll have to admit that I was considering buying a Yaesu VX-5 -
mostly because I wanted to play around with 6m. However, I understand
the FT-817 is fairly reasonably priced these days... pretty impressive
little QRP backpack unit... I suppose I could even use it on HF :-O

Stewart - N0MHS

4682. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 05:24:51 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF46623.1000805@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 43901

CAM wrote:

> Dan Finn wrote:
>
>>If I QSO
>>with a ham in Cuba who is touching 2 wires together, I need to know
>>Morse code, otherwise the Cuban loses the ability to communicate with me
>>and I have no business cluttering his bandwidth because there is someone
>>else who knows code that he should be communicating with.
>>
>
> Why should someone who hates Morse code and will never use it have
> to meet the Morse code requirement?

How can a reasonable person hate an abstraction such as a code? Can one hate ASCII or C++ or might they simply find them difficult to learn and dislike studying them? In and of themselves, these concepts are not physical and are not capable of being hated per se. There is no way to focus hate on a neutral technical concept. One may say that they hate Darwin's theory but what they really may hate is the possibility of it being true. One may say that they hate calculus but what they really might hate is refusing to be able to logically accept the summation of an infinitely high number of infinitely small areas. It goes against some peoples' grain. Calculus, Darwin and code are neutral and not capable of being truly hated in and of themselves by reasonable people.

One may disagree with the Morse code requirement but hating Morse code would seem to portray some psychological implications that would imply an irrational internalizing of Morse Code as a physical object of hate. It would imply an agenda...the Sohl-Anderson-Burke-Marx agenda of "From each according to his ability (no matter how limited), to each according to his need (to fire up on HF").

> For him, it is a 'make work'
> requirement like digging a hole and filling it up again.

Nobody likes to dig holes, only to fill them up again. I completely agree with you. This is truly a characteristic of international Communism (and Democrats) and the New World Order (Novus Ordo Seclorum) of Globalism. Holes that are dug must stay unfilled.

>>Basically, if
>>you can't play with the big boys, don't ruin it for everyone else.
>>
>
> I fail to see how someone who doesn't know Morse code could ruin CW

> QSOs since he wouldn't be operating in that part of the band.

But the privilege allows 5wpm Gen's to use CW sub bands. This can be very disruptive, an analogy being someone riding a bicycle in the left lane of I-40. Should they be allowed on sub bands where they are incapable of communication at a reasonable and acceptable speed?

73 de KR4AJ

4683. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 06:09:19 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205282209.1e041624@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43902
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

toomanyradios@aol.com (TooManyRadios) wrote in message
news:<20020528113149.01543.00000345@mb-dh.aol.com>...
> In article <3CF3286A.7722B8EF@swbell.net>, Wesley Horton <whorton@swbell.net>
> writes:
>
> >Oh, boy, I have this terrible feeling that GMRS is going to turn into
> >another CB fiasco.
>
> "Turn into???" It already has!!!

Isn't it just TERRIBLE! People are starting to communicate all OVER
the place. We can't have THAT now, can we? Better start a rumour on
the Internet, right away! We need to get this evil GMRS/FRS thing
BANNED!!

NOW - THE REAL REASON FOR THESE SMOKESCREENS:

Having failed in their attempts to assert the URBAN MYTH that
high-powered AMPS are being used on MURS/GMRS/FRS, these ham "Internet
Lobbyists" are now trying this NEW TACTIC to divert attention from the
fact that the ham VHF/UHF bands are VIRTUALLY UNUSED - and that
FRS/GMRS/MURS are runaway success stories in public communications.

PSSSTTT!!! Don't look now - but the ham 1.25M band has FALLEN
SILENT... go ahead, scan it for activity sometime - THERE ISN'T ANY!
... and sales of radios for the 222Mhz band have all but dried up.

... what to do? WHAT TO DO?! Let's start another rumour - there are
CHILD MOLESTERS on FRS!! That's it! We need to BAN FRS, because the
Catholic Priest Radio Club has infiltrated FRS with GMRS bubble-pack
radios!

Stewart - N0MHS

4684. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 06:16:32 UTC
From: lucifer@eternal-flames.gov
Message-ID: <3cf471e5.2631576@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 43903
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 28 May 2002 17:16:40 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>The motivation for spreading the rumor
>is somewhat complex - but, the main motivation appears be to maintain
>some kind of "superiority complex" these hams harbor over "CB users".

Not that difficult.... The average termite can justly feel superior
over a cb-er. :-)

4685. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 07:50:19 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205282350.be94373@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43904

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20020528221742.17205.00001347@mb-mw.aol.com>...
> >There has never been a reported violation involving amplifiers on any
> >of these VHF/UHF frequencies...(SNIP)
>
> I see...if the FCC doesn't mail a copy of the NAL to Stewie, it didn't
> happen.
>

Go thru the records... I have - there's NOTHING.

Stewart - N0MHS

4686. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 07:57:55 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205282357.779b0e1c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43905

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020528210135.17509.00000952@mb-ft.aol.com>...
> From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>
> >A secondary motivation seems to be to stop the growth of these
> >wildly-popular radio services - as ham VHF/UHF usage has continued to
> >decline in recent years, these services are rapidly growing in
> >popularity.
>
> In the first place, your math is a bit defective, Stew; there are more hams
> today, not fewer. It seems to me that you are the one trying to misrepresent
> ham radio to further your cause.

What does that have to do with the activity on the VHF/UHF bands?
Besides, growth is actually way down over the last few years, as a
percentage of the population(ignoring the spurt surrounding
restructuring).

> Why would hams care what happens on a handful of MURS channels?

I told you - primarily it has to do with some kind of misguided
superiorty complex; and secondarily it has to do with hiding the fact
that the VHF/UHF bands are going virtually unused.

Look - I've been trying to set things up so this band get more usage -
most hams don't want to listen, because they don't really give a rat's
ass about 1.25M, other than a "turf war" thing, whereby they just want
to keep the status quo, no matter what is in the best interest of the
county, or ham radio, for that matter.

Stewart - N0MHS

4687. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 08:20:44 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205290020.71d2e2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43906
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

'Doc <w5lz@icok.net> wrote in message news:<3CF4289D.6D539A11@icok.net>...
> stewart,
> Sorry, forgot to add this to the preceding post.
> Your license proposal is a REAL stupid idea. Some
> how, it 'fits' you.

Just like the CW code speed reduction idea, eh?

As I recall, you LOST that one BIG TIME... and you'll LOSE this one
eventually, too.

Yes - eventually the ARRL and the FCC will see the obvious - it is
only a matter of time. You can try to slow down progress - but
EVENTUALLY it will catch up to you and pass you by.

Tell me - why do you do it? Why do you fight progress? Go back and
think about all the arguments you made fighting the code speed
reduction - they are the same ones you'll make against opening up
1.25M to a new Novice Class. It's been quite a long time now since
restructuring, and NONE of the bad and evil things you predicted have
come true. Why are you so NEGATIVE? Don't you have ANY faith in your
fellow Americans?

> 'Doc

Stewart - N0MHS

4688. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 08:27:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529042722.20515.00001270@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43907

>Subject: Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin
>lincense!
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/29/02 02:09 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205282209.1e041624@posting.google.com>
>

>Having failed in their attempts to assert the URBAN MYTH that
>high-powered AMPS are being used on MURS/GMRS/FRS...(SNIP)

Now you've done it, Stewie...I am confused. Can't figure out if it's
lying, ignorance or trolling.

In any case, it looks foolish on you.

>PSSSTTT!!! Don't look now - but the ham 1.25M band has FALLEN
>SILENT... go ahead, scan it for activity sometime - THERE ISN'T ANY!

Well, damn, Stewie, there you go again. Two repeaters within 20 miles of
me on 222mHz, and with on-going traffic. Also, the link commands for two
remote bases and the link audio for a SKYWARN system that stretches from
Louisville, KY to Valdosta, GA, and from western Alabama to the NC shore.

Stupid putz.

>... what to do? WHAT TO DO?! Let's start another rumour - there are
>CHILD MOLESTERS on FRS!!

trolltrolltrolltrolltrolltrolltrolltrolltrolltroll.....

4689. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 08:28:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529042824.20515.00001271@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43908

>Subject: Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/29/02 03:50 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205282350.be94373@posting.google.com>

>
>Go thru the records... I have - there's NOTHING

Nothing between your ears, that is...

4690. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 08:31:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529043103.20515.00001272@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 43909

>Subject: Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/29/02 03:57 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205282357.779b0e1c@posting.google.com>

>
>Look - I've been trying to set things up so this band get more usage -

Your affect is like that of a certain former German pol that wanted to see more of the Hebrew faith in Synagogue.

BURNING in it, but in it none the less.

Go away, fool.

4691. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 09:01:49 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205290101.79aac6bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43910
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb

'Doc <w5lz@icok.net> wrote in message news:<3CF427BB.5B5CEC16@icok.net>...
> Stew,
> So far, you're the only one spreading these rumors, then
> 'debunking' them. A lot like the 'fire-bugs' who start a
> fire, then report it to be a 'hero'. You need help, boy...

I think you need better research... here I did some, myself:

Doc said on 5/3/2000:

As the 'old' saying goes, "If you can't do
the time, don't do the crime." ('Baretta' had it right
as far as I'm concerned).
'Doc/W5LZ (ex: AA5AN)

Nice 'hero' model, 'Doc. Maybe you need a new role model. BTW, I
think Baretta's 'new' saying goes something like; "If you can't do the
time, get a good lawyer."

Stewart - N0MHS

4692. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 09:12:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529051243.20019.00000346@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 43911

In article <ngTI8.1420$ib4.110550@news1.east.cox.net>, "Paul Peterson"
<pp23@cox.net> writes:

>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> wrote
>>
>> >All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.
>>
>> Well, then I wish you'd tell me what I've been building since I passed
>> General. They're not exactly state-of-the-art, and are mostly
>> rockbound, but they make beeps come out of a receiver when I press the
>> key.
>>
>> What could they be? Or am I dead and just haven't noticed?
>
>Typical response to one line out of context.
>
>When you can debate with intelligence, let us know, and
>we can then have a discussion.
>
OK, I'll bite.

What is the context you intended for "All those Hams who could build a radio,
are dead and gone"?

I've been a ham for 35 years come October. In that time I have built, from
scratch, several HF receivers, transmitters and transceivers. I've also had
manufactured rigs, built kits, converted surplus and brought basketcase rigs
back to life.

One of my current HF rigs is a 100 watt bandswitching transceiver of my own
design, built from recycled parts. (The other one is a kit I built a year ago).
Just the latest in a long line of projects that goes back to my first rig back
in 1967.

I'm 48 - not dead yet. In fact, I'm getting better. And there are lots of hams
like me out there.

Who are the hams you are referring to?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4693. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 09:57:38 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205290157.577b128e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43912
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message news:<F
VI8.53363$%o.5288192@bin3.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>...
> "horseshoe7" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:u6CH8.43700$db7.1534281@news2.west.cox.net...
> >
> > So please, do try to feed me a bunch of happy horsecrap about using
> amps on
> > VHF/UHF - it is VIRTUALLY USELESS.
>
> It is not "VIRTUALLY USELESS". For operating well beyond the LOS for two
> stations it would be true most of the time. However for two stations
> within LOS of each other it is not. One of the factors is the about of
> ground clutter between them, and how much of the RF power is either
> reflected off in to space or absorbed. The only other way to beat path
> loss, while using the same rigs, other than antenna gain, is to boost TX
> power, thus the market for V/UHF amplifiers. Think about it the next
> time your cell phone will not connect while inside of the big department
> store or a customer's factory location etc.

The discussion was really about "high-powered amps"; it is VITUALLY
USELESS to use high-powered amplifiers(>75W) in the context of LOS
MURS. Rather than restating the whole premise in each and every post
- I've posted the entire premise in another thread... the point is -
people simply haven't been using these amps on UHF GMRS/FRS or VHF
Itinerants in all the years of the existance of these services - why
all of a sudden would anyone think they are going to start to use them
now?

Stewart - N0MHS

4694. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 10:06:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529060627.03285.00000272@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 43913

In article <AEWI8.426$265.18345000@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

(N2EY wrote):

>> Today, May 28, 2002, Russia joined NATO. That's a good thing.
>
>What is good about it?

It's a sign of how much the Russians have changed. Old enemies have become new friends. They got a taste of blue jeans, rock'n'roll and McDonalds and now they want to join the party.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4695. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 10:06:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529060630.03285.00000273@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 43914

In article <20020528201949.17509.00000943@mb-ft.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>Dan used older. I simply said those who remember numerous, superflous
>>license classes will be gone one day. After that, hams will just consider
>>themselves hams without all this false class distiction.
>
>When I was licensed in 1963, there was Novice, Tech, General and Extra.

A minor point, Ed: In 1963 there were also about 39,000 Advanceds, making up about 15% of the US ham population. Of course Advanced had not been open to new applicants for more than a decade back then.

>Even though the General carried all operating privileges, we saw the Extra as
>a cut above. Unless the FCC goes to one license class, your vision of a
>classless society will never come to pass.

I agree to a point. Even with one license class, there will not be a "classless society".
>
>In your classless vision, do you think the requirements should be at today's
>entry level, ensuring maximum number of new hams, or at today's Extra,
>ensuring few new hams, albeit fairly well versed in Amateur practice before they >even begin?

Excellent question. How many steps does the ladder need? Having fewer steps can mean the steps become bigger unless the ladder is made shorter. Some folks only want a stepstool.

Note however, that some folks think the current Tech requirement is too difficult, even though it has been attained by preschoolers.

--

What needs to be developed is a new license structure for the US ARS after S25.5 goes away. Which will most probably be in 2003-2004. The smart thing to do is to have a proposal developed and ready to go to the FCC before that happens. FCC is happy with three license classes, so that's a starting point.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4696. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:04:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529070423.21437.00001241@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43915

From: CAM w5dxp@hotmail.com

>Dan Finn wrote:

>> If I QSO
>> with a ham in Cuba who is touching 2 wires together, I need to know
>> Morse code, otherwise the Cuban loses the ability to communicate with me

In my decades of Morse CW hamming, I don't believe I have ever had a QSO with a Cuban touching two wires together.

>I fail to see how someone who doesn't know Morse code could ruin CW
>QSOs since he wouldn't be operating in that part of the band.

I routinely have my 7040 kHz QSOs ruined by QRM from non-CW stations. On what basis can we determine that these operators could not ruin my QSOs because they know Morse code?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4697. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:06:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529070611.21437.00001242@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43916

From: CAM w5dxp@hotmail.com

>You want every ham to possess Morse code skill before being allowed to use
>any other mode on HF. How you can deny that is beyond belief.

Is this another one of those "what he said -- what he really meant" sort of
things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4698. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:07:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529070717.21437.00001243@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43917

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>No, but I do think todays entry level license is very difficult to attain,
>and conveys dangerous power authorizations for and entry level license.

I disagree with you that the Amateur power levels need to be reduced.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4699. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:07:51 UTC
From: Scott Sixnine <scott_unit_69@yaSPAMhoo.com>
Message-ID: <3CF4B689.E1994E4D@yaSPAMhoo.com>
Source record: 43918
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

If you weren't trolling, you wouldn't have cross posted this...

4700. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:08:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529070826.21437.00001244@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43919

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Don't be silly. Can't you envision a license presently called "General"
>that is a middle ground, and was good enough for all priveleges back in the
>heyday of slipstick competency?

Sure I can envision that, but it seems a rather large step to require every ham
to take before being allowed to transmit on Amateur frequencies.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4701. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:09:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529070910.06857.00000334@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 43920

In article <20020529060630.03285.00000273@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20020528201949.17509.00000943@mb-ft.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI)
>writes:
>
>>When I was licensed in 1963, there was Novice, Tech, General and Extra.
>
>A minor point, Ed: In 1963 there were also about 39,000 Advanceds, making up
>about 15% of the US ham population. Of course Advanced had not been open
>to new applicants for more than a decade back then.

OOOPS!! I gotta correct my own correction.

Actually, in 1963 the license classes in the USA were: Novice, Technician,
Conditional, General, Advanced and Extra. Of course a Conditional was a
"by mail" General, but the FCC thought it was important to differentiate
between hams who had taken their tests at an FCC office and those who
hadn't.

In fact, there were two kinds of Technicians back then - those who had
taken the test at an FCC office (their licenses read "Technician") and those
who
had taken the test by mail (their licenses read "Technician (C)" with the (C)
standing for "conditionally granted").

In early 1965, shortly after Ed got his start, the US license numbers looked
like this:

Extra - 3,683
Advanced - 39,928
General - 101,217
Conditional - 40,529
Technician - 58,546
Novice - 13,930

Total - 257,833

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

4702. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:09:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529070943.21437.00001245@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43921

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Don't Shoot Me, I'm Only The Messenger. I Only Observe...blah blah blah

You did not only observe. You interpreted and you reported. Most hams would disagree that your interpretation applies to most of ham radio. I do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4703. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:15:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529071514.21437.00001246@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43922

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>What does that have to do with the activity on the VHF/UHF bands?

If there were fewer hams today than in years past, I imagine you would see the connection between activity and the number of hams...

>Besides, growth is actually way down over the last few years, as a
>percentage of the population(ignoring the spurt surrounding
>restructuring).

That is flat-out incorrect. In the first place, it is a very weak argument to say that ham radio is becoming irrelevant because it is not growing as fast as it has sometimes done in the past. Pretty weak indeed. Second, the percentage of US hams vis-a-vis the total population is increasing, not decreasing.

MURS must be a very ineffective service if you have to resort to such distortions in order to defend it.

Is there a newsgroup or mailing list where I can go do undo some of the damage you are inflicting on MURS, or is it so unpopular that no such things have sprung up?

>I told you - primarily it has to do with some kind of misguided
>superiorty complex; and secondarily it has to do with hiding the fact
>that the VHF/UHF bands are going virtually unused.

Of course, the fact that the VHF/UHF bands are not going virtually unused doesn't seem to cloud your fantasty.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4704. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:16:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529071627.21437.00001247@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43923

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>they are the same ones you'll make against opening up
>1.25M to a new Novice Class.

1.25 M is already open to those who hold a Novice Class license.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4705. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:19:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529071905.21437.00001248@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43924

From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net

>Good grief, Stewart. One begins to wonder exactly what you are trying
>to promote.

He has an idea that only HE can see the worth of and he is willing to make up all sorts of misinformation to try to persuade others to his way of thinking.

It may work on some of the MURS newsgroups (I still can't find them, and so far he has not answered my request for any information about them), but it sure backfires when he tries his misinformation on hams who know better from personal experience.

But don't worry, SOMEDAY we will see the light -- or so I read in one of his posts.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4706. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:20:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529072056.21437.00001249@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43925

From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net

>Well, OK, I had to come up with my own solder and PCB.

PCB? Haw! REAL hams built on a metal chassis and had a complete set of
Greenlee punches.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4707. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:24:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529072429.21437.00001250@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43926

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

> the point is -
>people simply haven't been using these amps on UHF GMRS/FRS or VHF
>Itinerants in all the years of the existance of these services - why
>all of a sudden would anyone think they are going to start to use them
>now?

You don't think all this discussion is going to give anyone ideas, do you? Of course, I can understand why you don't want them to use amplifiers so you have no choice but to teach them misinformation that amplifiers don't work on VHF and up.

Can you point me to any newsgroups that discuss MURS so I can correct this misinformation? Or is MURS so popular that it doesn't need a newsgroup? Yeah, that's it... sure. MURS is more relevant and popular than ham radio that those using it don't have to have a newsgroup because they can all talk together on the MURS channels. THAT's the ticket!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4708. Plenty of MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:31:09 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ad2e6h$oc2$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 43927

Ed,

go to the following website. There are plenty of MURS reflectors there

http://groups.yahoo.com/search?query=murs

4709. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 11:33:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529073320.21437.00001251@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 43928

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>OK, given Part 97 and all referenced documents, recommendations,
>and specifications, WHAT IS WORD RATE IN MORSE ACCORDING
>TO REGULATIONS?!?

>Absolutely NOTHING in Part 97 specifies WORD RATE.

Absolutely nothing except:
SUBPART F-QUALIFYING EXAMINATION SYSTEMS
ï¿½97.501 Qualifying for an amateur operator license.
Each applicant must pass an examination for a new amateur
operator license grant and for each change in operator
class. Each applicant for the class of operator license
grant specified below must pass, or otherwise receive
examination credit for, the following examination elements:
(a) Amateur Extra Class operator: Elements 1, 2, 3, and 4;
(b) General Class operator: Elements 1, 2, and 3;
(c) Technician Class operator: Element 2.
ï¿½97.503 Element standards.
(a) A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove
that the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand
and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all
the letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
question mark, slant mark and prosigns AR, BT and SK.
Element 1: 5 words per minute.

>The morse character rate could be sent at anything from 5 to 50
>WPM per character and still keep the "conventional" word rate
>(5 characters plus a space) at "5 words per minute." All legal
>and per the law...because the law DOESN'T SPECIFY WORD
>RATE.

Yes, Farnsworth spacing is legal because the regulations give the VE teams the
authority to make the judgement on how the applicant is to be tested, as long
as the word rate is 5 wpm, as per the regulations.

Perhaps you intend to say that the regulations don't stipulate a character
rate? You would look a bit less foolish being wrong if you stopped yelling and
just took defeat gracefully.

>Those who are already licensed will see nothing wrong with an
>incomplete law. They may not dare challenge it for fear of being
>re-tested.

Not me; the only reason I wouldn't want to be retested is that it would be an inconvenience to have to show up at an exam session. After my unfortunate incident in Boston, I think I have already paid those dues. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4710. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 12:09:10 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF4C4E3.CA299BB0@icok.net>
Source record: 43930
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart,
It's not progress you're talking about, it's
only change. Change, just for the sake of change
is one of the stupidest ideas going. If your ideas
had any merit, that would be different, but they
don't.
As to the code speed reduction, how would you
possibly know what my feelings are about it? I've
never expressed them to you, or this NG. If you
knew what they were/are, it might suprise you.
And what new 'novice' class are you talking about?
The one you proposed which was rejected, or did
something happen and no one told me about it? I
think you're mixing fantasy with reality Stew.
Do I have faith in my fellow Americans? Yes I
do, but what has that got to do with what we're
discussing? Just more 'smoke', and trying to focus
on a totally unrelated topic. You've really got that
'politician two-step' down almost pat!
'Doc

PS - I still think you need help Stew baby...

4711. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 12:10:09 UTC
From: lucifer@eternal-flames.gov
Message-ID: <3cf4bdfc.479087@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 43929
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 28 May 2002 23:09:19 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>Isn't it just TERRIBLE! People are starting to communicate all OVER
>the place. We can't have THAT now, can we? Better start a rumour on
>the Internet, right away! We need to get this evil GMRS/FRS thing
>BANNED!!

Any truth to the rumour that the FCC is planning to withdraw the GMRS
and FRS bands and ban those particular services?

4712. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 12:13:53 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF4C5FF.214625CE@icok.net>
Source record: 43931
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb

Stew,
Now all you need to do is put that back
in context. As far as the 'hero' thing goes,
you still have no idea about what you're talking
about. Listen to the music Stew, no one's dancing
to the 'politician two-step' any more. Need to
do better than that...
'Doc

4713. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 12:29:49 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF4C9BD.C461EA7@hotmail.com>
Source record: 43932

Dan Finn wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Why should someone who hates Morse code and will never use it have
> > to meet the Morse code requirement?
>
> How can a reasonable person hate an abstraction such as a code? Can one
> hate ASCII or C++ or might they simply find them difficult to learn and
> dislike studying them? In and of themselves, these concepts are not
> physical and are not capable of being hated per se.

Of course they are physical. I'm not talking about hating an abstraction.
I'm talking about personal taste. Some hams hate Morse code like I hate
cream style corn. If I had to eat cream style corn in order to be a ham,
I wouldn't be a ham.

> > For him, it is a 'make work'
> > requirement like digging a hole and filling it up again.
>
> Nobody likes to dig holes, only to fill them up again. I completely
> agree with you. This is truly a characteristic of international
> Communism (and Democrats) and the New World Order (Novus Ordo Seclorum)
> of Globalism. Holes that are dug must stay unfilled.

But requiring a person to pass a Morse code exam who is never going to
use CW is exactly like digging a hole and filling it up again.

> > I fail to see how someone who doesn't know Morse code could ruin CW
> > QSOs since he wouldn't be operating in that part of the band.
>
> But the privilege allows 5wpm Gen's to use CW sub bands. This can be
> very disruptive, an analogy being someone riding a bicycle in the left
> lane of I-40. Should they be allowed on sub bands where they are
> incapable of communication at a reasonable and acceptable speed?

The FCC responds with a resounding "YES!" That part is already a done deal.
Nocode techs are even allowed to use CW on VHF/UHF.

Note that you are objecting to HF hams who know Morse code at a 5wpm
level and also note that HF hams who don't know Morse code at all
would be less disruptive, according to your logic.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!

------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4714. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 12:34:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529083436.26545.00002167@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 43933

> the point is -
>people simply haven't been using these amps on UHF GMRS/FRS or VHF
>Itinerants in all the years of the existance of these services - why
>all of a sudden would anyone think they are going to start to use them
>now?
>
>Stewart - N0MHS
>

Well I dont know Stewie, but 5 Truck Drivers left here yesterday with 5 VHF Delta S Radios that operate at 110 Watts, they had alot of Questions about installing them in there Trucks. I guss there going to use them as Monitor Rx. They also picked up 5, 6DB Mobile Ants to mount on there Trucks.
They Claim they work better than Scanners. They also said to let them know if anymore come available.

4715. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 12:36:28 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF4CB4C.C07494BC@hotmail.com>
Source record: 43934

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM w5dxp@hotmail.com
> >I fail to see how someone who doesn't know Morse code could ruin CW
> >QSOs since he wouldn't be operating in that part of the band.
>
> I routinely have my 7040 kHz QSOs ruined by QRM from non-CW stations. On what
> basis can we determine that these operators could not ruin my QSOs because they
> know Morse code?

Are you talking about ham stations or commercial stations? If ham stations,
weren't all of them required to know Morse code?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4716. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 12:40:38 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF4CC46.9244EAB4@hotmail.com>
Source record: 43935

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM w5dxp@hotmail.com
>
> >You want every ham to possess Morse code skill before being allowed to use
> >any other mode on HF. How you can deny that is beyond belief.
>
> Is this another one of those "what he said -- what he really meant" sort of
> things?

A Morse code requirement requires every HF ham to use the Morse code "mode"
first before using any other mode. Dick denied that fact.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4717. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 14:46:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <0R5J8.264$DM5.200@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 43936

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020529072056.21437.00001249@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
>
> >Well, OK, I had to come up with my own solder and PCB.
>
> PCB? Haw! REAL hams built on a metal chassis and had a complete set of
> Greenlee punches.

Metal chassis? Haw! REAL hams stole their Moms breadboard.

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4718. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 17:05:59 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <ad31pn$24l$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 43937

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>>There has never been a reported violation involving amplifiers on any
>>of these VHF/UHF frequencies; and, the fact is, there is simply no
>>real motivation for the average person to use amplifiers on these
>>frequencies.
>
>Only because useage is light. :-)
[...]
>>A side result of this
>>"culture", has been that these individuals resort to a kind of
>>"entertainment" by jamming smaller-powered stations ("squashing") when
>>the "skip is out".
>
>That IS the reason that people have to run more power on HF or VHF, Stew, and
>human nature being what it is, people are predicting that it will happen on the
>MURS channels, too. To promote MURS use, you seem to want to deny that.

Why do you think that more power is inevitable? There are a lot of
other ways to transmit RF without a license, yet illegal power is
commonly used in only a few of those. For CB and maybe Part 15 FM
in the broadcast band illegal power use is not uncommon, but we've also
got much heavier use of (off the top of my head) cordless phones, 802.11
devices and even cell phones and you almost never hear about people
using illegal amplifiers for these.

Why would MURS users be more likely to behave like the former rather
than the latter? (This question is not rhetorical, I have no opinion
about MURS one way or the other.)

Dennis Ferguson

4719. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 17:43:30 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <6r8J8.12446$UT.811967@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 43938

"K�HB" <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET> wrote in message
news:0R5J8.264$DM5.200@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020529072056.21437.00001249@mb-mn.aol.com...
> > From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net
> >
> > >Well, OK, I had to come up with my own solder and PCB.
> >
> > PCB? Haw! REAL hams built on a metal chassis and had a complete set
of
> > Greenlee punches.
>
> Metal chassis? Haw! REAL hams stole their Moms breadboard.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> ��� SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

```
Would stealing my mom's super-duper flat plateglass mirror to grind a
Novice crystal off of Radio Moscow count???
```

4720. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 18:17:25 UTC
From: aaron_voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <7314c094.0205291017.153a98ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43939
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

> Sky wave, or "skip" propagation is commonplace on HF
>frequencies. To take advantage of this propagation requires
>running more than the legally-allowed 4W output allowed
>on 11m CB...

This will come as a shock to the many folks who have worked all
continents on HF using milliwatt QRP transmitters.

>However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
>propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
>motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
>on these frequencies.

Right, CB'ers would NEVER think of running amps on FRS.......

From: Paul Furbert (pfurbert@ibl.bm)
Subject: FRS Amplifier
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 1998/11/16

Anybody make one yet?

235

From: Scott W (dkdk@dfkdk.ccc)
Subject: Re: Linear UHF Amp For FRS!
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 1999/12/03
In article <3845B53C.37ED321E@hotmail.com>, upplus@hotmail.com says...

I'm looking for a UHF linear that
will take the 500milliwat imput.
Thanks.

From: Bill Eitner (kd6tas@netzero.net)
Subject: Re: who has the amps for FRS?
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-11-20 14:02:27 PST

> What's the URL for the web site that sells the linears that work on
> the FRS channels? I'm looking for about 250W out.

You might do a web search for "T-E Systems."

They make high power amps for VHF/UHF ham
applications. They may have an amp for the
450 MHz FM ham band that makes that much
power and only requires a few watts of drive
power. Hopefully you have an early FRS radio
that had the potential to make more than 3/4
of a watt. If not, you'll have to start with a low
power amp, see what the output is, and then
buy a suitable high-power amp designed to deal
with the amount of drive power that the low-power
amp produces.

Good luck.
-=[Bill Eitner]=-

4721. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 18:26:51 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3CF51D6B.1D8B@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 43940
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:
>
> Like any of the classic urban legands - LSD tattoos, Kidney theft,
> Alligators in the sewers - the GMRS/FRS/MURS high-power amplifier myth
> just keeps making the rounds...
>
> http://www.urbanlegends.com/
>
> The myth - spread by hams having a strong "radio cop" slant - has
> absolutely no basis in fact.

But it does have a basis in history, and human nature, together with a declining morality standard, and a general "up yours" attitude.

> The motivation for spreading the rumor
> is somewhat complex - but, the main motivation appears be to maintain
> some kind of "superiority complex" these hams harbor over "CB users".

And how does one do that? Whether or not one operator is "superior" to another would be easy to discern based on their overall achievements and their dedication to their respective service. One does not need to promote a superior attitude. The facts will speak for themselves.

> A secondary motivation seems to be to stop the growth of these
> wildly-popular radio services - as ham VHF/UHF usage has continued to
> decline in recent years, these services are rapidly growing in
> popularity.

Why would hams want to purposely halt the growth of another radio service? For what gain? As a radio hobbyist, I welcome any and all outlets for experimenting.

>
> There has never been a reported violation involving amplifiers on any
> of these VHF/UHF frequencies; and, the fact is, there is simply no
> real motivation for the average person to use amplifiers on these
> frequencies.

How about the "entertainment" that you spoke of, of "squashing" other stations? How about for inproving their distance? How about the same motivation that pushed most high powered Cbers, and that is the "king of the hill" syndrome?

>
> THE BASIS FOR THE LEGEND:
>

> Illegal amplifier use on 11m CB frequencies has been an ongoing
> problem for many years. However, the dynamics of radio wave
> propagation on HF CB vs. VHF MURS or UHF FRS/GMRS are quite different.
> Sky wave, or "skip" propagation is commonplace on HF frequencies. To
> take advantage of this propagation requires running more than the
> legally-allowed 4W output allowed on 11m CB... as a result, many
> truckers(and other citizens) have resorted to using illegal amplifiers
> to raise the output of their radio stations to outrageosly-high
> values; 500, 1000, 1500, even 2000 Watt amplifier use is commonplace -
> allowing these individuals to communicate great distances(sometimes
> 1,000s of miles when the "skip is in").

So you think that "skip" is the sole reason that CBers run amps? You obviously haven't spent much time on CB in the last 20 years. When the "skip" is running, you can work the world with 10 watts. If the skip isn't running, you can't work the next state with 5,000 watts. (Unless, of course, the next state is less than 150 miles away).

I'll give you a clue. Amp usage on CB is about two things, either being heard above the next guy, or preventing the next guy from overrunning you. It's nothing more than a competitive spirit gone horribly wrong, and there's no evidence to suggest that this same attitude would not cross over to any other band available to these same undisciplined people.

> A side result of this
> "culture", has been that these individuals resort to a kind of
> "entertainment" by jamming smaller-powered stations ("squashing") when
> the "skip is out".

A "side" result? I'd say that this is probably 50% of the activity on CB during any given day. Just listen to Channel 6.

>
> However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
> propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
> motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
> on these frequencies.

Sure there is. The attitude of being the big dog on the block is still as strong on 154 Mhz, as it is on 27.

>
> The fact that there has never been any direct proof of individuals
> running amplifiers on these frquencies, seems to be of no consequence
> to the professors of this urban legend. They will come up with all
> kinds of contorted reasons why "The end is near", and "widespread
> amplifier use on these frequencies is just a matter of time". Of
> course, these are the same arguments these individuals have been
> making for YEARS, and still - as there are no alligators in the
> sewers, there are no high-powered amplifiers on GMRS/FRS/MURS.

One other thing is needed for this to happen; popularity. And then there has to be someone willing to market these accessories to the people that want them. FRS has deliberately been manufactured and marketed to discourage amp usage, or modifications in general. MURS is still a service in its infancy. It hasn't really caught on yet with the yahoo crowd. As long as there is activity on 11 meter CB, what is the incentive to move to MURS?

As long as these VHF/UHF services are marketed as short range, mostly handheld units, there will be little incentive for the "big guns" to set up shop. But give it time. Start offering fancy radios, cheaply, with lots of knobs and gadgets, and billy bob will be on those bands eventually.

Dave
"Sandbagger"

4722. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 18:31:05 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3CF51E69.100B@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 43941
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:
>
> The latest MURS rules changes now simply limit transmitter power
> output to 2W, and remove the old 2W ERP restriction:

Well, if you think about it, it just makes sense to do it that way. You are creating a service for non-technical people (as evidenced by the non-license requirement), and yet expect them to calculate their transmit power plus antenna gain and subtract feedline loss? Add to that that the radio would then need a means to adjust the power until the ERP fell into spec. It was a quagmire to deal with, at ERP levels.

But it does open up a bunch of possibilities, running 2w into stacked 22 element yagi arrays.......

Dave

4723. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 19:33:26 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CF5100B.D1EBFEDD@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43942
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I would suggest you acquire a VHF/UHF radio that actually receives
and listen again.

stewart wrote:

>
> NOW - THE REAL REASON FOR THESE SMOKESCREENS:
>
> Having failed in their attempts to assert the URBAN MYTH that
> high-powered AMPS are being used on MURS/GMRS/FRS, these ham "Internet
> Lobbyists" are now trying this NEW TACTIC to divert attention from the
> fact that the ham VHF/UHF bands are VIRTUALLY UNUSED - and that
> FRS/GMRS/MURS are runaway success stories in public communications.

4724. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 19:36:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CF510B9.C4D51D43@mailcity.net>
Source record: 43943
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

The cb'ers will make a sewer pit of any radio spectrum they can
get their hands on.

"Aaron H. Voobner" wrote:

>
> Right, CB'ers would NEVER think of running amps on FRS.......
>

4725. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 20:13:30 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205291213.3a521231@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43944
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

'Doc <w5lz@icok.net> wrote in message news:<3CF4C4E3.CA299BB0@icok.net>...

> PS - I still think you need help Stew baby...

Thanks, I COULD use some... so how about helping me get 1.25M openned
up for a new Novice Class?

Stewart - N0MHS

4726. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 20:25:23 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <E66958581A5226AB.EC6C69F6839FC720.00F753728F8D2541@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43947

On 29 May 2002 11:20:56 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>Well, OK, I had to come up with my own solder and PCB.
>
>PCB? Haw! REAL hams built on a metal chassis and had a complete set of
>Greenlee punches.

Given the price of sheet metal these days, the $3.95 18x24" sheets of
double-sided PCB from Tanner's are a lot more economical...though I do
have a small regen laying around here that I built on a scrap of
copper from a garage-sale decorative plate.

Greenlee punches are for sissies; real men use a big flathead
screwdriver and a hammer :)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4727. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 20:25:58 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205291225.27763849@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43945
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<faf2118571a2a9bddafcb1abbc0e2be6.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> Good grief, Stewart. One begins to wonder exactly what you are trying
> to promote. I've run phone patches from Guam to Webster, NY, running
> only 15 watts! I've gotten into a cw net thousands of miles away -
> running MILLIWATTS. Power is needed in VHF/UHF for some of the more
> exotic modes. Meteor trails, moonbounce, some scatter work ... heck,
> with my 6 double a alkalines, I can open repeaters close to 100 miles
> away (well, one that is high - and that is when I'm up on the 23rd floor
> of an apartment complex, but you get the idea). Problems happen when
> unknowlegable folks apply the golden screwdriver. I've seen posts which
> state you only have to turn a pot to make your FRS radio 'louder'. I
> doubt going into deviation and descriminators would help as it is likely
> over that user's head. Believe me, I've had a lot of fun back in the
> early 70s with CB. The urban legends usually circulate amongst those
> who don't know enough technology to know when something is simply not
> true. I saw a post perhaps not a week ago on a board from someone
> looking for a mod for a radio. Another guy posted a link to a website
> with the mod. Sure enough, TWO DAYS LATER, the first guy posts again
> with the subject 'HELP'. Seems he let the smoke out of the components.
> Seems the radio is stuck on 28.500, won't transmit, and squeals when
> the audio gain is turned up. You seem to think the amateurs are putting
> people down. The problem is that some folks are being led into things
> that they know nothing about - and it shows when some 27 MHz signals
> are 50 KHz wide. Unless you are working moonbounce, a 3 dB signal
> gain or loss won't usually amount to anything - yet people mod their
> rigs to try and get that 3 dB extra, which is usually spread where they
> don't want it. My guess is that the majority of amateurs are running
> 150 watts or less. The large majority. And working stations worldwide
> every day. Why do you think one necessarily needs a linear? Sure, the
> big gun DXCC guys run 'em (often with a mentality that is similar to
> yours), but most don't honestly need 'em. Besides, going from a ground
> mounted vertical to a 3 element beam up 60 feet will often gain you as
> much or more than increasing from 100 to 1000 watts and cost less.

While I'm pretty much a QRP-type operator, I really don't have any
argument with anything you are saying. But, all of this stuff really
doesn't apply to the services or the discussion at hand. The point
is, there have been ZERO actions by the FCC against any
individuals/entities for running high-powered amplifiers on the
MURS/GMRS/FRS frequencies; and there is(and never has been) the same
type of incentive to run these things, like there is on 11m. That's
all I'm saying.

> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim

Stewart - N0MHS

4728. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 20:26:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529162631.07522.00001955@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 43946

>Thanks, I COULD use some... so how about helping me get 1.25M openned
>up for a new Novice Class?
>
>Stewart - N0MHS
>

We already have one Moron, its called NoCode Tech

4729. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 20:32:13 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <AF718572ACEB658F.9099E799B8A9A8E6.31D011DFCB520A7F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 43948

On 29 May 2002 17:05:59 GMT, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)
wrote:

>got much heavier use of (off the top of my head) cordless phones, 802.11
>devices and even cell phones and you almost never hear about people
>using illegal amplifiers for these.

Haven't been listening very hard, have you? Overpowered cordless
phones have been sneaking across the borders for years now, and
discussions of how to boost the power output for 802.11 stuff are
common on the net.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4730. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 20:59:17 UTC
From: randy_NO_SPAM_PLEASE_@frs-usa.com
Message-ID: <b03b87e2.0205291259.74436459@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43949
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0205281616.4a5ccf0@posting.google.com>...
>
> However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
> propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
> motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
> on these frequencies.
>

What you are failing to see is that rarely do two radio operators
operate strict line-of-site. Most, if not all radio communications
using VHF and UHF radios are sending a signal to the other radio
through vegitation, buildings, cars, people, etc!

Even when I am taking to repeaters on high locations, I have to
contend with objects between me and the repeater antenna. Higher
power DOES help you to overcome these obsticles.

When I use my FRS radios, I rarely can see the person I am talking to.
DO YOU?

Randy
http://www.frs-usa.com

4731. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:07:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205291307.e1688b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 43950

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CF2999E.397D59E4@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > Your hypothesis attempted to explain why CW ops are, as a general rule, so well
> > behaved compared to 'phone ops. For your hypothesis to be valid, your
> > observations would have to be true for practically all CW operators, not just
> > you.
>
> It was a hypothesis based on personal experience and may or may not apply to
> the majority of hams.

That means it only applies to you and people who react the way you do.

But good on-air behavior is a general rule among CW-using hams, not
just among CW-using hams whose hands shake when they are angry.

> Just how many hams do you know who can send code when
> their hands are shaking in anger. I know I cannot.

Everyone is not like you.

> I assume there are many
> more hams like me. In fact, I would challenge anyone to send decent code when
> their hands are shaking in anger.

What percentage of CW using hams' hands shake when they are angry?

> > > I am not unique.
> >
> > Everyone is unique, even identical twins.
>
> Are you saying that I am the only human being whose hands shake when he is
> extremely angry?

Nope. Just that it's not a general rule for all hams. Good on-air
behavior is a general rule among CW-using hams, not just among
CW-using hams whose hands shake when they are angry.

>Get real.

I am real. You are trying to generalize your own behavior to all
CW-using hams.

>I would say it is extremely common.

Of course you would say that, but your saying it does not make it
true.

>
> > >I was describing how hams like
> > >me react to emotionalism while trying to send CW or type on a keyboard.
> >
> > That's fine. You did not make that clear in your original description.
>
> I have made it clear in subsequent postings. Why are you still arguing?

Your original posting indicated it was a general rule.
>
> > >I'm sorry you can't stand the truth but that's just the way it is. Some
> > >people cannot send CW while they are angry and therefore cannot vent their
> > >anger while sending CW. Why do you refuse to accept that reality?
> >
> > I don't "refuse" or "deny" that reality at all.
>
> Then why did you say "it has no basis in fact"?

Because your single example does not necessarily generalize to all or
even most CW-using hams.

> That certainly sounds like
> a denial and a refusal to accept reality to me.

The only denial and refusal to accept reality is yours.

>What I posted is 100% factual.

About yourself, maybe. Not about others.
>
> > Some people can send CW while they are angry and therefore can vent their
> > anger while sending CW. Same for keyboards. They simply control their behavior.
>
> And I wasn't describing people like that. I was speaking from experience and
> describing people like me. Sorry you refuse to accept that fact.

You don't have to apologize. Just admit your mistake and move on.

> I would
> estimate that people who can send CW while extremely angry are a small
> minority of the ham population.

Of course you would. But you present no proof or even credible
evidence.

By the same logic, shaking hands should prevent hams from holding a
mike and
pressing the PTT button.
>
> > Your hypothesis of general behavior by hams on CW is not proved by your
> > description of yourself.
>
> You are mistaken. It was not a hypothesis of general behavior.

Yes, it was. You wrote that CW was incompatible with bad on-air
behavior, or some such. That's a general rule.

> It was a description
> of hams like me of which there must be a considerable number.

Nope. Just you.
>
> > >There is no possibility of a mistake.
> >
> > Are you perfect? If not, there is always the possibility of a mistake.
>
> I am perfect in reporting my capabilities while under emotional stress.

No, you are not.

> There is *NO* possibility of a mistake.

There is always the possibility of a mistake.

> I am an ordinary prudent man.

Not if you claim infallibility. There's a guy in the Vatican you
should talk to.
>
> > In fact, the claim that there is no possibility of a mistake is, in itself, a
> > mistake. It therefore proves itself false.

[attempted expletive deleted]

> I cannot send CW when I am very angry. That is a fact. No mistake is
> possible.

A mistake is always possible. Denying that simple reality is a
mistake. Live with it.
>
> > Have I put forth any hypothesis as to why hams on CW are so well behaved?
>
> Yes, and my personal experience contradicts what you said.
>
> > You have not proved your hypothesis.
>
> My hypothesis is that hams like me cannot send CW while extremely angry.

That's not what you originally wrote.

> That is a fact not subject to question.

All facts are subject to question. That's what made Einstein a genius.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4732. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:10:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529171010.26589.00001088@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 44001

From: CAM w5dxp@hotmail.com

>Are you talking about ham stations or commercial stations? If ham stations,
>weren't all of them required to know Morse code?

I presume they are ham stations. Some nations do not require that their
citizens pass a Morse code test for HF access, treaty notwithstanding.

Even if we know they passed a code test, all we know is that they met the
minimum standards for that exam once; there is no certainty at all that they
know the code today. At 5 wpm, it is likely that the skill will be forgotten if
not used.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4733. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:11:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529171101.26589.00001089@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 44002

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>Thanks, I COULD use some... so how about helping me get 1.25M openned
>up for a new Novice Class?

Sure, as of today, I hereby declare that Novices can use a portion of 1.25 M.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4734. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:15:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529171513.26589.00001090@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 44003

From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)

>but we've also
>got much heavier use of (off the top of my head) cordless phones, 802.11
>devices and even cell phones and you almost never hear about people
>using illegal amplifiers for these.

There are a number of WISPs that have been bragging on the ISP-wireless list
about their use of amplifiers past the EIRP limits in the Part 15 rules.

>Why would MURS users be more likely to behave like the former rather
>than the latter? (This question is not rhetorical, I have no opinion
>about MURS one way or the other.)

I think that if the MURS users tend to be consumers rather than radio
hobbyists, they may well not use amps, on the whole. Most other Part 95
activities have tended toward the hobbyist use, and that certainly is the way
Stew is promoting it.

I am not saying that the use of amplifiers is inevitable, although it doesn't
take much thought to figure that at least a few people will. Stew is saying
that it is impossible because no MURS user would ever do so. I buy that even
less.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4735. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:26:09 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205291326.3700f788@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44004
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

lucifer@eternal-flames.gov wrote in message news:<3cf4bdfc.479087@news.btinternet.com>...
> On 28 May 2002 23:09:19 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >Isn't it just TERRIBLE! People are starting to communicate all OVER
> >the place. We can't have THAT now, can we? Better start a rumour on
> >the Internet, right away! We need to get this evil GMRS/FRS thing
> >BANNED!!
>
> Any truth to the rumour that the FCC is planning to withdraw the GMRS
> and FRS bands and ban those particular services?

Nope, they are very useful services... that would be like tearing up
the beginnings of the Interstate Freeway system, because of a few drag
racing gangs (known as the CBers and Freebanders) on Mulholland Drive
in the early 60's.

Quite the contrary - these services are reaching saturation, and need
to be EXPANDED. Another possibility is to release some of the
pressure on these services by allowing family members and friends to
easily get a ham license by opening up the 1.25M ham band to a New
Novice NoCode Voice Class License.

Stewart - N0MHS

4736. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:34:59 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF54982.1ABCF464@icok.net>
Source record: 44005
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart,
Nope. I don't waste my time if I can help
it. I was speaking about your delusions, anyway.
'Doc

4737. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:35:27 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <zQbJ8.63584$%o.6086814@bin3.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 44006
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205290157.577b128e@posting.google.com...
> The discussion was really about "high-powered amps"; it is VITUALLY
> USELESS to use high-powered amplifiers(>75W) in the context of LOS
> MURS. Rather than restating the whole premise in each and every post
> - I've posted the entire premise in another thread... the point is -
> people simply haven't been using these amps on UHF GMRS/FRS or VHF
> Itinerants in all the years of the existance of these services - why
> all of a sudden would anyone think they are going to start to use them
> now?

For some of the same reasons they get used on 11m. Not that the operator wants to work DX, on the contrary they want to be king-of-the-hill. Some of these poor folks have such a huge desire to control other people that the only way they can find to do it is by "taking control of a local frequency or channel", as with CB radio. They maybe the low person at work etc., but when empowered by a huge amplifier, that allows them to determine who talks and when or they get jammed, gives them the brief feeling of being in control - i.e. the Boss. How many times on 11m have you heard some channel control freak say " you're not going to talk on MY CHANNEL" followed by a dead carrier, loud music etc? Right, too many times. In short its an ego trip for some of the idiots, and has nothing to do with logic and V/UHF propagation facts. The bigger the amplifier all the better to key over other lesser powered stations in their mind.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

4738. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:42:50 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <tXbJ8.60498$jm.5941814@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 44007
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:utl8fuou71v39mu2tvd00u0hr7h89dmp1r@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 29 May 2002 00:42:54 GMT, "Leland C. Scott"
> <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> >> >I hear this typical "garbage" from CBers all the time,
> >> >Hams operating out of band.
> >>
> >> I heard it from a Ham.
> >
> >He was jerking your chain and you fell for it.
>
> I know the fellow. He wasn't jerking anyone's chain. He was a bit
> upset by their arrogance, not really caring if anyone found out who
> they were.

So who were they? If they don't care then it would be OK to post their callsigns right here
->>>

>
> >So if what you say is true then I should have picked up more that
> >one lousy low power packet station in the last year I have been
> >monitoring, particulary given the size of the Detroit area.
>
> Sure, if VHF had skip. I have not heard any high powered MURS
> stations anywhere between Everett and Seattle WA.

Not if you where in Billerica, MA.

> If you'd like to chat with your high powered buddies on MURS you might
> take a little trip to Billerica, MA. Sounds like it would be an easy
> fox hunt, well, more like an elephant hunt.

Billerica is just a fly speck of a town on the map, and about half way between Boston and
Lowell. I would be more interested in what is happening in the likes of Boston for example.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me

running
try to keep up "

4739. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:57:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529175711.18788.00001016@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 44008

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

> Another possibility is to release some of the
>pressure on these services by allowing family members and friends to
>easily get a ham license by opening up the 1.25M ham band to a New
>Novice NoCode Voice Class License.

1.25 meters is already open to Novice and to no-code hams who are free to
operate voice if the chose.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4740. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 21:59:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529175937.18788.00001017@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 44009

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>What percentage of CW using hams' hands shake when they are angry?

Mine might, but my experience operating CW mobile on bumpy roads would ensure
that no one ever knew. I don't think it would even slow me down!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4741. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 22:37:04 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF55810.DE5A3A18@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44010

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> That means it only applies to you and people who react the way you do.

Yep, which is probably the majority of coded hams. Choose 100 coded hams at random and provoke them until their hands are shaking from anger. Do you really think many of them could send decent code while their hands are shaking in anger? Get real!

> What percentage of CW using hams' hands shake when they are angry?

All of them who are angry enough and those are the hams I am talking about. If their hands are not shaking it simply means they are not angry enough and fall outside the bounds of my statements.

> Your original posting indicated it was a general rule.

It was obvious from my original posting that I was describing my personal reaction. If you didn't find it obvious, it means you didn't believe my earlier posting where I said *ALL* of my postings are my personal opinions based on my personal experience. If I said I weigh 200 pounds you would argue with me. You would argue with a fence post.

> >What I posted is 100% factual.
>
> About yourself, maybe. Not about others.

Nobody else in the world has shaking hands while experiencing extreme anger? Shirley, you jest.

> You don't have to apologize.

I feel I have to apologize for your refusal to accept facts.

> By the same logic, shaking hands should prevent hams from holding a
> mike and pressing the PTT button.

You are simply wrong and that's an absolutely ridiculous thing to say.

> > You are mistaken. It was not a hypothesis of general behavior.
>
> Yes, it was.

No, it wasn't. I am not stupid enough to do such a thing. All it takes is one example to prove that you are wrong.

> > My hypothesis is that hams like me cannot send CW while extremely angry.
>

> That's not what you originally wrote.

That was the meaning of what I originally wrote. Sorry you misunderstood.
You can always save a lot of time and trouble if you simply ask what I
meant instead of drawing some half-baked irrational conclusion.

> > That is a fact not subject to question.
>
> All facts are subject to question. That's what made Einstein a genius.

Nope, facts are absolute. Einstein didn't question facts, he questioned
beliefs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4742. MURS is SPAM - was Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 22:43:56 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205292242200.15958-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 44011
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Why bother? All you want to do is spam these newsgroups with your MURS crap.

This is amateur radio, CB radio, or FRS, depending on the newsgroup cross-posted to, not MURS.

MURS has no purpose. It was an FCC wet dream to clean after a radio manufacturing mistake - and it will never be more than that.

4743. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 22:46:47 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205292246330.15958-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 44013
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 29 May 2002, stewart wrote:
>lucifer@eternal-flames.gov wrote in message news:<3cf4bdfc.479087@news.btinternet.com>...
>> On 28 May 2002 23:09:19 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>>
>> >Isn't it just TERRIBLE! People are starting to communicate all OVER
>> >the place. We can't have THAT now, can we? Better start a rumour on
>> >the Internet, right away! We need to get this evil GMRS/FRS thing
>> >BANNED!!
>>
>> Any truth to the rumour that the FCC is planning to withdraw the GMRS
>> and FRS bands and ban those particular services?
>
>Nope, they are very useful services... that would be like tearing up
>the beginnings of the Interstate Freeway system, because of a few drag
>racing gangs (known as the CBers and Freebanders) on Mulholland Drive
>in the early 60's.
>
>Quite the contrary - these services are reaching saturation, and need
>to be EXPANDED. Another possibility is to release some of the
>pressure on these services by allowing family members and friends to
>easily get a ham license by opening up the 1.25M ham band to a New
>Novice NoCode Voice Class License.

There is no such "novice no-code" class. Must be another of Stewart's wet dreams.

4744. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 22:54:40 UTC
From: Dan Martin <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com>
Message-ID: <ufamill6tl6692@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 44012
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Leleand, lets cut to the chase, if the cop was using his ht as a work radio, he is wrong, period.
> bandm they do it all the time, for various "reasons".

And some of them may in fact be legitimate depending on the Ham. Some do have license privileges to transmit on other than the Ham Bands.

We're not talking about mars or caps here. the thread was typical ham operator, going out of band, using a murs, or up here in the GWN, one of the lpu freqs. Wrong , of couse, bothering anyone, no. BUT it does happen, something I can say I have witnessed. and done the odd time. Why, hmm, not enough radio's at an weekend event, dial up the handi to the radio's being used, and off we go. Wrong, of course, hurting anyone, no. He're another example, I was working with another ham and we needed radio's, we couldn';t very well use 147.555 for our purpose, being commercial, so we used 151.055, an lpu freq, with no tone to ensure we didn't bother any of the local security guards, et c.
I'm not trying to call you out on this, just make you aware that just becuase hams have thousands of freqs available, doesn't for a minute mean they won't wander. I will conceed that many hams take a dim view of this, but there are plenty that don't.

Sincerely

Dan

In one case I remember seeing a Royal Oak city cop, in full uniform with side arm, sitting at a table in a small restaurant on Woodward Avenue with a very plainly obvious Yeasu HT. His heavy duty Motorola radio was nowhere to be seen. Was he a Ham? I don't know because I didn't ask, and I didn't see him making a transmissions with it while I was there to check for a callsign.

I have seen court officer using the yeasu ht, I think it's a tad easir to get ear plugs for that the typical Motorola. As long as he's only monitoring, there no harm being done.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician

if you see me
running
try to keep up "

4745. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 23:07:23 UTC
From: Dan Martin <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com>
Message-ID: <ufanagglumi7e9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 44014
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Here's a bit of a response to all the hams who seem to bash cb'ers with amps(no I've never owned a linear) Why is it so bad (besides illegal) to run 100-200 watts on 27mhz, but ok to run 1500 on 28 and 29 ?

"Aaron H. Voobner" <aaron_voobner@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:7314c094.0205291017.153a98ab@posting.google.com...
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> > Sky wave, or "skip" propagation is commonplace on HF
> >frequencies. To take advantage of this propagation requires
> >running more than the legally-allowed 4W output allowed
> >on 11m CB...
>
> This will come as a shock to the many folks who have worked all
> continents on HF using milliwatt QRP transmitters.
>
> >However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
> >propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
> >motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
> >on these frequencies.
>
> Right, CB'ers would NEVER think of running amps on FRS.......
>
> --
> From: Paul Furbert (pfurbert@ibl.bm)
> Subject: FRS Amplifier
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Date: 1998/11/16
>
> Anybody make one yet?
>
> 235
>
> --
> From: Scott W (dkdk@dfkdk.ccc)
> Subject: Re: Linear UHF Amp For FRS!
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Date: 1999/12/03
> In article <3845B53C.37ED321E@hotmail.com>, upplus@hotmail.com says...
>
> I'm looking for a UHF linear that
> will take the 500milliwat imput.
> Thanks.

>
> ---
> From: Bill Eitner (kd6tas@netzero.net)
> Subject: Re: who has the amps for FRS?
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Date: 2001-11-20 14:02:27 PST
>
> > What's the URL for the web site that sells the linears that work on
> > the FRS channels? I'm looking for about 250W out.
>
> You might do a web search for "T-E Systems."
>
> They make high power amps for VHF/UHF ham
> applications. They may have an amp for the
> 450 MHz FM ham band that makes that much
> power and only requires a few watts of drive
> power. Hopefully you have an early FRS radio
> that had the potential to make more than 3/4
> of a watt. If not, you'll have to start with a low
> power amp, see what the output is, and then
> buy a suitable high-power amp designed to deal
> with the amount of drive power that the low-power
> amp produces.
>
> Good luck.
> -=[Bill Eitner]=-
>
> ---

4746. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 23:40:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <2GdJ8.282$wO3.121@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 44015
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

> Another possibility is to release some of the
> pressure on these services by allowing family members and friends to
> easily get a ham license by opening up the 1.25M ham band to a New
> Novice NoCode Voice Class License.

The 1.25M band is already open to Novices and to NoCode licensees.

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4747. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 23:41:30 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CF54A2E.9BE8E213@mailcity.net>
Source record: 44016
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> wrote:
> >>The cb'ers will make a sewer pit of any radio spectrum they can
> > > get their hands on.
> > >
> You have NEVER used a CB radio?

Exactly, and never intend to.

4748. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 23:46:10 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205291546.28de1dfd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44017
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:<3CF51D6B.1D8B@worldlynx.net>...

> As long as these VHF/UHF services are marketed as short range, mostly
> handheld units, there will be little incentive for the "big guns" to set
> up shop. But give it time. Start offering fancy radios, cheaply, with
> lots of knobs and gadgets, and billy bob will be on those bands
> eventually.

I respect all the points you have made. However, because of the fact
that we already have had GMRS and FRS for a great number of years(and
GMRS does allow external antennas, and does share freqs with FRS, and
will allow you to run easily obtainable Part 90 eqpt.), and these
types of antics are not going on - I stand by my basic premise that
the CB culture is FIRMLY ENTRENCHED and QUITE HAPPY on 11m... these
'ol boys can't just "reach out and knowingly squash somebody" for an
extended period of time over in the next county - now matter how many
WATTS they pump out. Oh sure, they could squash the conversation of
little Billy or Susie on FRS for about 30 seconds, while they were
passing thru town, or interfere with a business inventory being taken
on MURS for a minute or so - but that is NOTHING compared with the
HOURS OF PURE ENJOYMENT these CLOWNS can get on CB.

> Dave
> "Sandbagger"

Stewart - N0MHS

4749. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 23:46:10 UTC
From: aaron_voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <7314c094.0205291546.4a4cb799@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44018
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

> From: Scott W (dkdk@dfkdk.ccc)
> Subject: Re: Linear UHF Amp For FRS!
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Date: 1999/12/03
> In article <3845B53C.37ED321E@hotmail.com>, upplus@hotmail.com says...
>
> I'm looking for a UHF linear that
> will take the 500milliwat imput.
> Thanks.
>

Sorry Scott. I snipped out your response to this dope, but forgot to
snip out the article attribution which contaned your email address.
Got my dopes mixed up. Easy to do in rrcb.

Apologies,

-A

4750. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 23:47:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CF568B2.F981D252@adelphia.net>
Source record: 44019

I have to disagree Cecil! I certainly don't want to force anyone to use Morse Code on HF, but I support Morse Code testing. Although it is almost certain that there are hams who feel that way, it is pretty hard for me to go from there to "all hams who support code qualification feel this way".

I've told you a million times, don't exaggerate! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:
>
> Anyone who supports a code qualification for hams before they are allowed on HF
> wants every HF ham's first "mode" to be Morse code. That's prima facie, Dick.
> You want every ham to possess Morse code skill before being allowed to use
> any other mode on HF. How you can deny that is beyond belief.

4751. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-29 23:49:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CF56934.7A938E54@adelphia.net>
Source record: 44020

I may assume you mean off the air? That's roughly the same as pretending to push the PTT button on a HT and talking. A pretty loose definition of using a mode.

- Mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:

> A Morse code requirement requires every HF ham to use the Morse code "mode"
> first before using any other mode. Dick denied that fact.

4752. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 00:01:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529200146.15606.00001555@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 44021

From: "Dan Martin" nospamdwrtin@idirect.com

>And some of them may in fact be legitimate depending on the Ham. Some do
>have license privileges to transmit on other than the Ham Bands.

I know of no amateur equipment that is FCC Certificated to operate on the
public-service bands. Doing so is a clear rules violation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4753. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 00:11:14 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205291611.57a1a424@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44022
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

aaron_voobner@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner) wrote in message
news:<7314c094.0205291017.153a98ab@posting.google.com>...
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> > Sky wave, or "skip" propagation is commonplace on HF
> >frequencies. To take advantage of this propagation requires
> >running more than the legally-allowed 4W output allowed
> >on 11m CB...
>
> This will come as a shock to the many folks who have worked all
> continents on HF using milliwatt QRP transmitters.

Oh, COME ON, these people are also running high gain antennas on bands
not INFESTED with the level of noise present on 11m. With the type of
antennas these 'ol boys typically run, they need the watts to be heard
thru all the noise, and to overcome the ineffeciencies in their
antenna systems, and to communicate with the other good 'ol boys
running a similar power level and antenna system at the other end of
the link.

> >However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
> >propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
> >motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
> >on these frequencies.
>
> Right, CB'ers would NEVER think of running amps on FRS.......

Of course they are going to try to extrapolate their knowlege of 11m
to 70cm... but IT DOESN'T WORK - because of LOS limitations, because
of the increased imporatance of transmission line loss and antenna
gain, and because of the fact that nobody else runs a
similarly-powered system, the clowns get NO REASONABLE FEEDBACK, and
so they slink back to the 11m slimefest, where they can interfere with
conversations of thousands over a five county area, instead of the
sheer boredom of only being able to interfere with little Billy or
Susie's conversation down the block for a few seconds - who just end
up putting on CTCSS, and don't even know that they are being
interfered with. There just isn't the same THRILL.

This is why we haven't been seeing this kind of activity on
GMRS/FRS/interstitials. If this high-powered amplifier activity were
REALLY occuring on these services, wouldn't you think the UHF and VHF
amps would be being sold right there alongside all of those HF amps at
the truckstops?

Stewart - N0MHS

4754. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 01:06:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529210621.02802.00000323@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 44023

In article <20020529073320.21437.00001251@mb-mn.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>SUBPART F-QUALIFYING EXAMINATION SYSTEMS
>ï¿½97.501 Qualifying for an amateur operator license.
>Each applicant must pass an examination for a new amateur
>operator license grant and for each change in operator
>class. Each applicant for the class of operator license
>grant specified below must pass, or otherwise receive
>examination credit for, the following examination elements:
>(a) Amateur Extra Class operator: Elements 1, 2, 3, and 4;
>(b) General Class operator: Elements 1, 2, and 3;
>(c) Technician Class operator: Element 2.
>ï¿½97.503 Element standards.
>(a) A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove
>that the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand
>and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international
>Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all
>the letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma,
>question mark, slant mark and prosigns AR, BT and SK.
> Element 1: 5 words per minute.
>
>>The morse character rate could be sent at anything from 5 to 50
>>WPM per character and still keep the "conventional" word rate
>>(5 characters plus a space) at "5 words per minute." All legal
>>and per the law...because the law DOESN'T SPECIFY WORD
>>RATE.
>
>Yes, Farnsworth spacing is legal because the regulations give the VE teams
>the
>authority to make the judgement on how the applicant is to be tested, as long
>as the word rate is 5 wpm, as per the regulations.
>
>Perhaps you intend to say that the regulations don't stipulate a character
>rate? You would look a bit less foolish being wrong if you stopped yelling
>and
>just took defeat gracefully.

Let's clear up all this confusion for once and all.

There IS a standard definition of International Morse code. It may not be in Part 97 but it does exist.

The following is a simplified paraphrase, but it is accurate and correct.

Here it is:

- A "dot" is one time unit long.
- A "dash" is three time units long
- A "character" is any single symbol that is encoded (letters, numbers, punctuation marks, prosigns)
- A "word", for the purpose of speed/time definition, is 5 characters and the associated spaces
- Spaces between dots and dashes inside a character are one time unit long
- Spaces between characters are three time units long
- Spaces between words are seven units long.
- Speed for plain language is defined by how many times the word "PARIS", properly spaced, can be sent in one minute. "PARIS" and the word space following, is exactly 50 time units long.

Thus, at 5 words per minute, the basic time unit is 240 milliseconds. The word "PARIS" would take 12 seconds to send.

"Farnsworth spacing" is simply an alternative definition of the spaces between characters and words. It was developed as an aid to learning the code.

Most VEs use "Farnsworth spacing" in the 5 wpm tests. However, any examinee who prefers "regular" 5 wpm Morse can be tested that way upon request. Thus, there is absolutely no problem with the way the VECs conduct the tests.

>>Those who are already licensed will see nothing wrong with an
>>incomplete law.

I think the exact definition of Morse and Farnsworth spacing should be part of the law so there is no confusion among the ignorant.

>>They may not dare challenge it for fear of being re-tested.
>
>Not me; the only reason I wouldn't want to be retested is that it would be an
>inconvenience to have to show up at an exam session. After my unfortunate
>incident in Boston, I think I have already paid those dues. :-)

Ever since I got my first license 35 years ago, I've been ready for retesting, written or code. Current tests, old tests, whatever. Bring it on!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4755. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 01:06:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020529210623.02802.00000324@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 44024

In article <3CF55810.DE5A3A18@hotmail.com>, CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> That means it only applies to you and people who react the way you do.
>
>Yep, which is probably the majority of coded hams.

That's not a reasonable assumption at all.

>Choose 100 coded hams
>at random and provoke them until their hands are shaking from anger.

It's your claim - be my guest.

>Do
>you really think many of them could send decent code while their hands
>are shaking in anger?

I don't know anyone except you whose "hands shake in anger".

>> What percentage of CW using hams' hands shake when they are angry?
>
>All of them who are angry enough and those are the hams I am talking
>about.

Not true. There are hams who use CW but whose hands do not shake when they are
angry.

You are just blowing smoke and assuming your conclusion, Cecil. Get real!

>If their hands are not shaking it simply means they are not
>angry enough and fall outside the bounds of my statements.

Utter nonsense.

>> Your original posting indicated it was a general rule.
>
>It was obvious from my original posting that I was describing my personal
>reaction.

It was not obvious to me.

>If you didn't find it obvious, it means you didn't believe my
>earlier posting where I said *ALL* of my postings are my personal opinions
>based on my personal experience.

It is not my job to remember all of your quirks and claims.

>If I said I weigh 200 pounds you would argue with me.

That depends. If you had written that you weighed 240 pounds just a week
earlier I'd doubt that you were telling the truth both times.

>You would argue with a fence post.

Not everyone is like you, Cecil.
>
>> >What I posted is 100% factual.
>>
>> About yourself, maybe. Not about others.
>
>Nobody else in the world has shaking hands while experiencing extreme
>anger?

I don't know anyone who does, except you.

>> You don't have to apologize.
>
>I feel I have to apologize for your refusal to accept facts.

To whom?
>
>> By the same logic, shaking hands should prevent hams from holding a
>> mike and pressing the PTT button.
>
>You are simply wrong and that's an absolutely ridiculous thing to say.

If their hands are not shaking enough to prevent them from using a PTT mike
it simply means they are not angry enough and fall outside the bounds of my
statements.
>
>> > You are mistaken. It was not a hypothesis of general behavior.
>>
>> Yes, it was.
>
>No, it wasn't.

Yes, it was.

> I am not stupid enough to do such a thing.

I didn't say you were stupid. Just mistaken.

>All it takes is one example to prove that you are wrong.

I'm not wrong. I may be mistaken, but I'm not wrong.
>
>> > My hypothesis is that hams like me cannot send CW while extremely angry.
>>
>> That's not what you originally wrote.
>
>That was the meaning of what I originally wrote.

But it's not what you originally wrote. Thus, you did not express yourself clearly.
It is the writer's job to express the thought clearly, so that the reader can understand it.

>Sorry you misunderstood.

You don't have to apologize.

>You can always save a lot of time and trouble if you simply ask what I
>meant instead of drawing some half-baked irrational conclusion.

How can a reader know that what you wrote is not what you meant?

>> > That is a fact not subject to question.
>>
>> All facts are subject to question. That's what made Einstein a genius.
>
>Nope, facts are absolute.

That's just a belief of yours, not a fact.

>Einstein didn't question facts, he questioned beliefs.

Whatever.

Using that definition, it's clear that your belief that you are stating facts is
mistaken.

73 de Jim ,N2EY

4756. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 01:18:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ad3urh$e5t$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 44025

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF452BD.8B52EB7E@att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > You are confusing cause and effect, Dick. It is outdated
requirements
> > > > like Morse code that can *result* in killing off ham radio. If ham
> > > > radio is to survive it must be attractive to potential hams. Leave
> > > > the Morse code requirement and fast forward to 2050. What do you
> > > > see?
> > >
> > > You're a real joke, Cecil. Why would the most basic means of
> > > radiocommunication be anything less than attractive to potential hams?
> >
> > CW *is* attractive to a lot of potential hams. What is unattractive is
> > the Morse code *requirement* that puts Morse code on a pass/fail level
> > with everything else in ham radio combined. You are continuing to
> > confuse CW, the mode, with the Morse code requirement. The two
> > subjects are virtually unrelated. The Morse code requirement is
> > like forcing everyone to pass their driving exam in a 1950 stick-
> > shift Ford before being allowed to drive any other vehicle. Do
> > you support that concept?
>
> I totally reject your "concept" because it is grossly inaccurate, not to
> mention plain old wrong. Requiring learning the code is more like
requiring
> one to learn to drive on a two lane highway before going onto a freeway.
> Can you say THE BASICS?

Except the anology doesn't work at all. IF morse was in fact any
sort of basic building block on which more advanced knowledge
of radio/communications was based, then morse would be an
integral part of formal education in those fields also.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4757. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 01:30:19 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205291730.75fe8924@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44026
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan Martin" <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com> wrote in message
news:<ufanagglumi7e9@corp.supernews.com>...
> Here's a bit of a response to all the hams who seem to bash cb'ers with
> amps(no I've never owned a linear) Why is it so bad (besides illegal) to
> run 100-200 watts on 27mhz, but ok to run 1500 on 28 and 29 ?

The biggest problem is the sort of "arms race" mentality that has
developed. It leads to a kind of "nuclear winter" in which the whole
band is so over-saturated with RF energy, that nobody except the ones
with the largest amplifiers can cut thru the noise to communicate.
Things are ESPECIALLY BAD on the HF bands(like 11m CB), because of
skip - as the noise gets propagated ALL OVER THE WORLD!

I would assume the same problem holds true on the HF ham bands to a
certain extent. However, hams are taught to use only as much power as
necessary to maintain a contact(I don't know how many follow the rule,
and how far they will go in interpreting it, but I'm going to assume
most follow it to a certain degree - although it isn't the "prime
directive" of each and every ham).

Stewart - N0MHS, a VHF/low power-oriented Amateur Extra

4758. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 01:42:38 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205291742.6f042ea6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44027
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

randy_NO_SPAM_PLEASE_@frs-usa.com (Randy A. Hefner) wrote in message
news:<b03b87e2.0205291259.74436459@posting.google.com>...
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0205281616.4a5ccf0@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
> > propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
> > motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
> > on these frequencies.
> >
>
> What you are failing to see is that rarely do two radio operators
> operate strict line-of-site. Most, if not all radio communications
> using VHF and UHF radios are sending a signal to the other radio
> through vegitation, buildings, cars, people, etc!
>
> Even when I am taking to repeaters on high locations, I have to
> contend with objects between me and the repeater antenna. Higher
> power DOES help you to overcome these obsticles.
>
> When I use my FRS radios, I rarely can see the person I am talking to.
> DO YOU?

Of course not - RF LOS propagation is different than Visual LOS
propagation.

Why don't you take a gander at this:

http://www.ictp.trieste.it/~radionet/2000_school/lectures/carlo/linkloss/INDEX.HTM

... pay particular attention to Huygens' Principle, all right?

And while you're at it - why don't you look into upgrading that
Technician Class license, Randy?

Now - if you all would stop spreading this high-power GMRS/FRS/MURS
amplifier bullshit, I'll stop having to debunk it. Fair enough?

> Randy
> http://www.frs-usa.com

Stewart - N0MHS

4759. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 01:46:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ad40gp$968$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 44028
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:3cf4bdfc.479087@news.btinternet.com...
> On 28 May 2002 23:09:19 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
>
> >Isn't it just TERRIBLE! People are starting to communicate all OVER
> >the place. We can't have THAT now, can we? Better start a rumour on
> >the Internet, right away! We need to get this evil GMRS/FRS thing
> >BANNED!!
>
> Any truth to the rumour that the FCC is planning to withdraw the GMRS
> and FRS bands and ban those particular services?

Not a chance. With 8 zillion FRS units sold and more being
sold every day, outlawing their use would be a joke.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4760. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 01:55:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ad4108$ls2$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 44029
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205291326.3700f788@posting.google.com...
> lucifer@eternal-flames.gov wrote in message
news:<3cf4bdfc.479087@news.btinternet.com>...
> > On 28 May 2002 23:09:19 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:
> >
> > >Isn't it just TERRIBLE! People are starting to communicate all OVER
> > >the place. We can't have THAT now, can we? Better start a rumour on
> > >the Internet, right away! We need to get this evil GMRS/FRS thing
> > >BANNED!!
> >
> > Any truth to the rumour that the FCC is planning to withdraw the GMRS
> > and FRS bands and ban those particular services?
>
> Nope, they are very useful services... that would be like tearing up
> the beginnings of the Interstate Freeway system, because of a few drag
> racing gangs (known as the CBers and Freebanders) on Mulholland Drive
> in the early 60's.
>
> Quite the contrary - these services are reaching saturation, and need
> to be EXPANDED.

I see no such saturation of FRS. Another family and mine often
travel on weekends and we use FRS between cars. No saturation
encountered at all...much less even another occasional user
on the same channel. This is in the northeast, probably the most
densly populater area of the country.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

Another possibility is to release some of the
> pressure on these services by allowing family members and friends to
> easily get a ham license by opening up the 1.25M ham band to a New
> Novice NoCode Voice Class License.
>
> Stewart - N0MHS

4761. Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:14:15 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205291814.23d8e365@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44030
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

I'm beginning a 1 week "Internet cease-fire" on this issue. After that, if no further claims of "High-Powered Amps on GMRS/MURS" are made - there will be no further need to defend against these rumors.

You see, it is kind of a chicken-and-the-egg issue... Amps on GMRS/MURS do no good, as long as there aren't enough other people with amps out there... and there isn't a market for amps, until there are enough amps out there... and without a market for amps, there aren't enough amps out there...

What few morons who have tried to use amps on GMRS up to this point have surely gotten such rotten results that they most certainly have long ago abandoned these "experiments".

Now - as long as people don't go around spreading rumors that there are amps on MURS/GMRS(which could encourage the growth of this "rotten egg" syndrome), then we can all live happily ever after, in a low-noise environment.

As for me, I'm going QRP on this issue...

Stewart - N0MHS - horseshoe7 - E Pluribus Unum

4762. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:17:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pZfJ8.91$Of2.8122632@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44031

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020529073320.21437.00001251@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

> Yes, Farnsworth spacing is legal because the regulations give the VE teams
the
> authority to make the judgement on how the applicant is to be tested, as
long
> as the word rate is 5 wpm, as per the regulations.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, the VE teams are not given that authority. I think you meant the VEC give their teams their marching orders. For instance, Dick/W0EX's rogue ARRL VE team could send at a charater rate of 20wpm, with a word rate of 5wpm, and still be what you say is per regulation. Is the ARRL VEC going to allow that?

None-the-less, the text of part 97 clearly states "international Morse code" and not Farnsworth code. Morse code has a very specific dot dash ratio that is violated in Farnsworth code.

"Don't shoot me, I'm only the messenger," and all that other Dann Finn abdication of responsibility crappola.

73, Brian/N0iMD

4763. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:20:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <M%fJ8.92$om2.8526893@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44032

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020529175937.18788.00001017@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >What percentage of CW using hams' hands shake when they are angry?
>
> Mine might, but my experience operating CW mobile on bumpy roads would
ensure
> that no one ever knew. I don't think it would even slow me down!
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Tell Newington to fix their streets.

4764. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:24:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <R3gJ8.97$Yn2.8618193@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44033

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020529070717.21437.00001243@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >No, but I do think todays entry level license is very difficult to
attain,
> >and conveys dangerous power authorizations for and entry level license.
>
> I disagree with you that the Amateur power levels need to be reduced.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, you may disagree, but 1,500 watts of ionizing radiation doesn't sound like an entry level license to me. I think an entry level license should be introduced that has limits on power per the rf hazard chart in Part 97. Then you may eliminate a portion of the requirement for knowledge to perform the safety analysis.

4765. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:28:11 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF58E3B.4040701@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44034

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM w5dxp@hotmail.com
>
>
>>Dan Finn wrote:
>>
>
>>>If I QSO
>>>with a ham in Cuba who is touching 2 wires together, I need to know
>>>Morse code, otherwise the Cuban loses the ability to communicate with me
>>>
>
> In my decades of Morse CW hamming, I don't believe I have ever had a QSO with a
> Cuban touching two wires together.

Did you ever live in South Florida? I did in the 70's, 80's and early
90's. Are you implying that I am BS-ing? Says a lot to some of us about
you; otherwise it doesn't really matter. In any case, Sunday mornings
were and probably still are best for this sort of activity. It's on 40m,
best in South Florida of course where we were about 250 miles from
Havana. They have weak signals but a few weeks ago they were even strong
coming into North Carolina. Sometimes I think they are not always
official Cuban "hams". The one that sounded very much like he was
touching two wires together said he was at a railway station where I
suppose they should have had a straight key but this guy sure wasn't
using one. Try getting a contact as interesting as that on SSB or your
beloved digital modes! That, by the way, can be construed by some as
being "real" ham radio. It was for me. I have no history of BS-ing you
RFI, nor do I need to.

>
>
>>I fail to see how someone who doesn't know Morse code could ruin CW
>>QSOs since he wouldn't be operating in that part of the band.
>>
>
> I routinely have my 7040 kHz QSOs ruined by QRM from non-CW stations. On what
> basis can we determine that these operators could not ruin my QSOs because they
> know Morse code?

Gee Ed, *I* have never had my CW QSO's on 7040 *ever* QRM'd. Something
must be wrong with your statement.

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone

else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4766. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:29:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <A8gJ8.101$mp2.8710476@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44035

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020529070826.21437.00001244@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Don't be silly. Can't you envision a license presently called "General"
> >that is a middle ground, and was good enough for all priveleges back in
the
> >heyday of slipstick competency?
>
> Sure I can envision that, but it seems a rather large step to require
every ham
> to take before being allowed to transmit on Amateur frequencies.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, you've read it from me previously, but just because you're from the ARRL
I'll go over it again.

1. Full license: "Amateur" to present General standards.
2. Limited license: "Limited Amateur" to less than Technician knowledge.
Limited in power to the rf safety chart or 200 watts, whichever is less, No
repeater trustee privs, No 3rd party traffic. All bands, all modes.

4767. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:30:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <79gJ8.102$3r2.8809541@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44036

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF44D6A.504F0016@att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >
> > >Dan used older. I simply said those who remember numerous, superflous
> > >license classes will be gone one day. After that, hams will just
consider
> > >themselves hams without all this false class distiction.
> >
> > When I was licensed in 1963, there was Novice, Tech, General and Extra.
Even
> > though the General carried all operating privileges, we saw the Extra as
a cut
> > above. Unless the FCC goes to one license class, your vision of a
classless
> > society will never come to pass.
> >
> > In your classless vision, do you think the requirements should be at
today's
> > entry level, ensuring maximum number of new hams, or at today's Extra,
ensuring
> > few new hams, albeit fairly well versed in Amateur practice before they
even
> > begin?
>
> Don't confuse poor Brian, he doesn't know what he thinks. He just, uh,
thinks.

Dick just rolls his eyes back and opens his mouth.

4768. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:34:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4dgJ8.106$bp2.8698943@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44038

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020529070943.21437.00001245@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Don't Shoot Me, I'm Only The Messenger. I Only Observe...blah blah blah
>
> You did not only observe. You interpreted and you reported. Most hams
would
> disagree that your interpretation applies to most of ham radio. I do.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, I'll give you a chance before I declare that you have a double standard
or engage in cronyism.

Did you say of Dann Finn in his several diatribes concerning, "Don't shoot
me I'm only the messenger, I only observe and Report...." that, "You did
not only observe. You interpreted and you reported. Most hams would
disagree that your interpretation applies to most of ham radio. I do."

Or did you agree with Dann Finn?

4769. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:35:38 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <ad433u$a7b$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 44037
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan Martin" <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com> wrote in message
news:ufanagglumi7e9@corp.supernews.com...
> Here's a bit of a response to all the hams who seem to bash cb'ers with
> amps(no I've never owned a linear) Why is it so bad (besides illegal) to
> run 100-200 watts on 27mhz, but ok to run 1500 on 28 and 29 ?

Because it is the law. What part of "illegal" do you not comprehend?

4770. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:37:18 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF5905E.5030208@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44039

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>
>>No, but I do think todays entry level license is very difficult to attain,
>>and conveys dangerous power authorizations for and entry level license.
>>
>
> I disagree with you that the Amateur power levels need to be reduced.

I agree with Ed. It's not the power that kills you it's the voltage.
120V into a 15W power supply is as lethal as 120V into a 1500W power
amp, and if it kills you, 120V mains is just as bad as the 3KV side of
an HV XFMR.

On the other hand, high voltage could serve as an active filter, you
know, for NCT hams who have no business on HF. This could augment
Brian's Actuarial filter and support the Darwinian survival of the
fittest theory that I have championed elsewhere in this thread.

73 de KR4AJ

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4771. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:38:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <DggJ8.107$4o2.8626497@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44040

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020529070943.21437.00001245@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Don't Shoot Me, I'm Only The Messenger. I Only Observe...blah blah blah
>
> You did not only observe. You interpreted and you reported. Most hams
would
> disagree that your interpretation applies to most of ham radio. I do.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

OK, here it is again:

> >> - Operating skills
> >> - Practical technical skills and knowledge
> >> - Homebrewing and modifying equipment
> >> - Public Service
> >> - "G-rated" content
> >> - Healthy, friendly competition
> >> - No barriers because of age, gender, race, or socioeconomic status
> >> - Play by the rules at all times
> >>
> >> There are lots of younger hams who identify with this "older"
> >> ham radio culture.
> >
> >Fantastic! Nothing wrong with that until you add:
>
> >Cronyism
> >Double Standards
> >Cliques
> >Intolerance for newcomers and beginners
> >and
> >License class bigotry

Ed, are you saying that cronyism, double standards, cliques, intolerance for
newcomers, and license class bigotry do NOT occur or exist in amateur radio?

I do not believe that it exists in MOST of amateur radio, merely that it
exists, and it is ugly wherever it is found. And it is certainly found on
RRAP.

4772. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:39:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FhgJ8.108$Nu2.9053356@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44042

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020529060627.03285.00000272@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <AEWI8.426$265.18345000@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> (N2EY wrote):
>
> >> Today, May 28, 2002, Russia joined NATO. That's a good thing.
> >
> >What is good about it?
>
> It's a sign of how much the Russians have changed. Old enemies have become
> new friends. They got a taste of blue jeans, rock'n'roll and McDonalds and
now
> they want to join the party.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

What military secrets should we now give them?

4773. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:39:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <KhgJ8.76$RT5.67@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 44041

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> I know of no amateur equipment that is FCC Certificated to operate on the
> public-service bands. Doing so is a clear rules violation.
>

Horseshoe7 says it's OK to use a Yaesu VX-5 on MURS.

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4774. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:41:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3jgJ8.110$Yv2.9118868@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44043

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF45894.DAC5729D@att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > > Who is standing in the way of freedom of coice of modes? Certainly not
> > > W0EX.
> >
> > He wants every HF ham's first "mode" to be Morse code.
>
> Another fine example of the absolute propensity of the code haters'
routine
> outright lying about the actions, activities and viewpoints of anyone who
supports
> a code qualification for hams. You should be ashamed of yourself, but of
course you
> aren't capable of that.

Ergo, dick lies.

4775. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:41:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <XjgJ8.111$Ab2.7855172@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44044

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020529070611.21437.00001242@mb-mn.aol.com...
> From: CAM w5dxp@hotmail.com
>
> >You want every ham to possess Morse code skill before being allowed to
use
> >any other mode on HF. How you can deny that is beyond belief.
>
> Is this another one of those "what he said -- what he really meant" sort
of
> things?

Dick has said enough for a lifetime. What he meant is becoming more
meaningless by the moment.

4776. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:46:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <eogJ8.114$Ww2.9181357@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44045

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF45342.6891354E@att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Why should it matter where you learned radio as long as you learned
it?
> >
> > So my EE degree is not meaningless after all?
> >
>
>
> It's YOU that are meaningless.

And you are an anachronysm. Like "Sad Sack," a caricature of what used to
be.

4777. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:49:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <JqgJ8.115$gy2.9269565@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44046

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF444C5.30008@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CF41854.5000207@bellsouth.net...
> > >
> > >>
> > >>CAM wrote:
> > >>
> > >> > Dan Finn wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> >> Why can you not default on the side of excellence in your
> > >> >> so-called earthly matters such as laws and regulations on radio.
> > >> >
> > >> > Following that logic, the FCC should raise the Morse code
> > >> > requirement to 50 wpm. What do you think would happen to the
> > >> > Amateur Radio Service?
> > >> >
> > >>No, not exactly true. Raising code speed to 50 wpm is not a default.
> > >>
> > >> >
> > >> > What would the default be, if not 50wpm? 70wpm?
> >
> >
> > Hmm, CAM builds the straw man base for N0iMD, steps back and N0iMD adds
> > more pieces of straw to make the construct larger but more unstable.
> >
> > CAM knows how to push the ON switch to activate N0iMD. N0iMD has no idea
> > that CAM is playing him like a Stradivarius.
> >
> > Q: Who will shoot it the straw man down?
> >
> >
> > >>Instead. it would effectively be a decision to require Morse above
> > >>everything else at the risk of losing a large part of the amateur
> > >>community.
> > >>
> > >> >
> > >> > An Amateur Service of One? What's wrong with that? Would it exclude
> > KR4AJ?
> >

>
> A: N0iMD. Through no creativity of his own, Brian shoots down the straw
> man. Even KR4AJ is excluded from ham radio, according to the straw
> logic, therefore the KR4AJ position cannot be valid. N0iMD is actually
> exposed as a part time puppet of CAM.
>
> The straw logic can hardly stand up on its own weight and Brian
> easily topples the straw construct and claims victory.
>
> Rather stupid, don't you think? Vladimir Lenin used to do the same
> thing. He got it from Karl Marx, Comrade Burke.
>
> heh heh heh...and it's the oldest 6th grade trick in the book.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

Answer the question, "An Amateur Service of One? What's wrong with that? Would it exclude KR4AJ?"

It is just a simple question, such as the one's that Jim asks. Go for it.

4778. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:50:40 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF59380.7060302@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44047

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>
>>Don't Shoot Me, I'm Only The Messenger. I Only Observe...blah blah blah
>>
>
> You did not only observe. You interpreted and you reported. Most hams would
> disagree that your interpretation applies to most of ham radio. I do.

Aw, come on Ed, you did not read what I was saying. I was not talking about ham radio people, I was talking about how humanity in general reacts in the face of limited amounts of information. Humanity in general implies normal, typical people in the populace. It makes no difference whether you think hams fall into the category of normal, typical people because they are such an insignificant subset of all of humanity. This means that the inane attempts of yourself and others to turn ham culture into accepting no-code are rather futile, even if it works. Humans like stratification (except Marxists like Brian of course, heh heh heh).

If you are a ham, members of the general public will assume that you know how to use a code keyer and beep all day long. If you can't, then members of the general public will think you are not a real ham but perhaps a CBer, whom they know cannot send/receive morse code like hams do. And I am an expert at knowing how members of the general public think about hams because I am a member of both.

Don't shoot! I am just the messenger!

Best of 73 de KR4AJ

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4779. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:51:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <htgJ8.118$Tx2.9243878@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44048

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF46623.1000805@bellsouth.net...

> But the privilege allows 5wpm Gen's to use CW sub bands. This can be
> very disruptive
snip
> 73 de KR4AJ

So CW use is disruptive? Pretty soon it could be gone.

4780. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 02:56:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BxgJ8.119$4w2.9127073@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44049

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF58E3B.4040701@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:

> > I routinely have my 7040 kHz QSOs ruined by QRM from non-CW stations. On
what
> > basis can we determine that these operators could not ruin my QSOs
because they
> > know Morse code?
>
>
> Gee Ed, *I* have never had my CW QSO's on 7040 *ever* QRM'd. Something
> must be wrong with your statement.

I would have been overjoyed to have someone answer my novice cq's. Anyway,
Dick says that the brain can sort out the information from the noise.

4781. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:03:54 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF5969A.8000708@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44050

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:3CF444C5.30008@bellsouth.net...
>
>>
>>Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>>>news:3CF41854.5000207@bellsouth.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>CAM wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Dan Finn wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Why can you not default on the side of excellence in your
>>>>>>so-called earthly matters such as laws and regulations on radio.
>>>>>>
>>>>>Following that logic, the FCC should raise the Morse code
>>>>>requirement to 50 wpm. What do you think would happen to the
>>>>>Amateur Radio Service?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>No, not exactly true. Raising code speed to 50 wpm is not a default.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>What would the default be, if not 50wpm? 70wpm?
>>>
>>
>>Hmm, CAM builds the straw man base for N0iMD, steps back and N0iMD adds
>>more pieces of straw to make the construct larger but more unstable.
>>
>>CAM knows how to push the ON switch to activate N0iMD. N0iMD has no idea
>>that CAM is playing him like a Stradivarius.
>>
>>Q: Who will shoot it the straw man down?
>>
>>
>>
>>>>Instead. it would effectively be a decision to require Morse above

>>>>everything else at the risk of losing a large part of the amateur
>>>>community.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>An Amateur Service of One? What's wrong with that? Would it exclude
>>>
> KR4AJ?
>
>>
>>A: N0iMD. Through no creativity of his own, Brian shoots down the straw
>>man. Even KR4AJ is excluded from ham radio, according to the straw
>>logic, therefore the KR4AJ position cannot be valid. N0iMD is actually
>>exposed as a part time puppet of CAM.
>>
>> The straw logic can hardly stand up on its own weight and Brian
>>easily topples the straw construct and claims victory.
>>
>>Rather stupid, don't you think? Vladimir Lenin used to do the same
>>thing. He got it from Karl Marx, Comrade Burke.
>>
>>heh heh heh...and it's the oldest 6th grade trick in the book.
>>
>>73 de KR4AJ
>>
>
> Answer the question, "An Amateur Service of One? What's wrong with that?
> Would it exclude KR4AJ?"
>
> It is just a simple question, such as the one's that Jim asks. Go for it.

OK, I will play you kid's game but for just a minute: Your straw man
question would exclude KR4AJ but it would not necessarily be an amateur
service of only one. But now that I cluttered the bandwidth with
answering a stupid question, please make your point. Why 70 wpm? Why do
you guys always go to the extreme side of every situation? For you it's
either 70 wpm or no code at all.

I was merely suggesting a default more on the side of excellence, say,
13 wpm for EXTRA (keeping 5 wpm no-code for general). Someday I will
give you some personal examples of how I witnessed substantial code
usage outside of the US.

I don't know where you guys come up with that extremist 50-70 wpm crap.
That is as extreme on one side as no-code is on the other. Try the middle.

So Comrade, what do you think of the more reasonable path to preserve
excellence?
73 de KR4AJ

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.

Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4782. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:11:08 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF59846.6E674BE7@icok.net>
Source record: 44051
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:
----clipped----
> I respect all the points you have made. However, because of the fact
> that we already have had GMRS and FRS for a great number of years(and
> GMRS does allow external antennas, and does share freqs with FRS, and
----clipped----

Stew,
"A great number of years"... Are you sure that
FRS has been around for a great number of years?
How about 1 year (I think).
You know, the way you re-arrange facts to fit the
argument you're making, I think you're a politician.
Are you getting paid by the 'word', or by the pound of
fertilizer that you post?
'Doc

4783. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:12:51 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF598B3.7000003@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44052

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020529070717.21437.00001243@mb-mn.aol.com...
>
>>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>>
>>
>>>No, but I do think todays entry level license is very difficult to
>>>
> attain,
>
>>>and conveys dangerous power authorizations for and entry level license.
>>>
>>I disagree with you that the Amateur power levels need to be reduced.
>>
>>73,
>>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>
> Ed, you may disagree, but 1,500 watts of ionizing radiation doesn't sound
> like an entry level license to me. I think an entry level license should be
> introduced that has limits on power per the rf hazard chart in Part 97.
> Then you may eliminate a portion of the requirement for knowledge to perform
> the safety analysis.

Holy Shit! 1.5KW of *ionizing* radiation! I'm sure you understand that
ionizing radiation is radioactive radiation such as they type one might
create with U-235 in Nuclear power plants and atomic bombs.

Gosh, was I supposed to put lead shielding around my power amp?

GULP! I didn't.

"Here Lies a glowing ham, KR4AJ
Got ionizing radiation from his 3-500z, all day"

73 de KR4AJ SK

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4784. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:17:29 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF599C5.22FAE2B6@icok.net>
Source record: 44053
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

So far, Stew baby, you're the only one 'spreading'
it. And the only reason you're doing that is so you
can 'debunk' it. You know, one of those, "make a problem
so you can cure the problem and be a hero" kinda things.
You ned help Stew...
'Doc

4785. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:18:30 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF59A06.8020701@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44054

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> So CW use is disruptive? Pretty soon it could be gone.

Wishful thinking on your part. It will never be gone. It is too useful
for the non-Yuppie world.

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4786. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:20:39 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <bUgJ8.12609$LC3.889408@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 44055

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF5905E.5030208@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >
> >
> >>No, but I do think todays entry level license is very difficult to
attain,
> >>and conveys dangerous power authorizations for and entry level
license.
> >>
> >
> > I disagree with you that the Amateur power levels need to be reduced.
>
>
> I agree with Ed. It's not the power that kills you it's the voltage.
> 120V into a 15W power supply is as lethal as 120V into a 1500W power
> amp, and if it kills you, 120V mains is just as bad as the 3KV side of
> an HV XFMR.
>
> On the other hand, high voltage could serve as an active filter, you
> know, for NCT hams who have no business on HF. This could augment
> Brian's Actuarial filter and support the Darwinian survival of the
> fittest theory that I have championed elsewhere in this thread.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

Find a copy of H.L. Mencken on Chiropractic. You two would get along
famously.

4787. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:22:44 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF59B02.F73FD14E@icok.net>
Source record: 44056
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

stewart,
I hope you use this one week moritorium to
seek the help you need.
'Doc

4788. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:27:07 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF59C0B.27E37BC9@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44058

Mike Coslo wrote:
> I have to disagree Cecil! I certainly don't want to force anyone to use
> Morse Code on HF, ...

The Morse code requirement forces all HF hams to simulate the CW mode
receive operation before allowing them to use any other mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4789. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:28:43 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF59C6B.D08FD30F@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44060

Mike Coslo wrote:
> I may assume you mean off the air?

Yes, a simulation of the CW mode receive operation.

> CAM wrote:
> > A Morse code requirement requires every HF ham to use the Morse code "mode"
> > first before using any other mode. Dick denied that fact.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4790. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:28:53 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205291928.744d4c94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44057

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0205282111.1f78557b@posting.google.com>...
> Now - I'll have to admit that I was considering buying a Yaesu VX-5 -
> mostly because I wanted to play around with 6m. However, I understand
> the FT-817 is fairly reasonably priced these days... pretty impressive
> little QRP backpack unit... I suppose I could even use it on HF :-O

Ordered the little beastie today.

Stewart - N0MHS

4791. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:29:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <i0hJ8.195$RT5.77@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 44059

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

>
> Can you point me to any newsgroups that discuss MURS so I can correct this
> misinformation?
>

There is an excellent source of info about MURS on the web, hosted by PRSG
(sort of the "ARRL of GMRS/MURS") at http://www.provide.net/~prsg/home.htm

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4792. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkinlincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:43:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CF59FE1.3F24CC7A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 44061
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

>
> There is no such "novice no-code" class. Must be another of Stewart's wet dreams.

Some people say 5 wpm is equivalent to "no code". If you accept that,
then we used to have an "all code" "no-code" license. A license where
the only permitted mode used to be CW.

:-)

4793. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:44:48 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF5A030.390A2E7D@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44062

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> writes:
> >> > You are mistaken. It was not a hypothesis of general behavior.
> >>
> >> Yes, it was.
> >
> >No, it wasn't.
>
> Yes, it was.

No it wasn't. Here it is again from my original posting:
"If I am angry enough to utter obscenities,
my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type on a
keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
the microphone."

What is it about these personal facts that you find so difficult to accept?

> >> > My hypothesis is that hams like me cannot send CW while extremely angry.
> >>
> >> That's not what you originally wrote.
> >
> >That was the meaning of what I originally wrote.
>
> But it's not what you originally wrote.

Yes it is, Jim. Here's my original posting: "If I am angry enough to utter
obscenities, my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type
on a keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
the microphone."

What is it about "I", "my", and "I" that you do not understand?

> How can a reader know that what you wrote is not what you meant?

What I wrote *is* what I meant. Here it is again:
"If I am angry enough to utter obscenities,
my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type on a
keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
the microphone."

Are you having comprehension difficulties?

> >Nope, facts are absolute.
>
> That's just a belief of yours, not a fact.

From Webster's: "fact - something known to exist or have happened"
It is a fact that my hands shake so badly when I am extremely angry
that I cannot send copyable Morse code. Why do you think you know
more about my psychology/physiology than I do? You *are* waxing
omniscient again, aren't you?

> >Einstein didn't question facts, he questioned beliefs.
>
> Whatever.
>
> Using that definition, it's clear that your belief that you are stating facts
> is mistaken.

The following is a factual statement from my original posting:
"If I am angry enough to utter obscenities,
my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type on a
keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
the microphone."

What is it about these *facts* that you cannot understand and accept?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4794. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:52:18 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CF5A1F2.69A0F5EB@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 44063
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:

>
>
> I would assume the same problem holds true on the HF ham bands to a
> certain extent. However, hams are taught to use only as much power as
> necessary to maintain a contact(I don't know how many follow the rule,
> and how far they will go in interpreting it, but I'm going to assume
> most follow it to a certain degree - although it isn't the "prime
> directive" of each and every ham).

I suspect that the "minimum power needed for the contact" is
observed by hams at the "order of magnitude" level. Can't reach that
interesting DX on 20 with just the 100 watts your transceiver
puts out, well, fire up the kilowatt linear.

4795. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:53:30 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF5A23A.918F4B2@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44064

Dan Finn wrote:
> If you are a ham, members of the general public will assume that you
> know how to use a code keyer and beep all day long.

Most members of the general public don't know the difference between
ham radio and CB. People are curious about my screwdriver antenna with
its large top hat. I tell them it's a ham radio antenna. The majority
come back with, "Oh, so you have a CB radio in your truck."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4796. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 03:55:13 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF5A2A1.4D67850C@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44065

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> > Gee Ed, *I* have never had my CW QSO's on 7040 *ever* QRM'd. Something
> > must be wrong with your statement.
>
> I would have been overjoyed to have someone answer my novice cq's. Anyway,
> Dick says that the brain can sort out the information from the noise.

Dan's CW obviously gets through when all other modes fail. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4797. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 04:00:49 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF5A3F1.58BC4167@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44066

Dan Finn wrote:
> Why do you guys always go to the extreme side of every situation?
> I don't know where you guys come up with that extremist 50-70 wpm crap.

Whoa there pardner, guess who introduced the concept of "default on
the side of excellence"? Wouldn't 50-70wpm be defaulting on the side
of excellence? If 50-70wpm is not excellent enough, just what speed
is excellent enough?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4798. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 04:24:00 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF5A960.7090705@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44067

CAM wrote:

> Dan Finn wrote:
>
>>If you are a ham, members of the general public will assume that you
>>know how to use a code keyer and beep all day long.
>>
>
> Most members of the general public don't know the difference between
> ham radio and CB. People are curious about my screwdriver antenna with
> its large top hat. I tell them it's a ham radio antenna. The majority
> come back with, "Oh, so you have a CB radio in your truck."

Yeah, I know. But they don't realize that people use ham radios in their vehicles. The movies always have shown trucks with CB radios, therefore, it is the conventional wisdom that trucks contain only CB radios.

73 de KR4AJ

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4799. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 04:35:32 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF5AC14.7000606@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44068

CAM wrote:

> Dan Finn wrote:
>
>> Why do you guys always go to the extreme side of every situation? I
>> don't know where you guys come up with that extremist 50-70 wpm
>> crap.
>>
>
> Whoa there pardner, guess who introduced the concept of "default on the
> side of excellence"? Wouldn't 50-70wpm be defaulting on the side of
> excellence? If 50-70wpm is not excellent enough, just what speed is
> excellent enough?

By using the term default, this means to say that there is a fine line in the middle of no code, slow code and fast code. Many members of this group default to the left side (not political left) which is no-code. I am suggesting that we default closer to the middle (some code). To me it makes as little sense to default to the extreme left side (no code) as it does to default to 50 wpm (fast code). Going too far to the left is too far away from the standards of recent past. Too far to the right would be extreme, unattainable excellence. Going towards the middle is not excellence in and of itself, but it is more "on the side of excellence" which is all that many people are asking. That has been my suggestion, i.e., to default on the side of excellence, not to extreme excellence.

Ham radio need not be the Morse code olympics.

73 de KR4AJ

4800. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 04:35:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <KAYZEROHANDSOMEBOY@ELECTRICSMOKE.NET>
Message-ID: <u_hJ8.311$RT5.33@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 44069
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote

> there are no high-powered amplifiers on GMRS/FRS/MURS.

There are any number of "opened up" 2M mobile rigs running on MURS. You can find them advertised as "MURS Ready" on EBay any time you like. Just did a search on "MURS" and found 50W Icom IC-2100H available, with prominent mention that it would work on the "new MURS" CB service.

Sunuvagun!

73, de Hans, K0HB
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/

4801. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 05:01:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwwii20.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 44070
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 29 May 2002 14:26:51 -0400, Dave Hall wrote:

>Why would hams want to purposely halt the growth of another radio
>service? For what gain? As a radio hobbyist, I welcome any and all
>outlets for experimenting.

The Class D Citizens Radio Service was never intended for hobby or
experimental use. It became that way by default. Because of
laziness as a resault of a well-known-inside pizzing contest between
certain managers at the FCC - it was easier to just nake thw rules
conform to what the outlaws were doing than to enforce them.

The GMRS and the FRS and the MURS were never intendced to be for
hobby or experimental usage. But alas, the same throwing-up-of-the-hands
that overcame the FCC with the CBRS overcame them for these, too.

FRS was a pet project of Radio Shack to sell lots of junky
throw-away radios and MURS was a pet project of EF Johnson to sell
more JobComm radios than its competitor could sell Color-Dot radios
which both were selling when a Business Radio License was required
for their usage. But the outlaws walked into CostCo or Wal-Mart,
bought the radios and used them unlawfully and the FCC again changed
the rules rather than enforced them.

If you think that these companies had the good intentions of "making
communications more accessible for the average person", I have a bridge
for sale that may be of interest to you....

Wanna do hobby? Wanna do experimenting? Get a ham license....it's
much easier now than when the CBRS and GMRS were first founded.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4802. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 05:01:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwwita1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 44071

On Wed, 29 May 2002 15:32:13 -0500, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>Haven't been listening very hard, have you? Overpowered cordless
>phones have been sneaking across the borders for years now,

They don't walk across by themselves - prople or companies smuggle them in. Yep - failure to declare properly is smuggling.

>discussions of how to boost the power output for 802.11 stuff are
>common on the net.

Yup. Don't they understand that the higher the power and the greater the range, the more other types of electroc crooks can ji-hack their signal?

A white-collar (radio) criminal may be of higher economic status, better educated, and deal with more sophisticated schemes, but underneath all that you will still find a thug.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4803. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 05:09:57 UTC
From: "G. M. Alf" <gmalf.ears@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <9pcbfu8tul9bi1fuih52mnkgjtsppos40a@4ax.com>
Source record: 44072
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Thu, 30 May 2002 03:11:08 GMT, 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net> wrote:

>
>
>stewart wrote:
>----clipped----
>> I respect all the points you have made. However, because of the fact
>> that we already have had GMRS and FRS for a great number of years(and
>> GMRS does allow external antennas, and does share freqs with FRS, and
>----clipped----
>
>Stew,
> "A great number of years"... Are you sure that
>FRS has been around for a great number of years?
>How about 1 year (I think).

The Family Radio Service was established by the FCC on May 14, 1996, a
mere 6 years ago.

> You know, the way you re-arrange facts to fit the
>argument you're making, I think you're a politician.
>Are you getting paid by the 'word', or by the pound of
>fertilizer that you post?
> 'Doc

Seems to be a common practice.

Mike

4804. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 06:00:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530020031.03248.00001371@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 44073

>Subject: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/29/02 22:14 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205291814.23d8e365@posting.google.com>

>I'm beginning a 1 week "Internet cease-fire" on this issue. After
>that, if no further claims of "High-Powered Amps on GMRS/MURS" are
>made - there will be no further need to defend against these rumors.
>

You can't "defend" a rumour when it is indeed true.

>You see, it is kind of a chicken-and-the-egg issue.

You're too chicken to admit the egg on your face is from trying to
"defend" a "position" taht is untenable.

>Amps on
>GMRS/MURS do no good, as long as there aren't enough other people with
>amps out there... and there isn't a market for amps, until there are
>enough amps out there... and without a market for amps, there aren't
>enough amps out there...

That was about the most inane thing I have ever read, Stewart.

There are already plenty of amps out there, and many are being used
illegally.

4805. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 06:08:29 UTC
From: lucifer@eternal-flames.gov
Message-ID: <3cf5bca3.1885041@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 44074
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 29 May 2002 14:26:09 -0700, horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote:

>Nope, they are very useful services... that would be like tearing up
>the beginnings of the Interstate Freeway system, because of a few drag
>racing gangs (known as the CBers and Freebanders) on Mulholland Drive
>in the early 60's.

I thought the idea was for somebody to start the rumour? ;-)

Nick.

4806. Re: Off-Off-Topic!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 09:51:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020530055128.29986.00000873@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 44076

In article <0415641DC9FE9694.93DAB9B56A8E6BF0.097E8D2F2FDCD304@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>
>Sounds like a desk-decorator, but it brings up an interesting
>possibility; has anyone tried using an RC plane or helicopter to
>string wire antennas in the field?

Joe:

One particular R/C aircraft design, the TeleMaster, was designed
specifically for the purpose of stringing lightweight leaders used to
precede heavier cables used in the construction of bridges. It is
also popular for carrying cameras and video equipment into the
air; my father and I have done so with Telemasters for years, with
pretty good success. The only thing I don't like about them is with
their light wing loading and Clark-Y airfoil, the darn things are almost
impossible to land where you want them to.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Ex: AMA 63931

4807. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 09:51:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020530055129.29986.00000874@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 44075

In article <20020528210135.17509.00000952@mb-ft.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Why would hams care what happens on a handful of MURS channels?

Ed:

Speaking only for myself, I view MURS as a potentially useful service, and I, for one, would prefer that it not be crapped-out with a bunch of CB-like nonsense.

BTW: Any MixW users out there? I just started using it, and it is totally blowing my socks off! Wouldn't mind exchanging some zeroes and ones with anyone else in the NG who is using it!

73 de Larry, K3LT
A PCTA enjoying the Digital Revolution in Amateur Radio!

4808. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:08:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530060808.21944.00001232@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44077

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>> This will come as a shock to the many folks who have worked all
>> continents on HF using milliwatt QRP transmitters.

>Oh, COME ON, these people are also running high gain antennas on bands
>not INFESTED with the level of noise present on 11m.

You may have been able to get away with such misinformtion on the MURS groups until your deciding to try to promote MURS here with misinformation caused a number of hams to join in the MURS discussions, but you can't expect to tell such falsehoods here and get away unchallenged.

Many QRPers use modest antennas on HF. My 250 milliwatt worked-all-states was done using either a ladder-line-fed 40 M dipole and antenna tuner or a 20-meter ground plane, both up about 40 feet. That 1-milliwatt QSO to Europe was made on a ladder-line fed 80 meter dipole strung between the buildings.

Such misinformation in one area is probably causing people to doubt your information in all areas.

With the type of
>antennas these 'ol boys typically run, they need the watts to be heard
>thru all the noise, and to overcome the ineffeciencies in their
>antenna systems, and to communicate with the other good 'ol boys
>running a similar power level and antenna system at the other end of
>the link.
>
>> >However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
>> >propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
>> >motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
>> >on these frequencies.
>>
>> Right, CB'ers would NEVER think of running amps on FRS.......

>but IT DOESN'T WORK - because of LOS limitations, because
>of the increased imporatance of transmission line loss and antenna
>gain

All the more reason to run amplifiers. I can respect your motivations in trying to tell MURS users that amplifiers won't work -- if you can get them to believe you, that would help slow the use of amps, but spreading misinformation about Amateur Radio, QRP, propagation, capture effect and a host of other related subjects is making your cure worse than the disease.

Or is it possible that you really don't understand these things? If so, spreading "information" on a subject for which you have little real knowledge

is nearly as bad.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4809. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:11:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530061107.21944.00001233@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44078

From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)

>> When I use my FRS radios, I rarely can see the person I am talking to.
>> DO YOU?

>Of course not - RF LOS propagation is different than Visual LOS
>propagation.

RF LOS generally involves a fair amount of scatter.

>Now - if you all would stop spreading this high-power GMRS/FRS/MURS
>amplifier bullshit, I'll stop having to debunk it. Fair enough?

Cursing your way to the truth again, eh? Don't you think that doing so hurts
your cause just a little?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4810. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:13:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530061354.21944.00001234@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44079

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>I think an entry level license should be
>introduced that has limits on power per the rf hazard chart in Part 97.
>Then you may eliminate a portion of the requirement for knowledge to perform
>the safety analysis.

The FCC has spoken loud and clear that it wants fewer, not more, license classes. Which of the existing classes would you propose be eliminated to create this new sub-set of Amateur Radio you propose?

Why would you want to further fragment our community?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4811. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:15:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530061555.21944.00001235@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44080

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>> Ed, you may disagree, but 1,500 watts of ionizing radiation doesn't sound
>> like an entry level license to me.

>Holy Shit! 1.5KW of *ionizing* radiation!

It must be early in the AM -- I completely missed that one. Although no-code Tech's are licensed to use ultraviolet under Part 97, I don't know of a single ham, no-code Tech or otherwise, that has done so.

His credibility to make such proposals has been pretty seriously undermined by that one.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4812. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkinlincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:16:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020530061648.29986.00000875@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 44081

In article <3CF59FE1.3F24CC7A@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Some people say 5 wpm is equivalent to "no code". If you accept that,
>then we used to have an "all code" "no-code" license. A license where
>the only permitted mode used to be CW.

Robert:

A 5 WPM code test does nothing more than test basic character
recognition. This is adequate for someone who is to be licensed
at the entry level, particularly if he/she will be starting to make
on-the-air QSO's in CW, and thus progressively increase operating
speed and accuracy. However, as a maximum code speed test,
the passing of which results in the granting of full HF privileges,
it is sadly lacking, since there is no incentive for the prospective
upgraded amateur to increase his code skills beyond this level.
And experience has shown that without this incentive, only a tiny
handful of amateurs ever will pursue the Morse/CW mode to a
useful proficiency level (13 - 20 WPM).

Therefore, while the old Novice class was an "all code No code" license
as you call it, it was the *beginning* of the license structure, not the end.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4813. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:20:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530062033.21944.00001236@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44082

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>> In my decades of Morse CW hamming, I don't believe I have ever had a QSO
>with a
>> Cuban touching two wires together.

>Are you implying that I am BS-ing? Says a lot to some of us about
>you; otherwise it doesn't really matter.

The fact that I have never had a QSO with a Cuban ham touching two wires
together tells you "a lot?" How odd!

> The one that sounded very much like he was
>touching two wires together said he was at a railway station where I
>suppose they should have had a straight key but this guy sure wasn't
>using one.

I will gladly accept that you had one QSO with a Cuban ham that worked where a
straight key should have been available but he "sounded like" he was touching
two wires together. How that tells you a lot about me, though, is still a bit
unclear.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4814. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:23:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530062335.21944.00001237@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44083

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>> I routinely have my 7040 kHz QSOs ruined by QRM from non-CW stations. On
>what
>> basis can we determine that these operators could not ruin my QSOs because
>they
>> know Morse code?

>Gee Ed, *I* have never had my CW QSO's on 7040 *ever* QRM'd. Something
>must be wrong with your statement.

Even in my QRO days, I would say that having my 100-watt signals QRMed on 40 meters are a reasonably regular occurrence. I find it hard to believe that you have never experienced that yourself on 7040 kHz. Are you pulling my leg?

As to my own statement, most of my work on 7040 kHz is being done with power of 1 watt or less. I believe that some of the digital signals that are also there originate in Europe. It doesn't take a whopping signal to QRM a 1-watt transmssion.

Do you still think that there is something wrong with my statement, or do you feel better now?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4815. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:28:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530062814.21944.00001238@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44084

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Ed, you've read it from me previously, but just because you're from the ARRL
>I'll go over it again.

Actually, Brian, it may come as surprise to you, but I don't read everything
you post. Nor do I remember everything I read.

What does my employment at ARRL HQ have to do with your decision to restate
your views of a two-class classless Amateur Radio?

>1. Full license: "Amateur" to present General standards.
>2. Limited license: "Limited Amateur" to less than Technician knowledge.
>Limited in power to the rf safety chart or 200 watts, whichever is less, No
>repeater trustee privs, No 3rd party traffic. All bands, all modes.

I assume that if the FCC thought this was a good idea, they would have made the
rules change. I think that many hams would disagree that all priveleges should
be granted to a "General" level of knowledge. If you want this idea to be well
accepted, you may have to adopt the principle that there be no reduction in the
level of knowledge required to reach the highest pinnacle. In that case, all
you have accomplished is to make it one pretty big step.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4816. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:30:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530063025.21944.00001239@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44085

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Did you say of Dann Finn in his several diatribes concerning, "Don't shoot
>me I'm only the messenger, I only observe and Report...." that, "You did
>not only observe. You interpreted and you reported. Most hams would
>disagree that your interpretation applies to most of ham radio. I do."

No, I said different things to Dan.

>Or did you agree with Dann Finn?

By Dan's reaction to my post in response to him, I don't think that he would
think I agreed with him.

Or are you referring to a different post he made? It may come as a surprise to
you, but I don't read every one of his posts, either.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4817. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:32:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530063213.21944.00001240@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44086

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>On the other hand, high voltage could serve as an active filter, you
>know, for NCT hams who have no business on HF.

In what way does learning code help hams not be electrocuted, Dan?

In what way does the high voltages that can be used to generate VHF and up
signals act differently than the high voltages used to generate HF signals?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4818. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:33:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530063359.21944.00001241@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44087

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Ed, are you saying that cronyism, double standards, cliques, intolerance for
>newcomers, and license class bigotry do NOT occur or exist in amateur radio?

Why would I say something that ridiculous? Of course they exist, and I agree
that the tiny amount I have seen is shameful, but I don't think that
"intolerance for newcomers" is important enough that I included it on my list.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4819. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:37:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530063705.21944.00001242@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44088

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>If you are a ham, members of the general public will assume that you
>know how to use a code keyer and beep all day long.

I think that most members of the general public don't give it much thought at all. The times that non-hams have encountered me using Morse code, their usual reaction is "hams still use Morse code?"

>And I am an expert at knowing how members of the general public
>think about hams because I am a member of both.

This may be like the way you have never had QRM on 7040 kHz, Dan; we have each had different experiences.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4820. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:40:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530064002.21944.00001243@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44089

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>I was merely suggesting a default more on the side of excellence, say,
>13 wpm for EXTRA (keeping 5 wpm no-code for general).

>So Comrade, what do you think of the more reasonable path to preserve
>excellence?

Considering that the FCC has shut the door on having a 13 wpm code test, what other ways can you suggest to improve excellence among slow code operators? I don't think that your approach of calling the slow-code hams "disruptive" on a ham-radio newsgroup is very productive.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4821. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:40:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530064046.21944.00001244@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44090

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>Wishful thinking on your part. It will never be gone. It is too useful
>for the non-Yuppie world.

I agree, but if that is true, why all the hooplah about testing speed?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4822. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:42:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530064241.21944.00001245@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44091

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>Too far to the right
>would be extreme, unattainable excellence.

It seems to me that you have proposed a standard of what is easily attainable for you. I have seen hams struggle hard to learn code well enough to pass the 5 wpm test. To them, 5 wpm represents excellence. To me, 20 wpm sounds dirt slow.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4823. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:44:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530064414.21944.00001246@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44092

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> Mine might, but my experience operating CW mobile on bumpy roads would
>ensure
>> that no one ever knew.

>Tell Newington to fix their streets.

Actually, I have operated CW mobile relatively rarely in Newington. Most of the bumpy roads I have encountered have been during my county-hunter days, as I drove to counties with no interstates to put them on the county-hunters net.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4824. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:47:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530064714.21944.00001247@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44093

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>"Don't shoot me, I'm only the messenger," and all that other Dann Finn
>abdication of responsibility crappola.

If you feel that your words are not responsible, I will let your statement
"abdicating" that responsibility speak for itself.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4825. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkinlincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:49:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530064939.21944.00001248@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 44094

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> since there is no incentive for the prospective
>upgraded amateur to increase his code skills beyond this level.

Do you really feel that Morse code is so useless that there is no incentive for people to learn to use it beyond 5 wpm?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4826. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 10:57:50 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <ufc1l8ol50l579@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 44095
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ad4108$ls2$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> I see no such saturation of FRS. Another family and mine often
> travel on weekends and we use FRS between cars. No saturation
> encountered at all...much less even another occasional user
> on the same channel. This is in the northeast, probably the most
> densly populater area of the country.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

It's the way you're using them. On the highway, with the limited range, you WON'T find many other users. Even around Boston. (I'm below Worcester.) I've used FRS between multiple cars to the cape and to ski trips, and never run into someone on the highway.

On the other hand, I took FRS on a motorcycle trip. And stops up north of Lowel found a couple of channels busy. On ski trips to Vermont almost every channel is so busy as to be almost unusable. Going to things like NHRA (big events with top fuelers) FRS is one big party line. Even with PL.

Hey, even in the summer, when I was at the summit of Wachusett, I found about half the channels active. A lot from there, but I was also getting some pretty distant stuff. One conversation was hikers. Sounded like they were on Monadnock.
Mike

4827. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 11:26:42 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3CF60C72.2556@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 44098
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Wed, 29 May 2002 14:26:51 -0400, Dave Hall wrote:
>
> >Why would hams want to purposely halt the growth of another radio
> >service? For what gain? As a radio hobbyist, I welcome any and all
> >outlets for experimenting.
>
> The Class D Citizens Radio Service was never intended for hobby or
> experimental use. It became that way by default. Because of
> laziness as a resault of a well-known-inside pizzing contest between
> certain managers at the FCC - it was easier to just nake thw rules
> conform to what the outlaws were doing than to enforce them.

No arguement there. You are correct, but it doesn't change history. Be
that as it may, the CB band, the FRS band, and I'm sure the MURS band
are open to be used by THE PUBLIC, for whatever usage they seem to see
fit. GMRS is also (sadly) heading down the same road, now that
blister-pack GMRS radios are available to clueless people that think
they are just higher powered FRS radios.

>
> The GMRS and the FRS and the MURS were never intendced to be for
> hobby or experimental usage. But alas, the same throwing-up-of-the-hands
> that overcame the FCC with the CBRS overcame them for these, too.

They were never intended, but nonetheless are, the cheap and dirty way
to play with radio without taking a test.

>
> FRS was a pet project of Radio Shack to sell lots of junky
> throw-away radios

Some would say Motorola also had a stake in this.

> and MURS was a pet project of EF Johnson to sell
> more JobComm radios than its competitor could sell Color-Dot radios
> which both were selling when a Business Radio License was required
> for their usage. But the outlaws walked into CostCo or Wal-Mart,
> bought the radios and used them unlawfully and the FCC again changed
> the rules rather than enforced them.

That seems to be a common thread for the FCC. "If you can't beat 'em,
change the rules". Had the FCC's presence been stronger, 25 years ago,
we wouldn't be having this conversation. But it's water over the dam

now.

>
> If you think that these companies had the good intentions of "making
> communications more accessible for the average person", I have a bridge
> for sale that may be of interest to you....

Oh no, I'm far from naive. Any commercial venture has as it's primary goal, the advancement of their profits. Clever marketing types will look to find any new niche, that they can exploit for monetary gain. Why do you think companies like Uniden and Yaesu, made ham radios that (Wink wink) could be easily modified for 11 meter usage? That was no accident, and their sales demographics proved it, even though they ended up flooding the market with gear that was destined for illegal usage. But their bottom line was much better....

>
> Wanna do hobby? Wanna do experimenting? Get a ham license....it's
> much easier now than when the CBRS and GMRS were first founded.

Seems almost too easy doesn't it? Why would someone play arounf with services like MURS, and FRS, when ham radio offers so much more? The theory test is disgustingly easy these days, so there's really no good technical reaason why someone would not go the ham route.

But many seem to harbor a deep rooted hatred for hams and the service in general. This is likely due to bad exposure to "stuffed shirt" types that feel that "real hams" operate DX on HF with at least 75% of all contacts on CW. The bad taste left has turned away many prospective radiko hobbyists. Maybe that's why there's interest in these other services.....

Dave

>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4828. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 11:37:07 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3CF60EE3.453@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 44099
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:
>
> Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:<3CF51D6B.1D8B@worldlynx.net>...
>
> > As long as these VHF/UHF services are marketed as short range, mostly
> > handheld units, there will be little incentive for the "big guns" to set
> > up shop. But give it time. Start offering fancy radios, cheaply, with
> > lots of knobs and gadgets, and billy bob will be on those bands
> > eventually.
>
> I respect all the points you have made. However, because of the fact
> that we already have had GMRS and FRS for a great number of years(and
> GMRS does allow external antennas, and does share freqs with FRS, and
> will allow you to run easily obtainable Part 90 eqpt.), and these
> types of antics are not going on - I stand by my basic premise that
> the CB culture is FIRMLY ENTRENCHED and QUITE HAPPY on 11m... these
> 'ol boys can't just "reach out and knowingly squash somebody" for an
> extended period of time over in the next county - now matter how many
> WATTS they pump out. Oh sure, they could squash the conversation of
> little Billy or Susie on FRS for about 30 seconds, while they were
> passing thru town, or interfere with a business inventory being taken
> on MURS for a minute or so - but that is NOTHING compared with the
> HOURS OF PURE ENJOYMENT these CLOWNS can get on CB.

I agree that there always will be some that have no desire to leave the
11 meter band. But there are also others that like to test new waters.
Many upgrade to ham radio. Many find other avenues.

In my opinion, the only reason that GMRS has stood the test of time, is
that the service was not (Until very recently), widely marketed to the
public in places like Wal-Mart. Gear for GMRS was largely made up of
converted business radios, which are fairly expensive, and not always
easy to find, unless you cruise around in the radio world. In other
words, you had a need.

CB was also not very popular before the 70's, when the mass media
coverage of the "convoy" phenomenon, catapulted CB into every household,
and many companies started cranking out radios and selling them in
places like auto parts stores and 5 & 10 stores.

What will ultimately kill GMRS is the increasing marketing of cheap
"bubble pack" radios, with the predictable resultant rise in illegal
activity. The FCC, will once again run rather than fight, and will most

likely deregulate the band, and that will be the final death knell for a once usable band.

Dave
"Sandbagger"

4829. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 11:57:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205300357.2e2705b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44096

CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:<3CF5A030.390A2E7D@hotmail.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> writes:
> > >> > You are mistaken. It was not a hypothesis of general behavior.
> > >>
> > >> Yes, it was.
> > >
> > >No, it wasn't.
> >
> > Yes, it was.
>
> No it wasn't.

Yes, it was.

> Here it is again from my original posting:
> "If I am angry enough to utter obscenities,
> my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type on a
> keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
> the microphone."

That is not the post I responded to, nor the hypothesis that I said
had "no basis in fact".

73 de Jim, N2EY

4830. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 12:08:22 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3CF61636.2173@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 44100
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

stewart wrote:
>
> While I'm pretty much a QRP-type operator, I really don't have any
> argument with anything you are saying. But, all of this stuff really
> doesn't apply to the services or the discussion at hand. The point
> is, there have been ZERO actions by the FCC against any
> individuals/entities for running high-powered amplifiers on the
> MURS/GMRS/FRS frequencies; and there is(and never has been) the same
> type of incentive to run these things, like there is on 11m. That's
> all I'm saying.

And this is where your reasoning is flawed. Because the FCC hasn't publically flogged someone for running excessive power on MURS or FRS, you assume that it isn't happening. If I were to apply that logic to 11 meter CB, I'd conclude that since there are only a handfull of people getting NAL's from the FCC, that there are only a FEW people running illegally there. Anyone that's familiar with 11 meters, knows what a crock that is. The FCC isn't going to bust someone unless they are causing interference problems, that bring the illegal to their attention. If you can run a few more watts on MURS/FRS, and no one notices, do you think the FCC would care, or even know?

On the other hand, there is a certain amount of circumstantial evidence that would suggest that there is at least the intention or interest in running higher power equipment on the FRS and MURS band. I see radio mods for ham VHF/UHF radios that specifically address usage on those respective bands. I see radios for sale that mention being usable on FRS/GMRS/MURS. I guess it's a major selling point to have a single dual band radio handle 2 meter ham, MURS, the marine band, 440 ham, FRS, and GMRS. So why mention it, if it wasn't a desired feature by some?

Higher power operation on FRS and MURS wouldn't be particularly noticable either, due to the band's propagation (or lack thereof). Would you be able to tell the difference at a glance, between a 2W MURS station feeding a 10 element beam, 500 feet HAAT from a 50 watt mobile on the same frequency? Descrete use of ham gear on these frequencies will not attract much attention. But once Billy Bob finds out, it won't be so descrete.

Dave

4831. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 12:39:15 UTC
From: Prophet Cow-Flop <uncasgreasy@deAmishOnLine.com>
Message-ID: <T3pJ8.120$dB2.80@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 44097
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205291814.23d8e365@posting.google.com...
> I'm beginning a 1 week "Internet cease-fire" on this issue. After
> that, if no further claims of "High-Powered Amps on GMRS/MURS" are
> made - there will be no further need to defend against these rumors.

(SNIP)

Than't what I like about these ham
radio. The *easiest* way to start
a 2-terabyte-long multithread commentary
in newsgroups is make a PRO/ANTI-CW
message, or comment on illegal power
amplifiers being sold at Dayton or used
by CB'ers or others. Works every time
like Maalox or prunes. You would think
the topic of CW and/or amplifiers would
have died out long ago, but in ham radio
it seems, change comes, about as fast as
it takes for black strap molasses poured down
from the top of a 6 foot long fencepost in
Alaska to reach the bottom...

On a more curious note, it seems one of the ole
75 meter standouts is still going strong, even after
many years and the best efforts of R.H. Take a
listen down on 3.853 late at night for a certain
station in Co--oe Tx we all love to listen to.
He's mellowed out a tad from the "old days" when
"Johnny Reb" and "Lyin Dick" and the other
LA/TX/MS used to hang out down there, but still
an amusing SWL catch for U late nite insominacs.

4832. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 13:09:41 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3CF62495.788E199E@crosslink.net>
Source record: 44201
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

> stewart wrote:
>
> >
> >.... the ham VHF/UHF bands are VIRTUALLY UNUSED ....

I guess that's why there is at least a 5 year wait to get a repeater
pair coordinated on 2M even in the rural South.

4833. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 13:31:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF62984.97FA7FBA@att.net>
Source record: 44202
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Phil Kane wrote:

> Wanna do hobby? Wanna do experimenting? Get a ham >license....it's

> much easier now than when the CBRS and GMRS were first founded.
>

As someone once said, "Well, there you have it..."
Straight from as prominent an authority as you will ever find on rrap. Ham radio testing today IS much easier today than before.

4834. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkinlincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 13:34:06 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF62A4E.921B7370@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44203

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> A 5 WPM code test does nothing more than test basic character
> recognition. This is adequate for someone who is to be licensed
> at the entry level, particularly if he/she will be starting to make
> on-the-air QSO's in CW, and thus progressively increase operating
> speed and accuracy. However, as a maximum code speed test,
> the passing of which results in the granting of full HF privileges,
> it is sadly lacking, since there is no incentive for the prospective
> upgraded amateur to increase his code skills beyond this level.

Are you saying that CW doesn't have enough merits to entice amateur
radio operators to increase their skill level by using it? Maybe it
would help if you extolled the positive merits of CW rather than
spreading your vitriol on the negative shortcomings of the human race.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4835. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 13:36:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF62AA2.2CD6BE85@att.net>
Source record: 44204

W1RFI wrote:

> From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>
> >> This will come as a shock to the many folks who have worked all
> >> continents on HF using milliwatt QRP transmitters.
>
> >Oh, COME ON, these people are also running high gain antennas on bands
> >not INFESTED with the level of noise present on 11m.
>
> You may have been able to get away with such misinformtion on the MURS groups
> until your deciding to try to promote MURS here with misinformation caused a
> number of hams to join in the MURS discussions, but you can't expect to tell
> such falsehoods here and get away unchallenged.
>
> Many QRPers use modest antennas on HF. My 250 milliwatt worked-all-states was
> done using either a ladder-line-fed 40 M dipole and antenna tuner or a 20-meter
> ground plane, both up about 40 feet. That 1-milliwatt QSO to Europe was made
> on a ladder-line fed 80 meter dipole strung between the buildings.
>
> Such misinformation in one area is probably causing people to doubt your
> information in all areas.
>
>
>
> With the type of
> >antennas these 'ol boys typically run, they need the watts to be heard
> >thru all the noise, and to overcome the ineffeciencies in their
> >antenna systems, and to communicate with the other good 'ol boys
> >running a similar power level and antenna system at the other end of
> >the link.
> >
> >> >However, on VHF/UHF frequencies, greater than Line of Sight(LOS)
> >> >propagation is a fairly rare occurrance - so there is no initial
> >> >motivation for an average individual to run a high-powered amplifier
> >> >on these frequencies.
> >>
> >> Right, CB'ers would NEVER think of running amps on FRS.......
>
> >but IT DOESN'T WORK - because of LOS limitations, because
> >of the increased imporatance of transmission line loss and antenna
> >gain
>
> All the more reason to run amplifiers. I can respect your motivations in

> trying to tell MURS users that amplifiers won't work -- if you can get them to
> believe you, that would help slow the use of amps, but spreading misinformation
> about Amateur Radio, QRP, propagation, capture effect and a host of other
> related subjects is making your cure worse than the disease.
>
> Or is it possible that you really don't understand these things? If so,
> spreading "information" on a subject for which you have little real knowledge
> is nearly as bad.
>

As is all too often the case these days, Stew has no clue, despite his present
Extra class license.

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4836. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 13:36:53 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF62AED.AD5CA2C3@icok.net>
Source record: 44205
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

```
Prophet Cow-Flop,
And just for general information, there is
still a bounty on the 'Slobber-head's knee caps.
'Doc
```

4837. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 14:09:14 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF6328A.E7056FFB@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44206

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > Here it is again from my original posting:
> > "If I am angry enough to utter obscenities,
> > my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type on a
> > keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
> > the microphone."
>
> That is not the post I responded to, nor the hypothesis that I said
> had "no basis in fact".

You said you were responding to my "original posting". That *IS* my original posting on the subject dated 5-17-02. If that is not the post you responded to then you were mistaken when you said you were responding to my original posting. The above original posting clearly indicates that my opinions are based on personal experience. Any posting on the subject subsequent to 5-17 relied on readers having read that original posting and accepting the fact that I was speaking from personal experience.

I resent your attempt at trying to obfuscate and deny my personal experiences because they don't fit well with your agenda of CW operators being perfect little angels. Your premise that CW operation magically transforms a sow's ear into a purse is just wishful thinking.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4838. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 14:17:07 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF63463.7A86F583@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44207

CAM wrote:
> Your premise that CW operation
> magically transforms a sow's ear into a purse is just wishful thinking.

Make that, "a sow's ear into a silk purse".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4839. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkinlincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 14:27:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6365B.35F6D40B@att.net>
Source record: 44208

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > A 5 WPM code test does nothing more than test basic character
> > recognition. This is adequate for someone who is to be licensed
> > at the entry level, particularly if he/she will be starting to make
> > on-the-air QSO's in CW, and thus progressively increase operating
> > speed and accuracy. However, as a maximum code speed test,
> > the passing of which results in the granting of full HF privileges,
> > it is sadly lacking, since there is no incentive for the prospective
> > upgraded amateur to increase his code skills beyond this level.
>
> Are you saying that CW doesn't have enough merits to entice amateur
> radio operators to increase their skill level by using it?

Prospective hams won't even bother to learn it if not required for licensing. So why would they find it attractive and "with merit" to increase their nonexistant skill level? Where you been? If all the code bashers believed CW had "merit" why would they all avoid learning it like it was laced with arsenic?

> Maybe it
> would help if you extolled the positive merits of CW rather than
> spreading your vitriol on the negative shortcomings of the human race.

You just confirmed that he is right.

4840. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 14:33:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF63807.70F0F817@att.net>
Source record: 44209

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <20020528210135.17509.00000952@mb-ft.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >Why would hams care what happens on a handful of MURS channels?
>
> Ed:
>
> Speaking only for myself, I view MURS as a potentially useful service,
> and I, for one, would prefer that it not be crapped-out with a bunch of
> CB-like nonsense.
>
> BTW: Any MixW users out there?

I'm off the air till next week in an antenna-less environment, but see ya next week. 14070 or thereabouts?

Dick

4841. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 14:34:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF63852.F9D82D9D@att.net>
Source record: 44210

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <20020528210135.17509.00000952@mb-ft.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >Why would hams care what happens on a handful of MURS channels?
>
> Ed:
>
> Speaking only for myself, I view MURS as a potentially useful service,
> and I, for one, would prefer that it not be crapped-out with a bunch of
> CB-like nonsense.
>
> BTW: Any MixW users out there?

I'm off the air till next week in an antenna-less environment, but see ya next week. 14070 or thereabouts?

Dick

4842. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 14:36:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF638A7.AA3468F7@att.net>
Source record: 44211

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>Any MixW users out there?

I have used it quite a lot, but I'm where I can't get on the air right now. See ya next week. 20 meters, around 14070.

Dick W0EX

4843. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 15:44:49 UTC
From: shitblaster@volcanomail.com
Message-ID: <90a278e1.0205300744.120c4fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44212
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0205291611.57a1a424@posting.google.com>...
" This is why we haven't been seeing this kind of activity on
GMRS/FRS/interstitials. If this high-powered amplifier activity were
REALLY occuring on these services, wouldn't you think the UHF and VHF
amps would be being sold right there alongside all of those HF amps
at
the truckstops?
Stewart - N0MHS.......

It is happening "Big Time", but the "rule breakers" in this
case aren't likley to ever go to shop at truckstops or be "Truckers".
The Loads of people into running high power/unlicensed equipment at
FRS/GMRS/MURS are most likley to be people that have more of a
"purpose" for a semi-closed PL (ctcss)/DPL radio like MURS/GMRS/FRS.
These include loads of Amateurs that are using these radios to
communicate with the rest of their family & friends, the ones that had
no interest to jump thru hoops to take a Federal Amateur test, just to
play with a radio twice a year, also Scanner buffs, & the "cop/fireman
wannabees" that show up with a radio &/or camera on their belt at a
fire scene, but really don't belong to any law enforcement agency
(EVERY Cop or Fireman knows these guys WELL), also People that started
out in legitimate FRS, & then found out about higher power radios that
can be programmed to work with their existing handhelds.
Believe me, you may want to believe that EVERY "bad guy" is a
trucker, & every illegitimate use of any radio service will trace back
to a Truck driver or Truckstop, but that is a stupid conclusion.

4844. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkinlincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 17:29:06 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF66162.F0B58672@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44213

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Are you saying that CW doesn't have enough merits to entice amateur
> > radio operators to increase their skill level by using it?
>
> Prospective hams won't even bother to learn it if not required for
> licensing.

To you two birds of a feather: Maybe it
would help if you extolled the positive merits of CW rather than
spreading your vitriol on the negative shortcomings of the human race.

> You just confirmed that he is right.

You just confirmed that you two are equally paranoid. Hams who find
CW to have merit for them will learn the code. Hams who find CW without
merit for them will not learn the code. That's the way freedom of choice
in a free society is supposed to work. Why must you try to force every HF
ham to like your favorite mode? Would you object to someone trying to
force his/her favorite mode down your throat?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4845. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 17:37:19 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.m@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <64573B2757C0D1AD.C79CD7A1B975F369.80F1AE70BFC429BF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 44214
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Wed, 29 May 2002 19:07:23 -0400, "Dan Martin"
<nospamdwrtin@idirect.com> wrote:

>Here's a bit of a response to all the hams who seem to bash cb'ers with
>amps(no I've never owned a linear) Why is it so bad (besides illegal) to
>run 100-200 watts on 27mhz, but ok to run 1500 on 28 and 29 ?

Ham amps don't tend to be intentionally set up to splatter across half
their band.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

4846. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 18:12:45 UTC
From: Glenn <ggrrhh@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <oYtJ8.23$%J6.11608@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 44215
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article
<64573B2757C0D1AD.C79CD7A1B975F369.80F1AE70BFC429BF@lp.airnews.net>,
kd5nrh-r.r.a.m@kd5nrh.net says...
> On Wed, 29 May 2002 19:07:23 -0400, "Dan Martin"
> <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com> wrote:
>
> >Here's a bit of a response to all the hams who seem to bash cb'ers with
> >amps(no I've never owned a linear) Why is it so bad (besides illegal) to
> >run 100-200 watts on 27mhz, but ok to run 1500 on 28 and 29 ?
>
> Ham amps don't tend to be intentionally set up to splatter across half
> their band.
>

Unlike CB amps that are "intentionally set up to splatter across half
their band"? Do the CB mags run articles on how to intentionally set
up an amp to splatter across half the band? Is there a splatter per
MHz spec for 27 MHz stuff?

You have to love this hobby, you learn something new every day. Thanks
Joe for carrying on the ham radio tradition. The world most
certainly is our oyster!

73,

Glenn

4847. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 19:00:50 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CF676E2.3322376A@psu.edu>
Source record: 44216

It surely does, Cecil. But me carrying on a conversation with a person simulates AM, FM or SSB. Typing on usenet simulates psk31. All that is missing is the callsigns.

You are 100 percent correct, but it is a moot point to me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

CAM wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > I have to disagree Cecil! I certainly don't want to force anyone to use
> > Morse Code on HF, ...
>
> The Morse code requirement forces all HF hams to simulate the CW mode
> receive operation before allowing them to use any other mode.

4848. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 19:02:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3cf67a69_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 44218

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF62984.97FA7FBA@att.net...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > Wanna do hobby? Wanna do experimenting? Get a ham >license....it's
>
> > much easier now than when the CBRS and GMRS were first founded.
> >
>
> As someone once said, "Well, there you have it..."
> Straight from as prominent an authority as you will ever find on rrap. Ham
> radio testing today IS much easier today than before.
>

You're a slouch, Little Dick. *LIFE* is much easier today than before.
Don't see you willing to get back behind the butt of a horse to plow a
field; or willing to ride a pony several days--and at the risk of being
killed--to get food and supplies back to your family; or getting up in
freezing temps to wander out to the outhouse to take a dump in the middle of
the night.

Your living life quite simple these days. Makes you quite the lazy ass, I
suppose, right? My Great-Grampa would undoubtedly have that opinion...

Kim W5TIT

4849. Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 19:13:17 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205301113.725ff1db@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44217
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

As I've said, I'm not going to post for awhile regarding the high-power external amp issue... but I've noticed that it has now evolved to somehow include the subject of ANY radio that runs more than 2W TPO - which is really a different subject.

I have no doubt that there ARE people running 50W IC-2100 radios on MURS. Oddly enough, the few cases I've heard of involving the IC-2100 have all involved Hams.

As far as the individuals selling these radios on Ebay, can't Ebay be contacted regarding the illegal wording in these ads? Also, can't the FCC be notified, so we can BUST these jackasses?

Stewart - N0MHS

4850. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 20:04:58 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF685E3.BAE1A6DF@icok.net>
Source record: 44219
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

stewart,
Good. Shut up.
'Doc

4851. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 20:12:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205301212.1bc87670@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44220

CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:<3CF6328A.E7056FFB@hotmail.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > > Here it is again from my original posting:
> > > "If I am angry enough to utter obscenities,
> > > my hands are shaking too badly to even send Morse code or type on a
> > > keyboard but I could certainly squeeze the PTT button and scream into
> > > the microphone."
> >
> > That is not the post I responded to, nor the hypothesis that I said
> > had "no basis in fact".
>
> You said you were responding to my "original posting".

That's right. Your original posting of May 23, 2002.

> That *IS* my
> original posting on the subject dated 5-17-02.

That's not the one I was responding to when I wrote the "no basis in
fact" stuff. Hence, you are mistaken.

> If that is not the
> post you responded to then you were mistaken when you said you were
> responding to my original posting.

That's correct. My original and your original are not the same
original.

> The above original posting clearly
> indicates that my opinions are based on personal experience.

In other words, you generalize your own behavior onto the vast
majority of other people.

> Any posting
> on the subject subsequent to 5-17 relied on readers having read that
> original posting and accepting the fact that I was speaking from
> personal experience.

That's not a reasonable expectation at all. You post so much here that
nobody can be sure of the context after a few hours, let alone almost
a week.
>
> I resent your attempt at trying to obfuscate and deny my personal
> experiences because they don't fit well with your agenda of CW

> operators being perfect little angels.

I have not obfuscated or denied any of your alleged personal
experiences.

What I have done is to refute your claim that practically all CW-using
hams
react the way you do.

When was the last time a ham using Morse/CW on the ham bands got an
NAL or
enforcement letter? Compare that to the NALs and enforcement letters
issued
to hams using voice modes. QED.

Imagine an ARS where the on-air behavior of practically all hams is as
good as that of hams on CW/Morse. Cussing, jamming, arguing, and lots
of other obnoxious behaviors would be unknown. That would be something
to be proud of.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4852. Re: What SHOULD ham licenses test for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 20:43:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5awJ8.5167$r21.251884608@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44221

Ed, lets talk about double standards. What did you say to Dann Finn when he abdicated responsibility for his words?

Thanks, Brian

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020530064714.21944.00001247@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >"Don't shoot me, I'm only the messenger," and all that other Dann Finn
> >abdication of responsibility crappola.
>
> If you feel that your words are not responsible, I will let your statement
> "abdicating" that responsibility speak for itself.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

4853. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 20:48:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530164814.21229.00001714@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 44222

>Also, can't the
>FCC be notified, so we can BUST these jackasses?
>
>Stewart - N0MHS

You are a Idiot, FCC could care less.

4854. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 20:51:33 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0205302050430.16372-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 44223
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

On 29 May 2002, stewart wrote:
>I'm beginning a 1 week "Internet cease-fire" on this issue. After ..

The only "cease-fire" that is acceptable is your unconditional surrender that MURS topics on amateur radio newsgroups constitutes SPAM and that we get to flog you if you do it again.

4855. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 20:53:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%iwJ8.5174$hd1.252514552@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44224

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530061354.21944.00001234@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >I think an entry level license should be
> >introduced that has limits on power per the rf hazard chart in Part 97.
> >Then you may eliminate a portion of the requirement for knowledge to
perform
> >the safety analysis.
>
> The FCC has spoken loud and clear that it wants fewer, not more, license
> classes. Which of the existing classes would you propose be eliminated to
> create this new sub-set of Amateur Radio you propose?
>
> Why would you want to further fragment our community?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, we have no entry level license class.

The technician exam IS the old general exam, with years of new layers added on. Its the very same old exam which conveyed ALL amateur priveleges in the golden years of amateur radio.

Thus, I propose two license classes (again, so I hope you're paying attention).

Limited : a new entry level actually geared toward limited priveleges with limited knowledge.

Full: Everything else.

No Novice, no tech, no tech plus, no general, no advanced, and no extra. No superflous layers of merit badges.

4856. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 20:56:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <fmwJ8.5176$Jd1.252543302@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44228

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF5905E.5030208@bellsouth.net...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >
> >>No, but I do think todays entry level license is very difficult to
attain,
> >>and conveys dangerous power authorizations for and entry level license.
> >
> > I disagree with you that the Amateur power levels need to be reduced.
>
> I agree with Ed. It's not the power that kills you it's the voltage.
> 120V into a 15W power supply is as lethal as 120V into a 1500W power
> amp, and if it kills you, 120V mains is just as bad as the 3KV side of
> an HV XFMR.
>
> On the other hand, high voltage could serve as an active filter, you
> know, for NCT hams who have no business on HF. This could augment
> Brian's Actuarial filter and support the Darwinian survival of the
> fittest theory that I have championed elsewhere in this thread.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

Dan, that's a pretty mean thing to say. You otta be ashamed.

Anyway, I recall the 73 magazine article where the uninformed and
uninitiated were shown how to convert a 1,500 watt microwave oven into a 2.4
ghz transmitter.

Now that'll cook your hotdog or your eyeballs. I'm trying to recall what
kind of radiation that is.

73, Brian

4857. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:03:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <LswJ8.5180$ug1.252675115@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44229

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530062814.21944.00001238@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Ed, you've read it from me previously, but just because you're from the
ARRL
> >I'll go over it again.
>
> Actually, Brian, it may come as surprise to you, but I don't read
everything
> you post. Nor do I remember everything I read.
>
> What does my employment at ARRL HQ have to do with your decision to
restate
> your views of a two-class classless Amateur Radio?

Well Ed, you guys in Newington are slow to accept any new ideas. So I
repeated myself, again.

> >1. Full license: "Amateur" to present General standards.
> >2. Limited license: "Limited Amateur" to less than Technician
knowledge.
> >Limited in power to the rf safety chart or 200 watts, whichever is less,
No
> >repeater trustee privs, No 3rd party traffic. All bands, all modes.
>
> I assume that if the FCC thought this was a good idea, they would have
made the
> rules change. I think that many hams would disagree that all priveleges
should
> be granted to a "General" level of knowledge.

Why not? They grant 100% band, power, mode, trustee, and 3rd party traffic
priveleges to the VHF+ crowd with the old General exam. And its an "entry"
level exam. Hi.

If you want this idea to be well
> accepted, you may have to adopt the principle that there be no reduction
in the
> level of knowledge required to reach the highest pinnacle.

I'd rather it not be well accepted rather than have the government force yet
more superflous licensing "standards" on Americans. I won't author that.

In that case, all
> you have accomplished is to make it one pretty big step.

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

We'll let Jim and the ARRL rally around the "license of the week" charade.
I'll rally around what is necessary.

73, Brian

4858. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:05:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4uwJ8.5181$Me1.252603668@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44230

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530063025.21944.00001239@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Did you say of Dann Finn in his several diatribes concerning, "Don't
shoot
> >me I'm only the messenger, I only observe and Report...." that, "You did
> >not only observe. You interpreted and you reported. Most hams would
> >disagree that your interpretation applies to most of ham radio. I do."
>
> No, I said different things to Dan.
>
> >Or did you agree with Dann Finn?
>
> By Dan's reaction to my post in response to him, I don't think that he
would
> think I agreed with him.

Can you recall if you agreed or not?

4859. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:06:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CvwJ8.5182$Ph1.252759179@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44231

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530063359.21944.00001241@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Ed, are you saying that cronyism, double standards, cliques, intolerance
for
> >newcomers, and license class bigotry do NOT occur or exist in amateur
radio?
>
> Why would I say something that ridiculous? Of course they exist, and I
agree
> that the tiny amount I have seen is shameful, but I don't think that
> "intolerance for newcomers" is important enough that I included it on my
list.

It wasn't your list, it was Jim's list. Show us your list.

4860. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:11:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <WzwJ8.5184$nh1.252731429@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44232

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF59380.7060302@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >
> >
> >>Don't Shoot Me, I'm Only The Messenger. I Only Observe...blah blah blah
> >>
> >
> > You did not only observe. You interpreted and you reported. Most hams
would
> > disagree that your interpretation applies to most of ham radio. I do.
>
>
> Aw, come on Ed, you did not read what I was saying. I was not talking
> about ham radio people, I was talking about how humanity in general
> reacts in the face of limited amounts of information. Humanity in
> general implies normal, typical people in the populace. It makes no
> difference whether you think hams fall into the category of normal,
> typical people because they are such an insignificant subset of all of
> humanity. This means that the inane attempts of yourself and others to
> turn ham culture into accepting no-code are rather futile, even if it
> works.

If it works, why is it futile?

> Humans like stratification (except Marxists like Brian of course,
> heh heh heh).

Dann, why do you say such things? I pointed guns at Marxists for over 20
years.

> If you are a ham, members of the general public will assume that you
> know how to use a code keyer and beep all day long. If you can't, then
> members of the general public will think you are not a real ham but
> perhaps a CBer, whom they know cannot send/receive morse code like hams
> do. And I am an expert at knowing how members of the general public
> think about hams because I am a member of both.

Who here, other than Len, cannot make the same claim yet arive at a
different interpretation?

> Don't shoot! I am just the messenger!

You do not take responsibility for what you write? Bang, bang.

4861. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:12:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aBwJ8.5185$eh1.252722358@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44233

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF5A960.7090705@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dan Finn wrote:
> >
> >>If you are a ham, members of the general public will assume that you
> >>know how to use a code keyer and beep all day long.
> >>
> >
> > Most members of the general public don't know the difference between
> > ham radio and CB. People are curious about my screwdriver antenna with
> > its large top hat. I tell them it's a ham radio antenna. The majority
> > come back with, "Oh, so you have a CB radio in your truck."
>
>
> Yeah, I know. But they don't realize that people use ham radios in their
> vehicles. The movies always have shown trucks with CB radios, therefore,
> it is the conventional wisdom that trucks contain only CB radios.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

So you are now saying that you're original interpretation is wrong? Well,
at least that is taking some amount of responsibility.

4862. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:14:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <yCwJ8.5191$Kk1.252928133@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44234

"CAM" <w5dxp@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3CF59C6B.D08FD30F@hotmail.com...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > I may assume you mean off the air?
>
> Yes, a simulation of the CW mode receive operation.
>
> > CAM wrote:
> > > A Morse code requirement requires every HF ham to use the Morse code
"mode"
> > > first before using any other mode. Dick denied that fact.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

What about MCW? Is that off the air? Is it CW?

4863. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:20:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <SIwJ8.5194$Rm1.253065369@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44235

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF5969A.8000708@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CF444C5.30008@bellsouth.net...
> > >
> > >>
> > >>Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > >>>news:3CF41854.5000207@bellsouth.net...
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>>CAM wrote:
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>Dan Finn wrote:
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>>Why can you not default on the side of excellence in your
> > >>>>>>so-called earthly matters such as laws and regulations on radio.
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>Following that logic, the FCC should raise the Morse code
> > >>>>>requirement to 50 wpm. What do you think would happen to the
> > >>>>>Amateur Radio Service?
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>No, not exactly true. Raising code speed to 50 wpm is not a default.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>What would the default be, if not 50wpm? 70wpm?
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>>Hmm, CAM builds the straw man base for N0iMD, steps back and N0iMD adds
> > >>>>more pieces of straw to make the construct larger but more unstable.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>CAM knows how to push the ON switch to activate N0iMD. N0iMD has no idea
> > >>>>that CAM is playing him like a Stradivarius.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>Q: Who will shoot it the straw man down?

> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>>Instead. it would effectively be a decision to require Morse above
> >>>>everything else at the risk of losing a large part of the amateur
> >>>>community.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>An Amateur Service of One? What's wrong with that? Would it exclude
> >>>
> > KR4AJ?
> >
> >>
> >>A: N0iMD. Through no creativity of his own, Brian shoots down the straw
> >>man. Even KR4AJ is excluded from ham radio, according to the straw
> >>logic, therefore the KR4AJ position cannot be valid. N0iMD is actually
> >>exposed as a part time puppet of CAM.
> >>
> >> The straw logic can hardly stand up on its own weight and Brian
> >>easily topples the straw construct and claims victory.
> >>
> >>Rather stupid, don't you think? Vladimir Lenin used to do the same
> >>thing. He got it from Karl Marx, Comrade Burke.
> >>
> >>heh heh heh...and it's the oldest 6th grade trick in the book.
> >>
> >>73 de KR4AJ
> >>
> >
> > Answer the question, "An Amateur Service of One? What's wrong with
that?
> > Would it exclude KR4AJ?"
> >
> > It is just a simple question, such as the one's that Jim asks. Go for
it.
>
>
> OK, I will play you kid's game but for just a minute: Your straw man
> question would exclude KR4AJ but it would not necessarily be an amateur
> service of only one. But now that I cluttered the bandwidth with
> answering a stupid question, please make your point. Why 70 wpm? Why do
> you guys always go to the extreme side of every situation? For you it's
> either 70 wpm or no code at all.

No Dann, its not an extreme example. I could copy perfect code at 9wpm. I
could not breach the 10wpm barrier, as many others have also failed to
overcome. 13wpm is extreme to be. It might as well be 70wpm.

> I was merely suggesting a default more on the side of excellence, say,
> 13 wpm for EXTRA (keeping 5 wpm no-code for general). Someday I will
> give you some personal examples of how I witnessed substantial code

> usage outside of the US.

Perfect copy at 9wpm is excellence. Less than perfect copy would not be,
yet no FCC exam requires a perfect score. And then you have an opinion.

> I don't know where you guys come up with that extremist 50-70 wpm crap.
> That is as extreme on one side as no-code is on the other. Try the middle.

I've explained.

> So Comrade, what do you think of the more reasonable path to preserve
> excellence?
> 73 de KR4AJ

The very same code exam that Technicians, who are authorized to use CW, have
to take.

Brian

4864. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:23:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%KwJ8.5195$di1.252786014@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44236

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530064002.21944.00001243@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net
>
> >I was merely suggesting a default more on the side of excellence, say,
> >13 wpm for EXTRA (keeping 5 wpm no-code for general).
>
> >So Comrade, what do you think of the more reasonable path to preserve
> >excellence?
>
> Considering that the FCC has shut the door on having a 13 wpm code test,
what
> other ways can you suggest to improve excellence among slow code
operators?

Now that's a constructive approach to this "argument."

I
> don't think that your approach of calling the slow-code hams "disruptive"
on a
> ham-radio newsgroup is very productive.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Well, good thing I didn't point that out or Dick would've jumped in with a
"Gadfly" comment.

4865. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:26:47 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <rOwJ8.5197$GI1.252988730@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44238

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF59A06.8020701@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>
> > >
> > > So CW use is disruptive? Pretty soon it could be gone.
>
>
>
> Wishful thinking on your part. It will never be gone. It is too useful
> for the non-Yuppie world.
>
>
>

No, it's not wishful thinking. But you would have better luck getting new folks to try CW by using a positive approach, rather than coercing the government to give you a diminishing stream of applicants who were forced to do it.

And another thing, by demeaning those of us who learned "slow" code, you are the one wishing away the mode.

4866. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:28:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4QwJ8.5198$WI1.253005007@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44239

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530064046.21944.00001244@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net
>
> >Wishful thinking on your part. It will never be gone. It is too useful
> >for the non-Yuppie world.
>
> I agree, but if that is true, why all the hooplah about testing speed?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

By haranguing the slow coders, he encourages them to get faster. Where have
you ever seen that tactic work?

4867. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:37:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <9YwJ8.5200$Hw1.253654193@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44225

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530062033.21944.00001236@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net
>
> >> In my decades of Morse CW hamming, I don't believe I have ever had a
QSO
> >with a
> >> Cuban touching two wires together.
>
> >Are you implying that I am BS-ing? Says a lot to some of us about
> >you; otherwise it doesn't really matter.

I must have been BSing when I said that I could copy 9wpm perfectly, could not get past the 10wpm barrier, and could not score 70% on the exam. You must be BSing when he said that 70wpm would exclude him from the ARS. Lets go ahead and raise it to something unachievable by you.

4868. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:42:50 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF69CD4.C2D38161@icok.net>
Source record: 44226
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

stew,
What's this "we" stuff? Are you having your
delusions again, Stew baby? Did your perscription
run out? You really do need to see about getting
help again...
'Doc

4869. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkinlincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:44:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Q2xJ8.5204$Py1.253793656@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44227

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020530061648.29986.00000875@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3CF59FE1.3F24CC7A@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Some people say 5 wpm is equivalent to "no code". If you accept that,
> >then we used to have an "all code" "no-code" license. A license where
> >the only permitted mode used to be CW.
>
> Robert:
>
> A 5 WPM code test does nothing more than test basic character
> recognition.

That must be a bad thing.

> This is adequate for someone who is to be licensed
> at the entry level, particularly if he/she will be starting to make
> on-the-air QSO's in CW, and thus progressively increase operating
> speed and accuracy.

Axeually, the entry level is no code, and carries with it all priveleges to
operate CW.

> However, as a maximum code speed test,
> the passing of which results in the granting of full HF privileges,
> it is sadly lacking, since there is no incentive for the prospective
> upgraded amateur to increase his code skills beyond this level.

It conveys the same opportunity to reach 40wpm that it always has. What it
doesn't do is penalize qualified amateur who do not wish to purse that one
mode.

> And experience has shown that without this incentive, only a tiny
> handful of amateurs ever will pursue the Morse/CW mode to a
> useful proficiency level (13 - 20 WPM).

An even smaller percentage pursue FSTV. Maybe the FCC will give the ATVers
3,000 watts as an incentive.

> Therefore, while the old Novice class was an "all code No code" license
> as you call it, it was the *beginning* of the license structure, not the
end.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

They can make as much or as little of the priveleges as they desire, same as you.

4870. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkinlincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:46:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <l4xJ8.5206$yC1.254003454@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44237

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3CF6365B.35F6D40B@att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > A 5 WPM code test does nothing more than test basic character
> > > recognition. This is adequate for someone who is to be licensed
> > > at the entry level, particularly if he/she will be starting to make
> > > on-the-air QSO's in CW, and thus progressively increase operating
> > > speed and accuracy. However, as a maximum code speed test,
> > > the passing of which results in the granting of full HF privileges,
> > > it is sadly lacking, since there is no incentive for the prospective
> > > upgraded amateur to increase his code skills beyond this level.
> >
> > Are you saying that CW doesn't have enough merits to entice amateur
> > radio operators to increase their skill level by using it?
>
> Prospective hams won't even bother to learn it if not required for
> licensing. So why would they find it attractive and "with merit" to
> increase their nonexistant skill level? Where you been? If all the code
> bashers believed CW had "merit" why would they all avoid learning it like
> it was laced with arsenic?

I pursued it with all my heart. So what's the problem?

> > Maybe it
> > would help if you extolled the positive merits of CW rather than
> > spreading your vitriol on the negative shortcomings of the human race.
>
> You just confirmed that he is right.

You just confirmed that Cecil is right.

4871. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:50:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <M8xJ8.5208$MF1.254192978@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44240

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530164814.21229.00001714@mb-md.aol.com...
> >Also, can't the
> >FCC be notified, so we can BUST these jackasses?
> >
> >Stewart - N0MHS
>
> You are a Idiot, FCC could care less.

Yep, Bruice just sold his high power VHF radios to the bootleggers.

4872. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 21:56:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF6A00D.DA989B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 44241

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > You said you were responding to my "original posting".
>
> That's right. Your original posting of May 23, 2002.

That was NOT my original posting. No wonder you're confused.
My original posting was 5-17-02 and explained that I was
relying on personal experience and personal opinion. I really
wish that you would pay attention to the context. It is virtually
impossible to hold your hand and have to explain the context to
you in each and every posting.

> In other words, you generalize your own behavior onto the vast
> majority of other people.

Yes, I breath so I assume the majority of people likewise breath.
Do you breath? I assume I am of the same species as most hams.
By sheer probability, there must be a multitude of hams like me
out there. And I NEVER used the words, "vast majority". In fact,
you would be wrong even if I were the only ham in the world who
cannot send proper Morse code while my hands are shaking in anger.
Your notion that all hams can send perfect code when their hands
are shaking in anger has no basis in fact. See, I can do the same
thing to you. How does it feel?

> I have not obfuscated or denied any of your alleged personal
> experiences.

Of course you did, Jim. You said my personal experiences have
"no basis in fact". Why are your experiences so sacred when
compared to mine? Oh, that's right. Sometimes I forget that
you are omniscient. Next time I forget, please remind me that
your opinions are blessed by God Almighty Himself and mine are
therefore absolutely worthless unless they agree with yours.

> What I have done is to refute your claim that practically all CW-using
> hams react the way you do.

My original posting said I was relating
my personal opinions based on my personal experiences. Why do you
attempt to deny my personal experiences? And I still believe
that the majority of coded hams cannot send decent code if their
hands are shaking in anger. Can you send readable Morse code when
your hands are shaking in anger from someone hitting you over

the head with a long handled wooden spoon? Would you mind if I observed and taped such an experiment?

Morse code is a left-brain activity (for normal people). Cursing is a right-brain activity (for normal people). Those facts alone are enough to make Morse code unsuitable for venting obscenities. That you believe Morse code will turn a sow's ear into a silk purse is laughable but we realize that you believe that Ham Heaven is awaiting the hams who have been "Once Morsed, Always Morsed" and thus have experienced Ham Salvation and have been cleansed of all possibility of future sins. Heck, I even know what your theme song is:

"Whiter than snow, yes, whiter than snow,
Morse me and I shall be whiter than snow."

> When was the last time a ham using Morse/CW on the ham bands got an
> NAL or enforcement letter?

Key-down CW is the favorite choice for jammers on the voice bands. Virtually all of the hams uttering obscenities on HF are coded hams. Last time I was on PACTOR II, some CW jock tried to jam me by leaning on his electronic keyer. Didn't work. PACTOR II virtually ignored him.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4873. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 22:01:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF6A144.549F20CA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 44242

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Also, can't the
> >FCC be notified, so we can BUST these jackasses?
>
> You are a Idiot, FCC could care less.

Since the FCC could care less, it logically follows that
they have a certain level of caring which just possibly
might be high.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4874. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 22:42:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530184256.01709.00001929@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 44243

>Yep, Bruice just sold his high power VHF radios to the bootleggers.
>

Your darn right and I have more to sell, these guys pay top dollar

4875. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 23:45:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6B974.34268DE5@att.net>
Source record: 44244

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > > You said you were responding to my "original posting".
> >
> > That's right. Your original posting of May 23, 2002.
>
> That was NOT my original posting. No wonder you're confused.
> My original posting was 5-17-02 and explained that I was
> relying on personal experience and personal opinion. I really
> wish that you would pay attention to the context. It is virtually
> impossible to hold your hand and have to explain the context to
> you in each and every posting.
>
> > In other words, you generalize your own behavior onto the vast
> > majority of other people.
>
> Yes, I breath so I assume the majority of people likewise breath.
> Do you breath? I assume I am of the same species as most hams.
> By sheer probability, there must be a multitude of hams like me
> out there. And I NEVER used the words, "vast majority". In fact,
> you would be wrong even if I were the only ham in the world who
> cannot send proper Morse code while my hands are shaking in anger.
> Your notion that all hams can send perfect code when their hands
> are shaking in anger has no basis in fact. See, I can do the same
> thing to you. How does it feel?
>
> > I have not obfuscated or denied any of your alleged personal
> > experiences.
>
> Of course you did, Jim. You said my personal experiences have
> "no basis in fact". Why are your experiences so sacred when
> compared to mine? Oh, that's right. Sometimes I forget that
> you are omniscient. Next time I forget, please remind me that
> your opinions are blessed by God Almighty Himself and mine are
> therefore absolutely worthless unless they agree with yours.
>
> > What I have done is to refute your claim that practically all CW-using
> > hams react the way you do.
>
> My original posting said I was relating
> my personal opinions based on my personal experiences. Why do you

> attempt to deny my personal experiences? And I still believe
> that the majority of coded hams cannot send decent code if their
> hands are shaking in anger. Can you send readable Morse code when
> your hands are shaking in anger from someone hitting you over
> the head with a long handled wooden spoon? Would you mind if I
> observed and taped such an experiment?
>
> Morse code is a left-brain activity (for normal people). Cursing
> is a right-brain activity (for normal people). Those facts alone
> are enough to make Morse code unsuitable for venting obscenities.
> That you believe Morse code will turn a sow's ear into a silk
> purse is laughable but we realize that you believe that Ham
> Heaven is awaiting the hams who have been "Once Morsed, Always
> Morsed" and thus have experienced Ham Salvation and have been
> cleansed of all possibility of future sins. Heck, I even know
> what your theme song is:
>
> "Whiter than snow, yes, whiter than snow,
> Morse me and I shall be whiter than snow."
>
> > When was the last time a ham using Morse/CW on the ham bands got an
> > NAL or enforcement letter?
>
> Key-down CW is the favorite choice for jammers on the voice bands.
> Virtually all of the hams uttering obscenities on HF are coded hams.
> Last time I was on PACTOR II, some CW jock tried to jam me by leaning
> on his electronic keyer. Didn't work. PACTOR II virtually ignored him.

Cecil has been sucking on the sauce again. His rants at those times are
legendary

4876. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-30 23:57:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF6BC66.C288A598@IEEE.org>
Source record: 44245

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil has been sucking on the sauce again. His rants at those times are
> legendary

I'm at work, Dick, teaching GED classes. Are you ever right?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4877. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:09:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <VazJ8.5275$FE2.258000091@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44246

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530184256.01709.00001929@mb-dh.aol.com...
> >Yep, Bruice just sold his high power VHF radios to the bootleggers.
> >
>
> Your darn right and I have more to sell, these guys pay top dollar

You're dispicable.

4878. Re: Off Topic...help Find?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:11:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YczJ8.5276$EN2.258517408@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44247

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020527144442.24062.00000515@mb-ck.aol.com...
> In article <20020527010431.02458.00000644@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> > Searched them all and didn't find what I was looking for....Need a
> >Cessna 152/172/182/185 series model with a wing span 8-12"
> >
> > Oh well...the search continues....
>
> This is a reminder to all: The purpose of this newsgroup is to
> DISCUSS AMATEUR RADIO POLICY matters.

Is there a double standard at work here?

4879. Re: <<<I LOVE SEX>>>

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:13:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <sezJ8.5277$jU2.258929861@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44248

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF2D9E6.1050001@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Jimick wrote:
>
> > LMAO.....
>
> So did I, after I posted it. I think N0iMD missed this one.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

Dan, this isn't very nice. What kind of lowlife are you?

4880. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:32:47 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6C4AF.9000507@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44249

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net
>
> Considering that the FCC has shut the door on having a 13 wpm code test, what
> other ways can you suggest to improve excellence among slow code operators? I
> don't think that your approach of calling the slow-code hams "disruptive" on a
> ham-radio newsgroup is very productive.

It is productive but it isn't what everyone wants to hear. You see, I think you may be using this newsgroup to sell ham radio to people. "Ham Radio, talk it up". However, this is a policy newsgroup. Oftentimes when discussing policy, there are opposing sides. The opposing side will of necessity say things that you do not want to hear no matter how true. When you are selling something, you do not always want to reveal the opposing side if it appears negative to your product.

I am not interesting in selling ham radio. It can and will sell itself if it is of value. If you keep reducing the value, it will stop selling itself so then you need salesmen, like the organization you represent on this newsgroup. I was attracted to ham radio because it did offer challenge. Your organization had nothing to do with it. I had to study to learn code and hundreds of thousands like me were not discouraged by code.

As far as the disruption quandary, it is true. People who cannot do 13 wpm should confine their QSO's to the existing slow code 5 wpm segments of the code sub bands. I know I would, voluntarily. They should not be permitted into the faster code portions until they earn a CSCE for 13 wpm. A very small impact to no-coders indeed!

Hope you can keep an open enough mind to properly consider what I have said and not misinterpret like you often seem to do with my posts.

73 de KR4AJ

4881. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:39:08 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6C62C.1050900@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44250

W1RFI wrote:

>
> I will gladly accept that you had one QSO with a Cuban ham that worked where a
> straight key should have been available but he "sounded like" he was touching
> two wires together. How that tells you a lot about me, though, is still a bit
> unclear.
>

Because in your post you shoot from the hip without knowing if your
statement is really true. You doubted my statement by saying in all your
years you never experienced the same. You take chances with the truth,
therefore what you say becomes questionable.

4882. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:41:28 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6C6B8.9060604@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44151

Brian P Burke wrote:

> I must have been BSing when I said that I could copy 9wpm perfectly, could
> not get past the 10wpm barrier, and could not score 70% on the exam. You
> must be BSing when he said that 70wpm would exclude him from the ARS. Lets
> go ahead and raise it to something unachievable by you.

Do you actually go back and re-read some of this nonsense that you write
before making a decision to post?

4883. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:44:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwy1oz2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 44153
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 30 May 2002 03:11:08 GMT, 'Doc wrote:

>> I respect all the points you have made. However, because of the fact
>> that we already have had GMRS and FRS for a great number of years(and
>> GMRS does allow external antennas, and does share freqs with FRS, and

> "A great number of years"... Are you sure that
>FRS has been around for a great number of years?
>How about 1 year (I think).

FRS was created by rules effective July 8, 1996.

MURS was created by rules effective November 13, 2000.

GMRS (Formerly Citizens Class A) has been around for about 50 years.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4884. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:47:57 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6C83D.6040609@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44154

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> Ed, we have no entry level license class.
>
> The technician exam IS the old general exam, with years of new layers added
> on. Its the very same old exam which conveyed ALL amateur priveleges in the
> golden years of amateur radio.
>
> Thus, I propose two license classes (again, so I hope you're paying
> attention).
>
> Limited : a new entry level actually geared toward limited priveleges with
> limited knowledge.
>
> Full: Everything else.
>
> No Novice, no tech, no tech plus, no general, no advanced, and no extra. No
> superflous layers of merit badges.
>

Which license class is allowed to transmit 1.5KW of ionizing radiation
Brian, Class G? G = Glow (heh heh heh).

73 de KR4AJ

4885. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:49:17 UTC
From: Dan Martin <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com>
Message-ID: <ufdho89sn137a7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 44152
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

We, as collective users and hobbiests , I think I like Stews approach of being inclusionary rather than exclusionary.

Dan
VE3LIX
FRS user
11m user
uhf commercial user
800 anaolg user

"'Doc" <w5lz@icok.net> wrote in message news:3CF69CD4.C2D38161@icok.net...
>
>
> stew,
> What's this "we" stuff? Are you having your
> delusions again, Stew baby? Did your perscription
> run out? You really do need to see about getting
> help again...
> 'Doc

4886. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:56:39 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6CA47.2070502@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44155

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net
>
>
>>On the other hand, high voltage could serve as an active filter, you
>>know, for NCT hams who have no business on HF.
>>
>
> In what way does learning code help hams not be electrocuted, Dan?
>
> In what way does the high voltages that can be used to generate VHF and up
> signals act differently than the high voltages used to generate HF signals?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

I know what you mean good buddy. But I couldn't resist putting in a
little humor even if it did contradict my statement about 120V. Having
said that, let me not play down the additional safety exposures at that
high KV found in those HF power amps. They are very deadly for people
who go into the covers and do not know what they are doing. I do know of
hams who have been killed by power amps when they were careless or
weren't sure of what they were doing.

4887. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 00:59:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530205940.18807.00001291@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 44156

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>> I don't think that your approach of calling the slow-code hams "disruptive"
>> on a ham-radio newsgroup is very productive.

>When you are selling something, you do not always want to reveal the
>opposing side if it appears negative to your product.

Well, at least we agree that what you are sayig is negative to ham radio.

>If you keep reducing the value, it will stop selling
>itself so then you need salesmen

I would say, Dan, that your proclaiming that new hams learning code is
disruptive is more reducing than the things I have had to say.

>like the organization you represent on
>this newsgroup.

I work for ARRL. My boss doesn't care whether I post on rrap or not; in fact,
he would probably prefer that I don't, but there is that freedom of speech
thing. I say the things that I chose to say here. If I say them, I believe
them.

>Hope you can keep an open enough mind to properly consider what I have
>said and not misinterpret like you often seem to do with my posts.

I don't think that your wanting to ghettoize slower hams and calling their
attempts to learn and be proficient with code "disruptive." Any band is big
enough to fit all of us and if you don't like the code speed someone is using,
just spin your dial. Calling slow code disruptive just because you hear it
simply tells us how easily you are disrupted. Fortunately, most hams are a bit
more stable.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4888. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:02:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530210227.18807.00001292@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 44157

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Well Ed, you guys in Newington are slow to accept any new ideas. So I
>repeated myself, again.

What difference does it make if the ARRL HQ Lab staff accept your ideas, Brian?
That will not set ARRL policy and, even if you persuade the ARRL Directors,
that will not set the regulations.

And I did comment on your two-class system, so you should have been smart
enough to know that I read it.

Or were you just being snide and taking an opportunity to take a "slow to
accept new ideas" shot at me?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4889. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:04:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530210407.18807.00001293@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 44158

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Now that'll cook your hotdog or your eyeballs. I'm trying to recall what
>kind of radiation that is.

Heat. Ionizing radiation has photons that are strong enough to break bonds in molecules. Such ionization does not occur until about the middle of the ultraviolate range.

73
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4890. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:05:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530210539.18807.00001295@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 44159

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>It wasn't your list, it was Jim's list. Show us your list.

I don't usually try to discuss things by list, Brian. If you don't know my views on amateur radio by now from years of reading and responding to my posts, a list really isn't going to help you. Yours didn't help me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4891. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:08:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530210835.18807.00001296@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 44160

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Thus, I propose two license classes (again, so I hope you're paying
>attention).

I'll pay attention to you when you stop the that insultive tone with me, Brian.
You and Dan have one thing in common -- you thin that haranguing is the way to
people's hearts.

Consider yourself plonked for a while. We can resume reasonable conversatin
when you feel like being more civil.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4892. Ham radio stats vs percentage of the general public

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:14:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530211402.18807.00001298@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 44161

http://www.arrl.org/~ehare/temp/Hams_vs_Population.htm

4893. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:16:06 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6CEC7.7B1520AC@icok.net>
Source record: 44162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Dan,
Please, don't encourage him. He's been off
his medication too long and has started using
the royal 'we' again...
'Doc

4894. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:16:09 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6CED9.7010307@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44163

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> Dan, that's a pretty mean thing to say. You otta be ashamed.
>
> Anyway, I recall the 73 magazine article where the uninformed and
> uninitiated were shown how to convert a 1,500 watt microwave oven into a 2.4
> ghz transmitter.
>
> Now that'll cook your hotdog or your eyeballs. I'm trying to recall what
> kind of radiation that is.

That is considered to be non ionizing radiation. Maximum allowable exposure would be expressed either in terms of SAR, at .08W/kg if held with 6 in of your body (as in a homemade 2.4GHz handy talkie that used a MW oven magnetron in an uncontrolled environment (and would fail) or, for >6 in, in terms of whatever E (V/m) and H (I/m) field limits or power density (mW/cm**2) would apply at 2.4 GHz (and would also fail unless properly directed). NCT's are allowed there, of course, and in this case I would have to agree that a knowledge of RF Safety would take high priority in achieving excellence, over morse code. But if you want to get thru (as via EME), code gets thru when nothing else will! Note what SAR actually measures; it is a "specific absorption ratio", meaning the amount of actual heat energy in Watts that is absorbed per kilogram of human tissue. Note too that heat absorption, not radioactivity level, is the main concern according to this safety standard.

73 de KR4AJ

4895. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:18:26 UTC
From: "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
Message-ID: <ad6j5l0bnj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 44169
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

What is MURS and why should I give a shit?

--
- - -

Regards,
Joe S.

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205301113.725ff1db@posting.google.com...
> As I've said, I'm not going to post for awhile regarding the
> high-power external amp issue... but I've noticed that it has now
> evolved to somehow include the subject of ANY radio that runs more
> than 2W TPO - which is really a different subject.
>
> I have no doubt that there ARE people running 50W IC-2100 radios on
> MURS. Oddly enough, the few cases I've heard of involving the IC-2100
> have all involved Hams.
>
> As far as the individuals selling these radios on Ebay, can't Ebay be
> contacted regarding the illegal wording in these ads? Also, can't the
> FCC be notified, so we can BUST these jackasses?
>
> Stewart - N0MHS

4896. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:18:58 UTC
From: "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
Message-ID: <ad6j6k0bph@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 44170
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

What is MURS and why is it important in my life?

--
- - -

Regards,
Joe S.

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205291814.23d8e365@posting.google.com...
> I'm beginning a 1 week "Internet cease-fire" on this issue. After
> that, if no further claims of "High-Powered Amps on GMRS/MURS" are
> made - there will be no further need to defend against these rumors.
>
> You see, it is kind of a chicken-and-the-egg issue... Amps on
> GMRS/MURS do no good, as long as there aren't enough other people with
> amps out there... and there isn't a market for amps, until there are
> enough amps out there... and without a market for amps, there aren't
> enough amps out there...
>
> What few morons who have tried to use amps on GMRS up to this point
> have surely gotten such rotten results that they most certainly have
> long ago abandoned these "experiments".
>
> Now - as long as people don't go around spreading rumors that there
> are amps on MURS/GMRS(which could encourage the growth of this "rotten
> egg" syndrome), then we can all live happily ever after, in a
> low-noise environment.
>
> As for me, I'm going QRP on this issue...
>
> Stewart - N0MHS - horseshoe7 - E Pluribus Unum

4897. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:25:33 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6D10D.70703@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44164

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020530063025.21944.00001239@mb-df.aol.com...
>
>>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>>
>>
>>>Did you say of Dann Finn in his several diatribes concerning, "Don't
>>>
> shoot
>
>>>me I'm only the messenger, I only observe and Report...." that, "You did
>>>not only observe. You interpreted and you reported. Most hams would
>>>disagree that your interpretation applies to most of ham radio. I do."
>>>
>>No, I said different things to Dan.
>>
>>
>>>Or did you agree with Dann Finn?
>>>
>>By Dan's reaction to my post in response to him, I don't think that he
>>
> would
>
>>think I agreed with him.
>>
>
> Can you recall if you agreed or not?

I read it that Ed disagreed with me. "Most hams disagree with your interpretation....of ham radio. I do." This clearly states that "I do disagree too". If the word agree had been chosen, then 'I do' would have meant that Ed agreed. The word "do" in Ed's last sentence is clearly a modification of the predicate "disagree".

Ed, do you agree that you disagreed with me then but now agree with this post? I disagree with N0iMD's latest Burkeism.

73 de KR4AJ

4898. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:27:44 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6D190.1090607@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44165

Brian P Burke wrote:

>>
>>Yeah, I know. But they don't realize that people use ham radios in their
>>vehicles. The movies always have shown trucks with CB radios, therefore,
>>it is the conventional wisdom that trucks contain only CB radios.
>>
>>73 de KR4AJ
>>
>
> So you are now saying that you're original interpretation is wrong? Well,
> at least that is taking some amount of responsibility.

No, I'm not saying that. However, I could have stated it more accurately
and I would have had I known it would be challenged.

--
"My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
else in the universe.
Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
Cecil A. Moore

4899. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:36:00 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6D380.8040808@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44167

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> If it works, why is it futile?

Because, as the messenger has stated, you are being measured according
to you license class by the general public. It it futile to convince
hams that no code is real ham radio when the general public will not
agree with. If you don't mind be measured as lower in achievement by the
general public, i.e. equivalent to CB radio, then it doesn't matter.
However, since you have shot the messenger several times, I must assume
that it does matter, but, convincing hams only, that no code is just as
good as code, is futile with respect to convincing the general public
since hams are only a negligible subset of the general public.

>
>>Humans like stratification (except Marxists like Brian of course,
>>heh heh heh).
>>
>
> Dann, why do you say such things? I pointed guns at Marxists for over 20
> years.

Sorry. Would Democrat be a better term?

>
>
>>If you are a ham, members of the general public will assume that you
>>know how to use a code keyer and beep all day long. If you can't, then
>>members of the general public will think you are not a real ham but
>>perhaps a CBer, whom they know cannot send/receive morse code like hams
>>do. And I am an expert at knowing how members of the general public
>>think about hams because I am a member of both.
>>
>
> Who here, other than Len, cannot make the same claim yet arive at a
> different interpretation?
>
>
>>Don't shoot! I am just the messenger!
>>
>
> You do not take responsibility for what you write? Bang, bang.

Sorry again. The ionizing radiation in my power amp got me first!

73 de KR4AJ

4900. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:36:52 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6D3B4.40506@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44168

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <20020526080559.18807.00000507@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
>
>>From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net
>>
>>
>>>I wouldn't know about that but to pass today's written exams does not
>>>even require an education of the same quality as one might obtain from
>>>answering an advertisement on a matchbook, much less Milton.
>>>
>>Your exaggeration is ridiculous. I didn't require an education to pass my
>>General in 1963 to obtain all Amateur priveleges; I was a 14 year old kid who
>>wasn't doing so well in the 8th grade.
>>
>
> Dan demands Effort and Committment. Did you demonstrate that?

Not in the 8th grade, apparently.

4901. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:43:05 UTC
From: Dan Martin <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com>
Message-ID: <ufdkqanbrfd31@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 44166
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

All of it, thats why I stated it in the opening sentence! What part of "
besides" do YOU not understand.

Have a great day. Dog

Dan

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com> wrote in message
news:ad433u$a7b$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Dan Martin" <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com> wrote in message
> news:ufanagglumi7e9@corp.supernews.com...
> > Here's a bit of a response to all the hams who seem to bash cb'ers with
> > amps(no I've never owned a linear) Why is it so bad (besides illegal)
to
> > run 100-200 watts on 27mhz, but ok to run 1500 on 28 and 29 ?
>
> Because it is the law. What part of "illegal" do you not comprehend?
>
>

4902. Re: Ham radio stats vs percentage of the general public

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:52:06 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <844e40153306d81037ec476186b59be1.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 44171

Thanks, Ed. I just wish I knew what the percentage was when I started
in 1962 as WN2CJV.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530211402.18807.00001298@mb-dd.aol.com

> http://www.arrl.org/~ehare/temp/Hams_vs_Population.htm

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4903. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 01:55:36 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205301755.7422f985@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44172
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20020530184256.01709.00001929@mb-dh.aol.com>...
> >Yep, Bruice just sold his high power VHF radios to the bootleggers.
> >
>
> Your darn right and I have more to sell, these guys pay top dollar

Evidently... there is a ham selling modified 2100H radios on Ebay, and
he mentions MURS:

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1355829496

The funny thing is, there are actually jackasses out there willing to
bid $255 for a $149 radio...

http://www.gigaparts.com/radioindex.php

Oh, BTW, did I already mention that this seller is a ham.

Stewart - N0MHS

4904. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:03:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwy4ya3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 44173

On 30 May 2002 10:08:08 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>Many QRPers use modest antennas on HF. My 250 milliwatt
>worked-all-states was done using either a ladder-line-fed 40 M dipole
>and antenna tuner or a 20-meter ground plane, both up about 40 feet.
>That 1-milliwatt QSO to Europe was made on a ladder-line fed 80 meter
>dipole strung between the buildings.

What ever happened to your stacked rotary log-periodics?

Or did you trade then for stacked rhombics?

Modest indeed...! <ggg>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4905. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:03:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@na.shmavz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gwy55i4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 44174

On Thu, 30 May 2002 14:02:25 -0500, W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>Your living life quite simple these days. Makes you quite the lazy ass, I
>suppose, right? My Great-Grampa would undoubtedly have that opinion...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Welcome home, Kim.....
---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4906. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:06:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530220642.11232.00000237@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 44175

In article <3CF6A00D.DA989B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com> wrote:
>> > You said you were responding to my "original posting".
>>
>> That's right. Your original posting of May 23, 2002.
>
>That was NOT my original posting.

You plagiarized it? Whose original posting was it?

>No wonder you're confused.

Not me. It's perfectly clear.

>My original posting was 5-17-02 and explained that I was
>relying on personal experience and personal opinion.

But that's not the post that I responded to. In your post of 5-23-02, you made it clear that you were talking about a general case, not just yourself.

>I really wish that you would pay attention to the context.

Then provide some context. Write clearer posts. It's the transmitting station's job to send the message clearly and intelligibly.

>It is virtually impossible to hold your hand and have to explain the context
to
>you in each and every posting.

All you have to do is write clearly, Cecil. Perhaps that is asking too much.

>> In other words, you generalize your own behavior onto the vast
>> majority of other people.
>
>Yes, I breath so I assume the majority of people likewise breath.
>Do you breath?

Nope.

I breathe.

> I assume I am of the same species as most hams.

You have told us many times that you are actually a 300,000 foot tall space alien in disguise. Perhaps 300,000 foot tall space aliens' hands shake when they get angry, but that is not universally true of human beings.

>By sheer probability, there must be a multitude of hams like me
>out there.

Nope. Not at all.

> And I NEVER used the words, "vast majority". In fact,
>you would be wrong even if I were the only ham in the world who
>cannot send proper Morse code while my hands are shaking in anger.

That's not true.

>Your notion that all hams can send perfect code when their hands
>are shaking in anger has no basis in fact.

Where have I ever said that anyone can send code when their hands are shaking in anger? You are very confused, cecil. You sound angry, yet you are able to type very well. Thus, your claim is disproved.

>See, I can do the same thing to you.

No, you cannot "do the same thing to me", because what I do is shine the light of Irrefutable Truth and Elegant Logic upon your errors, mistakes and false assumptions.

> How does it feel?

How does what feel?
>
>> I have not obfuscated or denied any of your alleged personal
>> experiences.
>
>Of course you did, Jim.

No, I did not. You are confused and mistaken, Cecil.

Why don't you take a stress pill and lie down?

>You said my personal experiences have
>"no basis in fact".

Nope. I said your hypothesis had no basis in fact.

> Why are your experiences so sacred when
>compared to mine? Oh, that's right. Sometimes I forget that
>you are omniscient. Next time I forget, please remind me that
>your opinions are blessed by God Almighty Himself and mine are
>therefore absolutely worthless unless they agree with yours.

Sounds pretty angry to me, but you keep right on typing. Fascinating.
>
>> What I have done is to refute your claim that practically all CW-using
>> hams react the way you do.
>
>My original posting said I was relating
>my personal opinions based on my personal experiences.

Your "original" was not the same as my "original".

>Why do you
>attempt to deny my personal experiences?

I don't. I simply refute your faulty conclusions based on them.

>And I still believe
>that the majority of coded hams cannot send decent code if their
>hands are shaking in anger.

I agree with that.

>Can you send readable Morse code when
>your hands are shaking in anger from someone hitting you over
>the head with a long handled wooden spoon?

I don't know. My hands don't shake in anger, and I don't condone domestic violence.

Who has hit you over the head with a long handled wooden spoon, Cecil? When did this last happen? Perhaps the impact caused a concussion, distorting your perception.

>Would you mind if I observed and taped such an experiment?

Sounds like you are threatening physical violence upon me. Is that how you deal with disagreement, Cecil?
>
>Morse code is a left-brain activity (for normal people).

How do you know that? I can copy Morse heard in either ear. Are you an auditory processing specialist?

>Cursing is a right-brain activity (for normal people).

Define "normal". Are you saying left handed people are not normal? How about the ambidextrous?

If the right brain controls the left side of the body, how come righthanded people can write cusswords?

>Those facts alone
>are enough to make Morse code unsuitable for venting obscenities.

Nope. Your hypothesis is not correct. Morse is just like language, though it's not a language in and of itself.

>That you believe Morse code will turn a sow's ear into a silk
>purse is laughable but we realize that you believe that Ham
>Heaven is awaiting the hams who have been "Once Morsed, Always
>Morsed" and thus have experienced Ham Salvation and have been
>cleansed of all possibility of future sins.

I think you've been hit on the head a few too many times, Cecil.

> Heck, I even know what your theme song is:
>
>"Whiter than snow, yes, whiter than snow,
>Morse me and I shall be whiter than snow."

Nope. That's not it.
>
>> When was the last time a ham using Morse/CW on the ham bands got an
>> NAL or enforcement letter?
>
>Key-down CW is the favorite choice for jammers on the voice bands.

That's not Morse, it's just a carrier. And how would you know it's the
favorite?

Besides, it doesn't answer the question.

When was the last time a ham using Morse/CW on the ham bands got an
NAL or enforcement letter?

I think you are avoiding that question because the answer proves my point and
disproves yours.

>Virtually all of the hams uttering obscenities on HF are coded hams.

So? It's not about the test. The Morse test is all but gone now, and will soon
be just a memory. Get real, Cecil - the test issue is a dead duck.

It's the USE of Morse that is the key. Hams USING Morse on the air are, as a
general rule, extremely well behaved. They set a very high standard - that's
why some folks hate the mode so much.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4907. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:06:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530220643.11232.00000238@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 44176

In article <5f4fe4c2.0205291730.75fe8924@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>The biggest problem is the sort of "arms race" mentality that has
>developed. It leads to a kind of "nuclear winter" in which the whole
>band is so over-saturated with RF energy, that nobody except the ones
>with the largest amplifiers can cut thru the noise to communicate.
>Things are ESPECIALLY BAD on the HF bands(like 11m CB), because of
>skip - as the noise gets propagated ALL OVER THE WORLD!

OK so far.
>
>I would assume the same problem holds true on the HF ham bands to a
>certain extent.

Nope. It doesn't. When's the last time you operated on an HF ham band, Stew?

>However, hams are taught to use only as much power as
>necessary to maintain a contact(I don't know how many follow the rule,
>and how far they will go in interpreting it, but I'm going to assume
>most follow it to a certain degree - although it isn't the "prime
>directive" of each and every ham).

Most of the hams I hear and work on the HF ham bands are running about 100
watts output to antennas that are fairly simple, like G5RVs and verticals.
There are lots of QRP ops, most of whom don't have big antennas. (I worked
Hawaii and Alaska, on 20 meters from EPA last November with 5 watts output to
an inverted V at 35 feet). This was in a contest where I had to compete with
other stations running the legal limit and big beams. Major mojo.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4908. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:12:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <B_AJ8.5401$d24.263441649@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44177

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF6C6B8.9060604@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>
> > I must have been BSing when I said that I could copy 9wpm perfectly,
could
> > not get past the 10wpm barrier, and could not score 70% on the exam.
You
> > must be BSing when he said that 70wpm would exclude him from the ARS.
Lets
> > go ahead and raise it to something unachievable by you.
>
> Do you actually go back and re-read some of this nonsense that you write
> before making a decision to post?

Yes, I do read my own stuff. You want to raise the requirements to
something that I cannot achieve. I want to raise it to something that you
cannot achieve. You know, ham radio isn't for everyone.

4909. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:33:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <OhBJ8.5419$Yc4.264121390@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44178

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530210835.18807.00001296@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Thus, I propose two license classes (again, so I hope you're paying
> >attention).
>
> I'll pay attention to you when you stop the that insultive tone with me,
Brian.
> You and Dan have one thing in common -- you thin that haranguing is the
way to
> people's hearts.
>
> Consider yourself plonked for a while. We can resume reasonable
conversatin
> when you feel like being more civil.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

What is not civil about my posts? Have I invited you to "go soak your head?" Have I suggested that you "not let the door hit you...?" No, I merely repeat myself again and again, and I have made note of it. I don't sit on the fence. My opinions and views don't change dramatically from year to year. You can count on me to be consistent in what I think and say.

My opinions, for example:

CW is just another mode. Test it as other modes are tested.
Morse exams have outlived their usefullness by at least 15 years, probably 30 or 40 years, but I don't have the history on it.
The Novice CW subbands are grossly underutilized (dead).
We need only one full license and only one entry level license. Anything else are merit badges for the insecure.
The Technician was never designed nor meant to be an entry level license.
The Technician conveys huge priveleges that might not be suitable for beginners.
Thus a new entry level license is in order.
Dick is nuts.
Larry is nuts.
Steve is nuts.
Val is a Troll, bases his ham knowledge on and repeats what his ham neighbor says.
Bruce is an ignorant Troll.
Dann Finn is in collusion with Larry, very mean spirited, and solicits

pornography to be sent to my e-mail address.

So, if you ask me next month what I think of the Technician license, I will probably say the very same thing. Ditto Dick, Larry and Bruce.

4910. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:34:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <AiBJ8.5420$6f4.264241357@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44179

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF6CA47.2070502@bellsouth.net...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net
> >
> >
> >>On the other hand, high voltage could serve as an active filter, you
> >>know, for NCT hams who have no business on HF.
> >>
> >
> > In what way does learning code help hams not be electrocuted, Dan?
> >
> > In what way does the high voltages that can be used to generate VHF and
up
> > signals act differently than the high voltages used to generate HF
signals?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
>
> I know what you mean good buddy. But I couldn't resist putting in a
> little humor even if it did contradict my statement about 120V. Having
> said that, let me not play down the additional safety exposures at that
> high KV found in those HF power amps. They are very deadly for people
> who go into the covers and do not know what they are doing. I do know of
> hams who have been killed by power amps when they were careless or
> weren't sure of what they were doing.
>
>
Name them.

4911. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:39:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gnBJ8.5424$fi4.264446142@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44180

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF6CED9.7010307@bellsouth.net...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > Dan, that's a pretty mean thing to say. You otta be ashamed.

Its still a mean thing to say.

> > Anyway, I recall the 73 magazine article where the uninformed and
> > uninitiated were shown how to convert a 1,500 watt microwave oven into a
2.4
> > ghz transmitter.
> >
> > Now that'll cook your hotdog or your eyeballs. I'm trying to recall
what
> > kind of radiation that is.
>
>
> That is considered to be non ionizing radiation.

Thank you for the correction.

> Maximum allowable
> exposure would be expressed either in terms of SAR, at .08W/kg if held
> with 6 in of your body (as in a homemade 2.4GHz handy talkie that used a
> MW oven magnetron in an uncontrolled environment (and would fail) or,
> for >6 in, in terms of whatever E (V/m) and H (I/m) field limits or
> power density (mW/cm**2) would apply at 2.4 GHz (and would also fail
> unless properly directed). NCT's are allowed there, of course, and in
> this case I would have to agree that a knowledge of RF Safety would take
> high priority in achieving excellence, over morse code.

So do I. I don't think that level of RF belongs in an entry level license.

But if you want
> to get thru (as via EME), code gets thru when nothing else will!

Note that they use very slow code.

Note
> what SAR actually measures; it is a "specific absorption ratio", meaning
> the amount of actual heat energy in Watts that is absorbed per kilogram
> of human tissue. Note too that heat absorption, not radioactivity level,
> is the main concern according to this safety standard.
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

Thus, I propose that the new entry level license be capped at power levels where no RF safety study is required, or 200 watts, whichever is less.

Brian/N0iMD

4912. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:45:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <atBJ8.5430$Dh4.264405375@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44181

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530210227.18807.00001292@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Well Ed, you guys in Newington are slow to accept any new ideas. So I
> >repeated myself, again.
>
> What difference does it make if the ARRL HQ Lab staff accept your ideas,
Brian?
> That will not set ARRL policy and, even if you persuade the ARRL
Directors,
> that will not set the regulations.
>
> And I did comment on your two-class system, so you should have been smart
> enough to know that I read it.
>
> Or were you just being snide and taking an opportunity to take a "slow to
> accept new ideas" shot at me?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Cheap shot. I apologize. Although the people you work for are slow to
accept new ideas.

4913. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:46:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <wuBJ8.5431$a74.263743920@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44182

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530210539.18807.00001295@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >It wasn't your list, it was Jim's list. Show us your list.
>
> I don't usually try to discuss things by list, Brian. If you don't know
my
> views on amateur radio by now from years of reading and responding to my
posts,
> a list really isn't going to help you. Yours didn't help me.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Fine. You've been snippy lately. What's up?

4914. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:54:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mBBJ8.5437$Rt4.265150902@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44183

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3CF6D380.8040808@bellsouth.net...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > If it works, why is it futile?
>
> Because, as the messenger has stated,

Which messenger? The one who reports facts, or the one who has an
editorial?

> you are being measured according
> to you license class by the general public.

The general public doesn't know the license classes. Hell, there are so
many of them that even hams have trouble figuring them all out. Not all the
"if I'm an Tech and I pass the code..." questions.

It it futile to convince
> hams that no code is real ham radio when the general public will not
> agree with.

Ham radio is real ham radio. Just convince yourself of that. Forget about
the caste system.

>If you don't mind be measured as lower in achievement by the
> general public, i.e. equivalent to CB radio, then it doesn't matter.

It doesn't matter anyway. They are ignorant on the matter. You are not,
but feign ignorance to bolster your views.

> However, since you have shot the messenger several times, I must assume
> that it does matter, but, convincing hams only, that no code is just as
> good as code, is futile with respect to convincing the general public
> since hams are only a negligible subset of the general public.

Circle talk.

> >>Humans like stratification (except Marxists like Brian of course,
> >>heh heh heh).
> >>
> >
> > Dann, why do you say such things? I pointed guns at Marxists for over
20
> > years.
>

> Sorry. Would Democrat be a better term?

I'm registered Republican. Say, "Republican." That would be better.

> >>If you are a ham, members of the general public will assume that you
> >>know how to use a code keyer and beep all day long. If you can't, then
> >>members of the general public will think you are not a real ham but
> >>perhaps a CBer, whom they know cannot send/receive morse code like hams
> >>do. And I am an expert at knowing how members of the general public
> >>think about hams because I am a member of both.
> >>
> >
> > Who here, other than Len, cannot make the same claim yet arive at a
> > different interpretation?
> >
> >
> >>Don't shoot! I am just the messenger!
> >>
> >
> > You do not take responsibility for what you write? Bang, bang.
>
> Sorry again. The ionizing radiation in my power amp got me first!
>
> 73 de KR4AJ

It probably did. I wish you a speedy recovery.

4915. Re: Ham radio stats vs percentage of the general public

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:58:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <sFBJ8.5440$gp4.264877498@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44184

Does this include undocumented aliens?

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020530211402.18807.00001298@mb-dd.aol.com...
> http://www.arrl.org/~ehare/temp/Hams_vs_Population.htm

4916. Re: Ham radio stats vs percentage of the general public

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 02:59:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <wGBJ8.5442$Yz4.265524278@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44185

I interpolate between 0.13 and 0.14 %

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:844e40153306d81037ec476186b59be1.80792@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Thanks, Ed. I just wish I knew what the percentage was when I started
> in 1962 as WN2CJV.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020530211402.18807.00001298@mb-dd.aol.com
>
> > http://www.arrl.org/~ehare/temp/Hams_vs_Population.htm
>
>
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4917. Re: Debunking the MURS/GMRS/FRS Amplifier Myth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:02:48 UTC
From: twithedslappa@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <9bd4d6e5.0205301902.290b2522@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44186
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

please go to twistedhed FAQ at

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

to see what twistedhed is all about.

twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed) wrote in message
news:<22333-3CF62856-69@storefull-2313.public.lawson.webtv.net>...
> From: DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com (Arf!?Arf!)
> "Dan Martin" <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com> wrote in message
> news:ufanagglumi7e9@corp.supernews.com...
> >Here's a bit of a response to all the hams who seem to bash cb'ers with
> amps(no I've never owned a linear) Why is it so bad (besides illegal)
> to run 100-200 watts on 27mhz, but ok to run 1500 on 28 and 29 ? <<
>
> >>Because it is the law. What part of "illegal" do you not comprehend?<<
>
> If it was merely that simple then those that self-profess the virtue of
> legal radio behavior would never have to resort to the usual BS lies
> such as cb interference to emergency ops., cancer induced from RF
> spewing linears, false attributions to folks that have a difference of
> opinion, etc., etc.,

4918. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:13:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6EA74.63C38E72@earthlink.net>
Source record: 44187

CAM wrote:

> Yes, I breath so I assume the majority of people likewise breath.
> Do you breath?

Me Dave. Me inhale and exhale. Me breathe.

Dave K8MN

4919. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:19:03 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF6EBA7.7B4C0639@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44188

Dan Finn wrote:
> I am not interesting in selling ham radio. It can and will sell itself
> if it is of value.

If you are willing to allow ham radio to sell itself, why are you not
willing to allow OOK/Morse/CW to sell itself?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4920. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:22:34 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF6EC7A.C34D47B1@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44189

Dan Finn wrote:
> Having
> said that, let me not play down the additional safety exposures at that
> high KV found in those HF power amps. They are very deadly for people
> who go into the covers and do not know what they are doing. I do know of
> hams who have been killed by power amps when they were careless or
> weren't sure of what they were doing.

The same can be said about automobiles, guns, towers, etc.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4921. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:30:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <b7CJ8.5471$OV4.266861894@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 44190

"CAM" <w5dxp@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3CF6EBA7.7B4C0639@hotmail.com...
> Dan Finn wrote:
> > I am not interesting in selling ham radio. It can and will sell itself
> > if it is of value.
>
> If you are willing to allow ham radio to sell itself, why are you not
> willing to allow OOK/Morse/CW to sell itself?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Hey Mister, don't ask him the tuff questions. His ideas fall apart under close scrutiny.

4922. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:31:17 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6EE85.2070600@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44191

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
>>Maximum allowable
>>exposure would be expressed either in terms of SAR, at .08W/kg if held
>>with 6 in of your body (as in a homemade 2.4GHz handy talkie that used a
>>MW oven magnetron in an uncontrolled environment (and would fail) or,
>>for >6 in, in terms of whatever E (V/m) and H (I/m) field limits or
>>power density (mW/cm**2) would apply at 2.4 GHz (and would also fail
>>unless properly directed). NCT's are allowed there, of course, and in
>>this case I would have to agree that a knowledge of RF Safety would take
>>high priority in achieving excellence, over morse code.
>>
>
> So do I. I don't think that level of RF belongs in an entry level license.

Yes, we agree.

> Note
>
>>what SAR actually measures; it is a "specific absorption ratio", meaning
>>the amount of actual heat energy in Watts that is absorbed per kilogram
>>of human tissue. Note too that heat absorption, not radioactivity level,
>>is the main concern according to this safety standard.
>>
>>73 de KR4AJ
>>
>
> Thus, I propose that the new entry level license be capped at power levels
> where no RF safety study is required, or 200 watts, whichever is less.

I agree. At 2.4GHz, for uncontrolled environments, they will probably
have to stay around .6 to 1.5 W ERP to stay below the SAR limit for < 6
inches. I guess Ed would know what the actual value would be. This is
something that really should be covered by the FCC for new licensees.

KR4AJ

4923. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:32:13 UTC
From: Prophet Cow-Flop <profcowflopesq@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <19CJ8.39$h23.22@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 44192
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"'Doc" <w5lz@icok.net> wrote in message news:3CF62AED.AD5CA2C3@icok.net...
>
>
> Prophet Cow-Flop,
>
> And just for general information, there is
> still a bounty on the 'Slobber-head's knee caps.
> 'Doc

Ya know, I can still remember the very first time
I heard the "J--es is a drunken queer"
and the "We'll be glad when your dead
you rascal you.." songs on 53 come thru the
speaker and ole Slobber's reaction to it...

Nearly passed a bite of a ham-n-cheese
sandwich and sodawater thru my nose at
200 PSI... I was laughing *so hard*
my sides ached fer a 1/2 hour later.

Those were the good-ole-dayz - grin
Thank glub I got that classic on
reel-to-reel for posterity someplace :)

4924. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:43:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020530234328.26604.00001563@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 44194

>Subject: Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 05/30/02 21:55 Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0205301755.7422f985@posting.google.com

>
>Oh, BTW, did I already mention that this seller is a ham.

So? You continually tell us how "irrelevant" Amateur Radio is by virtue of the FCC's opening of five CHANNELS of VHF spectrum to unlicensed users, THEN sign the posts with YOUR Amateur callsign.

Do you know how silly that looks?

Steve

4925. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:43:58 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6F17E.9000007@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44193

Brian P Burke wrote:

>>
> Name them.

Actually I could get their call signs from the people on I know on 75 meters but I will not because this is really not a situation that is hard to believe happened. I consider the benefit of going through the personal effort, for you, to obtain such details, not to be worth the cost of the effort, as it is, overall, not very useful. Therefore I will absorb whatever "consequences" you may dish out for declining your challenge. If you do not believe such electrocutions ever happened, so be it.

de KR4AJ

4926. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:47:04 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6F238.4010107@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44195

Brian P Burke wrote:

> Dann Finn is in collusion with Larry, very mean spirited, and solicits
> pornography to be sent to my e-mail address.

I never gave the seniorita from Tijuana your email address, only your
call sign.

73 de KR4AJ

4927. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:50:01 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6F2E9.5020702@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44196

CAM wrote:

> Dan Finn wrote:
>
>>I am not interesting in selling ham radio. It can and will sell itself
>>if it is of value.
>>
>
> If you are willing to allow ham radio to sell itself, why are you not
> willing to allow OOK/Morse/CW to sell itself?

Ham radio sells itself even if 13 wpm 00K is a requirement.

73 de KR4AJ

4928. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 03:51:50 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF6F356.1070500@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44197

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> Hey Mister, don't ask him the tuff questions. His ideas fall apart under
> close scrutiny.
Heh heh....you fall apart under close scritiny.

4929. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 04:05:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531000532.28039.00001960@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 44198

>You're dispicable.
>
>

Why because Im getting the Money and your not?

4930. Re: Ham radio stats vs percentage of the general public

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 04:06:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531000654.10184.00000435@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 44199

In article <20020530211402.18807.00001298@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>http://www.arrl.org/~ehare/temp/Hams_vs_Population.htm

Ed,

Interesting stuff! Note how there were some periods of fast growth and other periods of no growth and even decline. Yet overall, the trend is growth.

What's the source of these numbers? Do they include club, repeater, and RACES licenses or just individual hams?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4931. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 04:10:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531001010.28039.00001961@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 44102

>Evidently... there is a ham selling modified 2100H radios on Ebay, and
>he mentions MURS

I never mentioned MURS, and I never asked if they were going to XMIT, Wink
Wink.

4932. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 04:15:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531001530.28039.00001962@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 44200

>So, if you ask me next month what I think of the Technician license, I will
>probably say the very same thing. Ditto Dick, Larry and Bruce.
>

Brian I keep forgetting to ask, is Bill and Hillary your parents, or are you
just Gores love child?

4933. Re: Good idea, except ... Re: Novice Sub-band Refarming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 04:18:11 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF6F983.D60C7C43@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44101

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> But that's not the post that I responded to. In your post of 5-23-02, you made
> it clear that you were talking about a general case, not just yourself.

That is absolutely NOT true. I have told you it was not true yet you insist
on obfuscation. Here's that posting:

"Since netnews is not real time, a posting can be composed and edited to
achieve any desired level of emotionalism. If a poster's hands are shaking
with emotion to the extent that he cannot type, he can wait a few minutes
until his hands quit shaking. One cannot do that with real time CW."

The conditional statement presupposes that the CW operator's hand is shaking
uncontrollably. You admit later in this posting that it is a true statement
thus contradicting your own argument.

> Where have I ever said that anyone can send code when their hands are shaking
> in anger?

In your response to my above posting which assumes that the operator's hand
is shaking in anger. But I'm willing to throw in the towel and agree with
you that you are omniscient and were personally sent by God to straighten
out ham radio. You are a super being and I am but a lowly human. I don't
know how I have lived my life without your guidance. Next time I see you,
I will kiss your feet and beg for forgiveness.

> No, you cannot "do the same thing to me", because what I do is shine the light
> of Irrefutable Truth and Elegant Logic upon your errors, mistakes and false
> assumptions.

Yeah, yeah, I know, you are omnipotent and sit on the right hand of God
when you are not posting here. Your $hit doesn't even stink.

> Your "original" was not the same as my "original".

Then it is no wonder that you are confused. You completely lost the context.
In the actual original posting, I made it clear that I was speaking from
personal experience.

> >And I still believe
> >that the majority of coded hams cannot send decent code if their
> >hands are shaking in anger.
>
> I agree with that.

I am glad to see you changed your mind. Above is the posting with which you disagreed. It assumes that the operator's hand is shaking in anger. But of course, an omniscient being such as yourself can never be mistaken or make a mistake.

> >Can you send readable Morse code when
> >your hands are shaking in anger from someone hitting you over
> >the head with a long handled wooden spoon?
>
> I don't know. My hands don't shake in anger, ...

Then I wasn't talking about you, was I? See the conditional statement above which you apparently completely missed prior to your mad dog attack.

> >Morse code is a left-brain activity (for normal people).
>
> How do you know that? I can copy Morse heard in either ear. Are you an auditory
> processing specialist?

Morse code uses a language. The language processing center is in the left brain in most people.

> >Cursing is a right-brain activity (for normal people).
>
> Define "normal". Are you saying left handed people are not normal? How about
> the ambidextrous?

Reverse-brained people are not normal. It has nothing to do with handedness. Some people's brains are mirror images of the average brain. A small minority of individuals have their speech processing centers in the right brain.

> Nope. Your hypothesis is not correct. Morse is just like language, though it's
> not a language in and of itself.

What I have said is based on the assumption that Morse is just like language and is processed in the speech centers of the brain. Language is processed in the left brain in most people. Obscenities originate in the right brain in most people. Some people who have had their speech centers destroyed by an accident can shout only obscenities.

> It's the USE of Morse that is the key. Hams USING Morse on the air are, as a
> general rule, extremely well behaved. They set a very high standard - that's
> why some folks hate the mode so much.

Some people realize that your assignment of supernatural powers to CW is just a bunch of excrement. CW does not magically change a bad guy into a good guy. It is simply unrewarding to misbehave while using CW except for jamming purposes of course. Digital signals are quite often jammed by your lily white CW operators.

You win, Jim. Who am I to argue with an omniscient being?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4934. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 04:25:27 UTC
From: CAM <w5dxp@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3CF6FB37.B4C93638@hotmail.com>
Source record: 44103

Dan Finn wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > If you are willing to allow ham radio to sell itself, why are you not
> > willing to allow OOK/Morse/CW to sell itself?
>
> Ham radio sells itself even if 13 wpm 00K is a requirement.

But, but, but, 13 wpm is NOT a requirement. Ham radio sells itself even
better at 5 wpm. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

4935. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 04:57:24 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3CF702B4.7080108@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 44104

Brian P Burke wrote:

>
> Cheap shot. I apologize.

Very good. Admitting that you have a problem in this area is the first
step towards recovery.

Although the people you work for are slow to
> accept new ideas.

Cheap shot. One step back. Try harder, you can recover. Your friends are
here to help you.

--
"Do the things I did the day before yesterday not stand for anything?"
Edward Hare W1RFI

4936. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 07:47:58 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205302347.4d431671@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44105
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org> wrote in message news:<ad6j5l0bnj@enews4.newsguy.com>...
> What is MURS and why should I give a shit?

MURS (Multi-Use Radio Service) is a no-license VHF personal radio service which operates on 151.820, 151.880, 151.940, 154.570, and 154.600 MHz with a maximum Transmitter Power Output limit of 2 Watts. The FCC MURS rules permit voice and data communication; as well as external gain antennas. Unlike some other services, there are no restrictions on business activities with MURS, and the 2W power limit works as a major benefit for allowing more users per channel. With the latest changes to the FCC MURS rules, most any low-power VHF Part 90 business radio that was certified before May 2002, can be used on at least some of the MURS frequencies(radios certified after 5/2002 will only need to be certified under Part 95). Additionally, the new rules no longer specify an ERP (Effective Radiated Power) restriction of 2 watts - so it is now possible to build quite efficient stations, using external gain antennas.

4937. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 09:38:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531053853.26789.00001155@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 44106

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>No, I
>merely repeat myself again and again, and I have made note of it.

Okay. If I tell you that your idea is stupid will you at least not tell
everyone you are repeating it because I "obviously" haven't read it?

You are welcome to say that you are repeating it because people who work in
Newington, CT are slow to accept new ideas.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4938. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 09:43:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531054305.26789.00001156@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 44107

From: Dan Finn djfinn2@bellsouth.net

>But if you want
>to get thru (as via EME), code gets thru when nothing else will!

Actually, some of the work being done on EME at levels tens of dB lower than OOK CW can achieve is being done digitally.

>Note
>what SAR actually measures; it is a "specific absorption ratio", meaning
>the amount of actual heat energy in Watts that is absorbed per kilogram
>of human tissue.

The term is Specific Absorbtion Rate. It is indeed expressed in watts/kilogram.

>Note too that heat absorption, not radioactivity level,
>is the main concern according to this safety standard.

Actually, the standard doesn't stipulate that heat is the mechanism; it just notes that at an SAR of 4 watts/kilogram (translate: a human in a close just big enough to hold him with a 500-watt heater) unwanted, albeit often temporary, biological effects have been seen in numerous animal and human (volunteer) studies.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4939. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 09:44:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531054427.26789.00001157@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 44108

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>So do I. I don't think that level of RF belongs in an entry level license.

>Thus, I propose that the new entry level license be capped at power levels
>where no RF safety study is required, or 200 watts, whichever is less.

One can exceed the SAR limits with a 5-watt HT, or a watt or so in a
waveguide...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4940. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 09:45:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531054545.26789.00001158@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 44109

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Fine. You've been snippy lately. What's up?

Must be another thing that happens to people who have jobs in Newington, CT.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4941. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 09:46:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531054650.26789.00001159@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 44110

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Cheap shot. I apologize. Although the people you work for are slow to
>accept new ideas.

So now it is everyone that you don't know at ARRL HQ that is slow.

I don't accept your idea, and I decided that pretty quickly.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4942. Re: Ham radio stats vs percentage of the general public

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 09:52:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531055202.26789.00001160@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 44111

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Interesting stuff! Note how there were some periods of fast growth and other
>periods of no growth and even decline. Yet overall, the trend is growth.

And I bet the Doom and Gloomers were around noting how amateur radio was doomed
and gloomed during the periods of a modest decline in growth. :-)

>What's the source of these numbers? Do they include club, repeater, and RACES
>licenses or just individual hams?

John Bee put them together when he worked for ARRL's Ad Department. I don't
know if he included club calls, etc. He is no longer with us, but I would
imagine he can be reached at his arrl.net address. His arrl.org address won't
work any more -- that is for employees, SMs, officers and contract authors.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4943. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 09:57:31 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <fOHJ8.15627$UT.1023202@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 44112

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020531054427.26789.00001157@mb-mn.aol.com...
snip.....
> One can exceed the SAR limits with a 5-watt HT, or a watt or so in a
> waveguide...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

I am reminded of the gendarmes who mounted their 10 GHz radars on the rear window. Does make you wonder what the guys with the CB mentality -- need POWER, Jake -- are going to do with Bluetooth, etc for the biz of the local cataract surgeons.

4944. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 10:06:18 UTC
From: "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
Message-ID: <ad7i3d01vpn@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 44113
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0205302347.4d431671@posting.google.com...
> "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org> wrote in message
news:<ad6j5l0bnj@enews4.newsguy.com>...
> > What is MURS and why should I give a shit?
>
> MURS (Multi-Use Radio Service) is a no-license VHF personal radio
> service which operates on 151.820, 151.880, 151.940, 154.570, and
> 154.600 MHz with a maximum Transmitter Power Output limit of 2 Watts.
> The FCC MURS rules permit voice and data communication; as well as
> external gain antennas. Unlike some other services, there are no
> restrictions on business activities with MURS, and the 2W power limit
> works as a major benefit for allowing more users per channel. With the
> latest changes to the FCC MURS rules, most any low-power VHF Part 90
> business radio that was certified before May 2002, can be used on at
> least some of the MURS frequencies(radios certified after 5/2002 will
> only need to be certified under Part 95). Additionally, the new rules
> no longer specify an ERP (Effective Radiated Power) restriction of 2
> watts - so it is now possible to build quite efficient stations, using
> external gain antennas.

Thanks. Now I understand why I should care. Watch out 2 meters -- here
come the goddam freebanders and Children's Banders..

--
- - -

Regards,
Joe S.

4945. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 10:30:57 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <ad7ke301od6@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 44117
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Paul Peterson" <pp23@cox.net> wrote in message
news:6SgI8.90396$Md6.3020010@news1.east.cox.net...
> "stewart" wrote
> >
> > What I'm saying is that Amateur Radio has slowly become less relevant
> > in the last 10 years, but the trend is accelerating.
>
> Amateur Radio has changed. That is a fact. The reason it
> changed, is that you can't build a radio cheaper than you can buy it.
>

Can you name anything associated with technology in any form that has not
advanced or progressed over the years?

> All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.

Pure baloney.... there are a ton of them, I can name quite a few right in my
"own backyard" as it is. (And some of these are not the old timers either)

>
> What that leaves, is the Hams who like to interface things to a
> pre-built radio. There is a lot of experimentation and fun in doing
> those projects.

Who's fault is that? Could it be the manufacturer's? I cannot buy enough
parts to make a "decent" rig even 1/10 of the quality and stability of
today's rigs locally here where I live. Christ, the manufacturers are also
responsible for the virtual death of some of the VHF and above bands.

>
> Radio is not the fascinating thing it was in the 60's and before.
> Radio is boring since the invention of the CD. Not many people
> stay up all night to here a far away AM station like we did as kids.
>

The hell it is..... there is even MORE things to learn and do in the hobby
that it ever was in the sixties.

> Radio is an appliance to Americans, not as much a hobby anymore.
>

Just a matter of individual perception.

> The numbers will never again reach what there was at the peak
> of Ham radio. The commercialization of RF to one or two
> companies in America will continue, and Ham radio will go to

> the same place that model railroaders, and slot car racing went.
>

Hmmm.... the numbers have (for the most part) gone up every year. Granted some years were definitely not as large in growth as others, but almost every year for the past 20-30 years has appreciated some level of growth, not decline. If there is a death in ham radio, it is going to come from lack of promotion on a national level down to the local/club level and of course the personal level. If we also spent as much time whining about what is supposedly so shitty about ham radio, and spent that time educating prospective hams and new hams we would have a greater growth that we currently do have.

> Hobbies die, and people die. MURS is still-born.
>

That is true if you want them to, or a person can be proactive and work for positive change or at least to keep things at a even keel.

Ryan

4946. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 10:41:36 UTC
From: jthorpe1234@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <d45cd084.0205310241.75a5707b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44114
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0205291814.23d8e365@posting.google.com>...
> Now - as long as people don't go around spreading rumors that there
> are amps on MURS/GMRS(which could encourage the growth of this "rotten
> egg" syndrome), then we can all live happily ever after, in a
> low-noise environment.
>
> As for me, I'm going QRP on this issue...
>
> Stewart - N0MHS - horseshoe7 - E Pluribus Unum

So much for the cease fire. You call for a cease fire then proceed to
continue the argument. So what is it? Moron.

4947. Re: Call for a cease fire on the GMRS/MURS Amp issue.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 10:46:07 UTC
From: Scott Sixnine <scott_unit_69@yaSPAMhoo.com>
Message-ID: <3CF75471.524F0D08@yaSPAMhoo.com>
Source record: 44115
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Jack Thorpe wrote:

> So much for the cease fire. You call for a cease fire then proceed to
> continue the argument. So what is it? Moron.

Species: Trollius Maximus.

4948. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 10:46:58 UTC
From: jthorpe1234@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <d45cd084.0205310246.420ced80@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44116
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<ad4108$ls2$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> I see no such saturation of FRS. Another family and mine often
> travel on weekends and we use FRS between cars. No saturation
> encountered at all...much less even another occasional user
> on the same channel. This is in the northeast, probably the most
> densly populater area of the country.
>

Hmmm, you haven't been to a state fair, race or other special event,
have you? Different story during those times.

4949. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 11:28:35 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3CF75E63.6F63@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 44118
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

stewart wrote:
>
> As I've said, I'm not going to post for awhile regarding the
> high-power external amp issue... but I've noticed that it has now
> evolved to somehow include the subject of ANY radio that runs more
> than 2W TPO - which is really a different subject.
>
> I have no doubt that there ARE people running 50W IC-2100 radios on
> MURS. Oddly enough, the few cases I've heard of involving the IC-2100
> have all involved Hams.

Pardon me for saying this, but you sound like you're backpeddling a bit.
In all reality, what's the difference between someone running a 2W HT
into a 100 watt output amplifier, or someone running a modified Motorola
Micor at 100 watts?

It's not about "amplifiers" as much as it's about ignoring the power
limits of the law.

Dave

4950. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 12:06:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531080635.21693.00000356@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 44119

In article <B_AJ8.5401$d24.263441649@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>news:3CF6C6B8.9060604@bellsouth.net...
>>
>>
>> Brian P Burke wrote:
>>
>>
>> > I must have been BSing when I said that I could copy 9wpm perfectly,
>could
>> > not get past the 10wpm barrier, and could not score 70% on the exam.
>You
>> > must be BSing when he said that 70wpm would exclude him from the ARS.
>Lets
>> > go ahead and raise it to something unachievable by you.
>>
>> Do you actually go back and re-read some of this nonsense that you write
>> before making a decision to post?
>
>Yes, I do read my own stuff. You want to raise the requirements to
>something that I cannot achieve. I want to raise it to something that you
>cannot achieve.

Medical waivers. Since 1990.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4951. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 12:46:59 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CF770C3.B9F6619D@psu.edu>
Source record: 44120

Not really heat, Ed. It's rf that happens to get water molecules all
worked up by virtue of resonance. But of course the end result is heat.

- Mike KB3EIA -

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Now that'll cook your hotdog or your eyeballs. I'm trying to recall what
> >kind of radiation that is.
>
> Heat. Ionizing radiation has photons that are strong enough to break bonds in
> molecules. Such ionization does not occur until about the middle of the
> ultraviolate range.

4952. Unamerican? (was Debunking the ...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 12:48:09 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3CF77109.6D7D43F6@crosslink.net>
Source record: 44121
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Somebody said:
> > Because it is the law. ....
> >

Good thing Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Washington, et al had a somewhat different attitude. :o)

Yes, this like the rest of the thread is a mindless troll sent to captivate the clueless ...

73 K3DWW

4953. Re: Ham radio stats vs percentage of the general public

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 14:24:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0205310624.57113d01@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44122

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020531055202.26789.00001160@mb-mn.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >Interesting stuff! Note how there were some periods of fast growth and other
> >periods of no growth and even decline. Yet overall, the trend is growth.
>
> And I bet the Doom and Gloomers were around noting how amateur radio
> was doomed
> and gloomed during the periods of a modest decline in growth. :-)

For as long as I've been a ham, there have been doom'n'gloom types.
My research indicates they go all the way back to the days of "Rotten
Radio".

Just in my time, the following have been cited as leading to the
"death of amateur radio":

- SSB and transceivers
- incentive licensing
- FM and repeaters
- solid state electronics
- dominance of Japanese equipment
- Bash books
- VEC system
- question pools
- computers, the internet, videogames
- demographics, economics, politics
- "legacy" modes

And of course, the universal scapegoats:

- code tests
- nocodetest licenses
- medical waivers

Yet the growth in both size and depth of the ARS continues.

> >What's the source of these numbers? Do they include club, repeater, and RACES
> >licenses or just individual hams?
>
> John Bee put them together when he worked for ARRL's Ad Department. I don't
> know if he included club calls, etc. He is no longer with us, but I would
> imagine he can be reached at his arrl.net address. His arrl.org address won't
> work any more -- that is for employees, SMs, officers and contract authors.

I'll ask him. The reason I ask is that the numbers sometimes differ somewhat from those on the AH0A site and other sources that list only current operator licenses. Most of the entries look like they came from callbooks.

Some of the "bumps in the curve" may be due to rules and recordkeeping changes
such as counting station vs. operator licenses, and
expired-but-in-the-grace-period licenses.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4954. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 14:56:47 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <PaMJ8.15956$UT.1045982@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 44123

> > you are being measured according
> > to you license class by the general public.

> The general public doesn't know the license classes.
> Hell, there are so many of them that even hams have
> trouble figuring them all out. Not all the
> "if I'm an Tech and I pass the code..." questions.

Maybe we should require some kind of identifying
mark on the individual to indicate license class
if he/she operates a radio anywhere in public view?

Perhaps a tattoo on the forehead - T for Technician,
G for General and E for Extra. As the individual
upgrades, the previous class letter could be X'ed
out.

Expiring minds want to know license class!

Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4955. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 15:46:34 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3CF77DCC.111B0061@mailcity.net>
Source record: 44124
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Before activating his brain Paul Peterson wrote:

>
> All those Hams who could build a radio, are dead and gone.

Try again, I have in the past built a lot of ham gear, some from
kit, some completely homebrew and can still do it. Just because
you are incapable of building something doesn't mean everyone else
is also.

4956. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 15:50:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF79BD4.32AFA608@IEEE.org>
Source record: 44125

K7JEB wrote:
> Perhaps a tattoo on the forehead - T for Technician,
> G for General and E for Extra. As the individual
> upgrades, the previous class letter could be X'ed
> out.

Make it a scarlet letter 'A' for Advanced, also good
for cocktail party conversations.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4957. Re: Ham radio stats vs percentage of the general public

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 16:08:50 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <ad876ieti1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 44128

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Interesting stuff! Note how there were some periods of fast growth and other
>>periods of no growth and even decline. Yet overall, the trend is growth.
>
>And I bet the Doom and Gloomers were around noting how amateur radio was doomed
>and gloomed during the periods of a modest decline in growth. :-)

I computed the average annual growth rate for each 5 year period in the
data to average out the bumps (along with the US population growth rate
for comparison) and found only one period in the 75 years with a sustained
growth rate lower than it is now. That period was 1968-1975. This
period has a suspicious correspondence with the introduction of incentive
licensing, though I guess there are other things it could correlate with
as well.

I think you are correct, however, that the current situation isn't
unique, and it did turn around pretty well the last time this happened.

Dennis Ferguson

Annual Growth
Years Hams US
25-30 2.8% 1.2%
30-35 18.8% 0.7%
35-40 4.4% 0.8%
40-45 2.2% 1.2%
45-50 5.5% 1.7%
50-55 12.1% 1.7%
55-60 9.6% 1.7%
60-65 3.2% 1.5%
65-70 1.0% 1.1%
70-75 -0.8% 1.0%
75-80 8.0% 1.0%
80-85 2.2% 0.9%
85-90 1.3% 1.0%
90-95 7.1% 1.0%
95-00 0.8% 0.9%

4958. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 16:27:01 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CF7A456.D34AAD68@psu.edu>
Source record: 44126

Hey Dan, how come you stole Cecil's tagline? At least you give him
credit for it!!!!! Or could it be..... nahhh, couldn't be.... could it?

- Mike -

Dan Finn wrote:
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >>
> >>Yeah, I know. But they don't realize that people use ham radios in their
> >>vehicles. The movies always have shown trucks with CB radios, therefore,
> >>it is the conventional wisdom that trucks contain only CB radios.
> >>
> >>73 de KR4AJ
> >>
> > So you are now saying that you're original interpretation is wrong? Well,
> > at least that is taking some amount of responsibility.
>
> No, I'm not saying that. However, I could have stated it more accurately
> and I would have had I known it would be challenged.
>
> --
> "My code speed is completely irrelevant to me and virtually everyone
> else in the universe.
> Does anyone care that I can ride a bicycle?"
> Cecil A. Moore

4959. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 16:28:56 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CF7A4C8.BC10286A@psu.edu>
Source record: 44127

Hey Jim, How about a 6 for technician, 66 for General, and the big 666 for Extra? 8^)

- Mike -

K7JEB wrote:

> Maybe we should require some kind of identifying
> mark on the individual to indicate license class
> if he/she operates a radio anywhere in public view?
>
> Perhaps a tattoo on the forehead - T for Technician,
> G for General and E for Extra. As the individual
> upgrades, the previous class letter could be X'ed
> out.

4960. Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 16:37:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CF7A6BB.4FB07B02@IEEE.org>
Source record: 44129

mike coslo wrote:
> Hey Dan, how come you stole Cecil's tagline?

I've been wondering why it is good enough to rate a
tagline. Seems to be a blatantly obvious truism to me.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4961. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 17:23:24 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0205310923.1bd282b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44130
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Isn't there a "commercial" Yaesu model HT that is/was marketed for the
155's and 460's which looks like an FT50RD? I thought some of the
vendors were closing out battery packs for those a year or so ago,
seliing them as spares for the FT50's etc.

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<NFVI8.48797$jm.5088882@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>...
> "Dan Martin" <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com> wrote in message
> news:uf5svdkud9r837@corp.supernews.com...
> > Well I have seen hams use out of band freqs, 151.055, 451.1875....
> not
> > just heard, but seen. Don't for a minute think that hams don't go out
> of
> > bandm they do it all the time, for various "reasons".
>
> And some of them may in fact be legitimate depending on the Ham. Some do
> have license privileges to transmit on other than the Ham Bands. In one
> case I remember seeing a Royal Oak city cop, in full uniform with side
> arm, sitting at a table in a small restaurant on Woodward Avenue with a
> very plainly obvious Yeasu HT. His heavy duty Motorola radio was nowhere
> to be seen. Was he a Ham? I don't know because I didn't ask, and I
> didn't see him making a transmissions with it while I was there to check
> for a callsign.
>
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a
> bomb
> technician
> if you see me
> running
> try to keep up "

4962. Re: Unamerican? (was Debunking the ...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 18:10:03 UTC
From: randy_NO_SPAM_PLEASE_@frs-usa.com
Message-ID: <b03b87e2.0205311010.7920b8aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44131
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3CF77109.6D7D43F6@crosslink.net>...
> Somebody said:
> > > Because it is the law. ....
> > >
>
> Good thing Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Washington, et al had a
> somewhat different attitude. :o)
>
> Yes, this like the rest of the thread is a mindless troll sent to
> captivate the clueless ...
>
> 73 K3DWW

A very narrow look at this! The men you quote all were for laws.
They were just for laws that was balanced by representation!

Talk about spin!

Randy
http://www.frs-usa.com

4963. Re: MURS gets boost

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 19:34:14 UTC
From: Dan Martin <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com>
Message-ID: <uffkg0dkdv98ff@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 44132
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Well, Carl, that could very well be the case. I know there's an icom 02at
/o24t clone or two out there.

"Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:77f1797e.0205310923.1bd282b0@posting.google.com...
> Isn't there a "commercial" Yaesu model HT that is/was marketed for the
> 155's and 460's which looks like an FT50RD? I thought some of the
> vendors were closing out battery packs for those a year or so ago,
> seliing them as spares for the FT50's etc.
>
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<NFVI8.48797$jm.5088882@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>...
> > "Dan Martin" <nospamdwrtin@idirect.com> wrote in message
> > news:uf5svdkud9r837@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Well I have seen hams use out of band freqs, 151.055, 451.1875....
> > not
> > > just heard, but seen. Don't for a minute think that hams don't go out
> > of
> > > bandm they do it all the time, for various "reasons".
> >
> > And some of them may in fact be legitimate depending on the Ham. Some do
> > have license privileges to transmit on other than the Ham Bands. In one
> > case I remember seeing a Royal Oak city cop, in full uniform with side
> > arm, sitting at a table in a small restaurant on Woodward Avenue with a
> > very plainly obvious Yeasu HT. His heavy duty Motorola radio was nowhere
> > to be seen. Was he a Ham? I don't know because I didn't ask, and I
> > didn't see him making a transmissions with it while I was there to check
> > for a callsign.
> >
> >
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
> > KC8LDO
> >
> > Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
> >
> > "I am a
> > bomb
> > technician
> > if you see me
> > running
> > try to keep up "

4964. Re: Unamerican? (was Debunking the ...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 19:47:33 UTC
From: Vito <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3CF7D355.CF0950C4@crosslink.net>
Source record: 44133
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Randy A. Hefner" wrote:
>
> Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote
> > Somebody said:
> > > > Because it is the law. ....
> > > >
> >
> > Good thing Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Washington, et al had a
> > somewhat different attitude. :o)
> >
> > Yes, this like the rest of the thread is a mindless troll sent to
> > captivate the clueless ...
> >
> > 73 K3DWW
>
> A very narrow look at this! The men you quote all were for laws.
> They were just for laws that was balanced by representation!
>
> Talk about spin!

One fish in the basket ... any more?

4965. OT: Need a ham club in Chattanooga TN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 20:30:25 UTC
From: N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ad8mlf$vet5q$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 44134

I have a friend of a friend who currently lives near Chattanooga TN. This fall she is going to Africa to be a missionary. She is in the process of studying to get her tech, then general license so she will be able to communicate back home.

I'm looking for a club in the Chattanooga area who might be able to give her a little guidance, answer questions, maybe give her a place to test. If anyone is in that area and can give me a contact name/number I can direct her to, I sure would be appreciative.

Thanks,

Robert / N4IXT

4966. Re: Need a ham club in Chattanooga TN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 20:48:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%kRJ8.16420$UT.1075139@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 44135

"N4IXT" <n4ixt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:ad8mlf$vet5q$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de...
> I have a friend of a friend who currently lives near Chattanooga TN.
This
> fall she is going to Africa to be a missionary. She is in the process of
> studying to get her tech, then general license so she will be able to
> communicate back home.
>
> I'm looking for a club in the Chattanooga area who might be able to give
her
> a little guidance, answer questions, maybe give her a place to test. If
> anyone is in that area and can give me a contact name/number I can
direct
> her to, I sure would be appreciative.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Robert / N4IXT

The ARRL site http://www.arrl.org lists the Chatanooga Radio Club.
Contact is Charles E Curle AD4F. Web site is www.qsl.net/w4am. Club is
in Ooltewah, apparently a suburb.
Wish the lady luck for me.

4967. Re: Need a ham club in Chattanooga TN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 20:58:14 UTC
From: K0CKB <k0ckb@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <GtRJ8.1446$bJ4.941@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 44136

"N4IXT" <n4ixt@arrl.net> wrote

> I'm looking for a club in the Chattanooga area who might be able to give
her
> a little guidance, answer questions, maybe give her a place to test.

Check the list below. Hopefully one or more is close by to your friend.

God's blessing to her in her work.

73/88, CKB

Name: MUSIC CITY ARA
Specialties: Repeater
Call sign: W4SQE
Services: Other
Address: 1065 BARNES RD
ANTIOCH, TN 37013-4421
Contact: ARIEL M ELAM, K4AAL
Phone: (615)834-4792 (N)
E-mail: k4aal@jackatak.theporch.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: RADIO AMATEUR TRANSMITTING SOC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4PQP
Services: Help for newcomers, RFI help, Other
Address: POB 1685
BRENTWOOD, TN 37024-1685
Contact: ELAM ARIEL M, K4AAL
Phone: (615)834-4792 (D) (615)834-4792 (N)
Web: http://www.nashvillerats.org
E-mail: k4aal@jackatak.theporch.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: BRISTOL AMATEUR RADIO CLUB
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4UD
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, RFI help, Other
Address: 107 MAPLELAWN DR
BRISTOL, TN 37620-1625
Contact: GREEVER CHARLES V, KG4CKV
Web: http://www.qsl.net/barc
E-mail: 4greever@3wave.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: CLARKSVILLE AMATEUR TRANSMITTI
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: KF4L
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, RFI help, Other
CLARKSVILLE, TN 37040
Contact: BLACK THOMAS F, KC6TUU
Phone: ( )572-9238 (D)
Web: http://www.kf4l.org
E-mail: pbsunshine@aol.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: HICKORY WITHE DX CLUB
Specialties: Contest/DX
Call sign: KB4KC
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: 110 FISHERVILLE RD
COLLIERVILLE, TN 38017
Contact: COX TERRY A, KB4KA
Phone: (901)263-4888 (D) (901)854-4191 (N)
Web: http://www.concentric.net/~Tacox
E-mail: kb4kc@arrl.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: MID SOUTH 2M SSB GROUP (Regional/National)
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: KG4HUZ
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: 961 POPLAR LEAF RD
COLLIERVILLE, TN 38017-1439
Contact: WEATHERFORD GARY A, N4LGY
Phone: (901)384-4100 (D) (901)853-5011 (N)
Web: http://www.geocities.com/midsouth2meterssb/
E-mail: n4lgy@bellsouth.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: MAURY ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4GGM
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, Other
Address: 300 KIMBERLY DR
COLUMBIA, TN 38401-6908
Contact: SKAGGS DANIEL L, N7DLS
Phone: (931)381-5476 HOME (D)
Web: http://www.w4ggm.org
E-mail: sec@w4ggm.org
ARRL Section: TN

Name: CUMBERLAND PLATEAU ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W8EYU

Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Other
Address: P.O. BOX 2956
CROSSVILLE, TN 38557
Contact: KOESTER JOSEPH W, W4NSA
Phone: (931)788-1360 (D)
Web: http://www.qsl.net/w8eyu/index.html
E-mail: jwkoest@citlink.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: TRI-COUNTY ARC-SPARTA TN
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: KR4BT
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: 169 SOUTHERN HILLS DR
DOYLE, TN 38559
Contact: WEBB CHRISTY L, KF4TEP
Web: http://www.public.usit.net/kr4bt/kr4bt.html
ARRL Section: TN

Name: RHEA COUNTY ARS
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: K4DPD
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Other
Address: POB 233
EVENSVILLE, TN 37332
Contact: LYDA LARRY H, WA4PJP
Phone: (423)365-6684 (D) (423)365-6684 (N)
Web: http://www.volstate.net/~ko4sy
E-mail: wa4pjp@volstate.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: MID-SOUTH DX ASSOCIATION
Specialties: DX
Services: None
Address: 1527 W CHURCHILL DOWNS
GERMANTOWN, TN 38138-1910
Contact: JIMMY H MCLEAN, K4XO
ARRL Section: TN

Name: KINGSPORT ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4TRC
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Other
Address: 138 CIRCLE VIEW DR
GRAY, TN 37615-3306
Contact: WINEGAR LAWRENCE A, KE4GUT
Phone: (615)477-8888 (D)
Web: http://w4trc.tripod.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: ROANE COUNTY ARC INC
Specialties: General Interest

Call sign: KG4PZD
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes,
Other
Address: 112 LAKESIDE DR
HARRIMAN, TN 37748-8634
Contact: ERISMAN CHARLES M, KC4YYD
Phone: (865)354-1101 (D) (865)354-1101 (N)
Web: http://www.qsl.net/rcarc
E-mail: cmerisman@home.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: BIG SOUTH FORK ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4BSF
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Other
Address: 3287 HURRICANE ROAD
HUNTSVILLE, TN 37756
Contact: WEST JACQUETTA E, KE4QQG
Phone: (423)663-2303 (D) (423)663-2377 (N)
Web: http://bsfarc.com
E-mail: westsheep@highland.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: CAMPBELL COUNTY ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4OGJ
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes
Address: POB 131
JACKSBORO, TN 37757
Contact: ELKINS JAMES V, KQ4AB
Phone: (423)562-0442 (D)
E-mail: jelkins@ccdi.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: WEST TENNESSEE ARS
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: WF4Q
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: POB 3382
JACKSON, TN 38303
Contact: KENNY R JOHNS, AB4EG
Phone: (731)425-8545 (D) (731)427-6782 (N)
Web: http://www.wtars.org
E-mail: wf4q@arrl.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: UNIVERSITY ARC (School/Youth)
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: WA4UCI
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes
Address: E TN STATE UNIVERSITY

BOX 70552
JOHNSON CITY, TN 37614
Contact: ROBERT M MAY, II, K4SE
Phone: (423)439-7815 (D) (423)753-3662 (N)
E-mail: MAYR@ETSU.EDU
ARRL Section: TN

Name: UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE ARC OR (School/Youth)
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: AA4UT
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, Other
Address: 401 EAST STADIUM HALL
KNOXVILLE, TN 37996
Contact: NAPIER JEFFREY A, AG4JF
Web: http://www.utarc.org
E-mail: utarc@utarc.org
ARRL Section: TN

Name: NASHVILLE ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: K4CPO
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, RFI help, Other
Address: 241 LANIER DR
MADISON, TN 37115-3814
Contact: MALONE BOBBY G, WB5ZDS
Phone: (615)865-6225 (D)
Web: http://QSY.to/NARC.ARES
ARRL Section: TN

Name: SMOKY MOUNTAIN ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4OLB
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, Other
Address: CARROLL W PEABODY W4PCA SCTR
2054 INDEPENDENCE DR
MARYVILLE, TN 37803
Contact: CARROLL W PEABODY, JR, W4PCA
Phone: (865)982-5839 (D) (865)982-5839 (N)
Web: http://smarc.homestead.com/basic.html
E-mail: w4pca@att.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: OCOEE ARS
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: WD4OAR
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, RFI help, Other
Address: PO BOX 502

MCDONALD, TN 37353
Contact: BENTON DAVID M, WB4JGG
Phone: (423)479-2700 (D) (423)479-2700 (N)
Web: http://www.qsl.net/wd4oar/
E-mail: wd4oar@arrl.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: DELTA ARC [SSC]
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4BS
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, Other
Address: POB 750482
MEMPHIS, TN 38175-0482
Contact: THOMPSON TOMMY L, KD4TJO
Phone: (901)363-1198 (N)
Web: http://www.deltaclub.org
E-mail: kd4tjo@arrl.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: CARTER COUNTY ARA
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: KF4ZQA
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: PO BOX 414
MILLIGAN COLLEGE, TN 37682-0414
Contact: PAUL TOLLEY, KD4INB
Phone: (423)543-6107 (D) (423)543-6107 (N)
Web: http://www.telery.com/ccares/
E-mail: kd4inb@wireco.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: JOHNSON COUNTY ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: KF4RBR
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: PO BOX 238
MOUNTAIN CITY, TN 37683-0238
Contact: MC ELYEA JACKIE E, N4JEM
Phone: (423)727-7394 (D) (423)727-7394 (N)
E-mail: n4jem@prefeered.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: SHORT MTN. REPEATER CLUB, INC.
Specialties: Repeater
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: POB 110846
NASHVILLE, TN 37222
Contact: FANNING MILTON H, WA4GZZ
Phone: (615)832-3215 (D) (615)832-3215 (N)
Web: http://www.qsl.net/smrc

E-mail: wa4gzz@juno.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: OAK RIDGE ARC INC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4SKH
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, Other
Address: P.O. BOX 4291
OAK RIDGE, TN 37831-4291
Contact: BOWER DAVID L, K4PZT
Phone: (865)690-8360 (D) (865)670-1503 (N)
Web: http://www.korrnet.org/orarc/
E-mail: orarc@korrnet.org
ARRL Section: TN

Name: EAST TENNESSEE DX ASSN.
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: NJ4I
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: 104 PALLAS RD
OAK RIDGE, TN 37830
Contact: GARDNER CHARLES W, KF4VZQ
Phone: (865)483-6963 (D) (865)483-6963 (N)
Web: http://www.etdxa.org
E-mail: jgarn32596@aol.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: WILSON ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4LYR
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: 141 MEDEARIS DR
OLD HICKORY, TN 37138-1714
Contact: O.D. KEATON, WA4GLS
Web: http://www.wilsonarc.org
E-mail: odwa4gls@prodigy.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: CHATTANOOGA ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4AM
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, Other
Address: 8719 SNOW HILL RD
OOLTEWAH, TN 37363-9689
Contact: CURLE CHARLES E, AD4F
Phone: (423)755-3217 (D) (423)756-4881 (N)
Web: http://www.qsl.net/w4am
E-mail: ad4f@juno.com
ARRL Section: TN

Name: TENNESSEE CONTEST GROUP
Specialties: Contest
Call sign: K4TCG
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: 1385 OLD CLARKSVILLE PIKE
PLEASANT VIEW, TN 37146-8095
Contact: ROBBINS SCOTT, W4PA
Web: http://www.k4ro.net/tcg
ARRL Section: TN

Name: RADIO AMATEUR CLUB OF KNOXVILLE
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4BBB
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes,
Other
Address: 3951 THOMAS CROSS RD
SEVIERVILLE, TN 37876-1247
Contact: WATERS DAVID P, AC4JF
Phone: (423)453-1051 (D) (423)428-2282 (N)
Web: http://www.korrnet.org/rack
E-mail: w4bbb@arrl.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: DEKALB COUNTY AMATEUR RADIO CLUB
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: KC4GUG
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, RFI help, Other
Address: 288 DOGWOOD CIR
SMITHVILLE, TN 37166-2712
Contact: CURTIS WILLIAM F, KC4GUG
Phone: (615)597-9563 (D) (615)597-9563 (N)
Web: http://www.geocities.com/kg4bto1/darc_warc.html
E-mail: curtisf@k12tn.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: STONES RIVER ARC [SSC]
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: K4FUN
Services: Help for newcomers, Other
Address: P.O. BOX 54
SMYRNA, TN 37167
Contact: HALL JAMES M, WB4OFM
Phone: (615)287-3331 (D) (615)223-9997 (N)
Web: http://www.k4fun.net
E-mail: stonesriverarc@comcast.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: LAKEWAY ARC
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: KF4JJJ
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes,
Other

Address: P.O. BOX 895
TALBOTT, TN 37877-0895
Contact: BRADLEY ED L, W4VGI
Phone: (865)993-1422 (D) (865)993-1422 (N)
Web: http://www.lakewayarc.org
E-mail: w4vgi@lakewayarc.org
ARRL Section: TN

Name: MID SOUTH VHF ASSOCIATION
Specialties: DX/Repeater
Services: Help for newcomers, RFI help, Other
Address: 1600 WILSON AVE
TULLAHOMA, TN 37388-2881
Contact: WIECK DENNIS J, N4ZKR
Phone: (931)455-7541 (D) (931)393-3909 (N)
E-mail: n4zkr@arrl.net
ARRL Section: TN

Name: MIDDLE TENNESSEE ARS
Specialties: General Interest
Call sign: W4UOT
Services: Help for newcomers, Entry-level classes, Higher-level classes, RFI help, Other
Address: P.O. BOX 932
TULLAHOMA, TN 37388
Contact: BARTHOLOMEW TERRY D, NQ4Y
Phone: (931)454-4292 9 (D) (931)393-3992 (N)
Web: http://www.net/mtars
E-mail: jack@cafes.net
ARRL Section: TN

4968. Re: Modified IC-2100 usage MURS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 21:11:57 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205311311.5aba6831@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44137
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:<3CF75E63.6F63@worldlynx.net>...
> stewart wrote:
> >
> > As I've said, I'm not going to post for awhile regarding the
> > high-power external amp issue... but I've noticed that it has now
> > evolved to somehow include the subject of ANY radio that runs more
> > than 2W TPO - which is really a different subject.
> >
> > I have no doubt that there ARE people running 50W IC-2100 radios on
> > MURS. Oddly enough, the few cases I've heard of involving the IC-2100
> > have all involved Hams.
>
>
> Pardon me for saying this, but you sound like you're backpeddling a bit.
> In all reality, what's the difference between someone running a 2W HT
> into a 100 watt output amplifier, or someone running a modified Motorola
> Micor at 100 watts?

HUGE difference. The "bigger is better" External High-Power Amplifier
"arms race" culture that exists on 11m CB leads to a never-ending
escalation in amplifier power... nowadays 3000W "just isn't enough".

With use of integral radios(with internal amplifiers) on GMRS/MURS,
there is at least a somewhat "reasonable upper power bound" that
exists on these services. Even in light of this, it should be noted
that the vast majority of users on MURS use rules-conforming handheld
radios having <= 2W TPO capability. While there have been a few
recent reports of hams using and/or selling low-cost 50W IC-2000
mobile ham rigs on MURS - these individuals are being pressured to
"cease and desist" their high-profile illegal activities.

Additionally, while it can't be ruled out that some individuals have
experimented with the usage of external high-power amplifiers on
MURS/GMRS, it is quite clear that the usage of these devices is not
culturally endemic on these services, as it is on 11m CB.

> It's not about "amplifiers" as much as it's about ignoring the power
> limits of the law.

While I understand your point; as a MURS user, I'm personally much
more concerned with an individual running an external 500W amplifier,
than I am with someone running a 5W handheld with a rubber duck dummy
load antenna.

> Dave

Stewart - N0MHS

4969. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 21:44:45 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205311344.ac804a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44138
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Vito <vito@crosslink.net> wrote in message news:<3CF62495.788E199E@crosslink.net>...
> > stewart wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >.... the ham VHF/UHF bands are VIRTUALLY UNUSED ....
>
> I guess that's why there is at least a 5 year wait to get a repeater
> pair coordinated on 2M even in the rural South.

Common misconception... just because they are allocated, doesn't mean they are used.

Stewart - N0MHS

4970. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 21:50:17 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0205311350.234fc09d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 44139
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.net> wrote in message news:<3CF5100B.D1EBFEDD@mailcity.net>...
> I would suggest you acquire a VHF/UHF radio that actually receives
> and listen again.

I've got plenty of good radios and antennas...

Hams better start dealing with reality - or we all are going to wake
up one day soon, and - POOF! there goes 1.25M!

Stewart - N0MHS

4971. Re: OT: Need a ham club in Chattanooga TN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 22:07:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CF7F430.1DDAAAE0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 44140

N4IXT wrote:

> I have a friend of a friend who currently lives near Chattanooga TN. This
> fall she is going to Africa to be a missionary. She is in the process of
> studying to get her tech, then general license so she will be able to
> communicate back home.
>

Be sure she understands the "no pecuniary interests" rule in ham radio.
Missionaries have been known to run into trouble with this from
time to time.

4972. Re: Licensing. . . We buy at Wal mart, we don't need no stinkin lincense!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 22:10:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020531181004.08074.00001861@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 44141

>Hams better start dealing with reality - or we all are going to wake
>up one day soon, and - POOF! there goes 1.25M!
>
>Stewart - N0MHS
>

Who cares let it go away, I sure wont miss it

4973. Q!Re: Code Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-05-31 23:02:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3CF80079.24F1B78F@att.net>
Source record: 44142

Brian P Burke wrote:

You're a fairly amazing fella, Gadfly.

> My opinions,

And you're fairly entitled to them, as everyone else is. But you find it impossible to understand that your opinions are *your opinions*, not first principles eligible to be forced onto the rest of the civilized world.

> for example:
>
> CW is just another mode.

Yep. But, strangely, it's the only mode that demands the level of training required for humans to be able to actually use it.

> Test it as other modes are tested.

Which amounts to no testing at all. Not too an obscure concept in the ham radio testing world of today, actually. So why even have such a thing as tests? Just dump them right along with all the categories of licenses. We see where you're coming from.

>
> Morse exams have outlived their usefullness by at least 15 years, probably
> 30 or 40 years, but I don't have the history on it.

You don't have a grasp of it, either.

> The Novice CW subbands are grossly underutilized (dead).

Yep, all you Novices abandoned them for a microphone on 10 meters. Novices used to talk to each other on the novice bands, practicing, improving their CW skills and code speed. First thing you knew, they found themselves ready for the General test. What a concept!

But as for you, well, when no OT answered your forlorn CQ at a couple words per minute or whatever, you found your calling. You know what it is, just as we do.

>
> We need only one full license and only one entry level license.

Well, that's all you ever had! Problem is, not that many people, including the folks at the FCC, seem to buy your story. Have you ever worked in sales?

> Anything
> else are merit badges for the insecure.

I don't think you're exactly qualified to make such a pronoucement to the world in general. But your opinion is yours, and you're welcome to it.

>
> The Technician was never designed nor meant to be an entry level license.

Nope. The ARRL and the FCC managed to really screw up the Novice license by awarding it HF fone privileges. Novice enhancement, they called it, but it should have been novice termination. That was the result. More of the ongoing "get the numbers up" nonsense.

>
> The Technician conveys huge priveleges that might not be suitable for
> beginners.

Dang, we agree on something! But fact is virtually none of them seem to be dumb enough to actually try to use those high power privileges to the max. Fortunately.

>
> Thus a new entry level license is in order.

Been around for over 50 years. Known as the Novice. Should be reviewed and refurbished. Won't be. No one who matters who could fix it cares.

>
> Dick is nuts.
> Larry is nuts.
> Steve is nuts.

You may have your opinion, as inaccurate as it is. I think you might have understood that there are opinons are subject to review. And there will be others who regard your activities of the past couple decades as something less than rational. Like insisting on self-flagellation. And terminal stubbornness, not to mention stupidity.

>
> Val is a Troll, bases his ham knowledge on and repeats what his ham neighbor
> says.

Do you happen to have a neighbor who is a knowledgeable longtime ham whom you might lean on for some real, accurate information??? Sure would be a possible source of assistance, of which you clearly are in dire need.

>
> Bruce is an ignorant Troll.
> Dann Finn is in collusion with Larry, very mean spirited, and solicits
> pornography to be sent to my e-mail address.
>
> So, if you ask me next month what I think of the Technician license, I will
> probably say the very same thing. Ditto Dick, Larry and Bruce.

> No surprises here. You've been a terminal lamebrain so long that change for
> you is out of the question.